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At a recent symposium on “history and new teacher unionism” convened by 
the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston 
1990), it became apparent that there is a worldwide revival in the historical study 
of teachers’ unions. Canada is part of this revival, as one would expect from a 
country that produced its first teacher union histories just before the outbreak of 
the Second World War. Since then there have been periodic excursions into the 
field, yielding over fifty “scholarly” studies and another dozen or so “in-house” 
histories. Surprisingly, while the interest in the history of Canadian organizations 
has persisted, the overall quality of the work has been uninspiring and little of it 
has been published. As a result there has been none of the lively debate on teacher 
union history that has occurred in England, France, Australia, and to a lesser 
extent in the United States.¹

This absence of mainstream inquiry in Canada has been lamented by some 
historians of education and ignored by others, while labour historians have not 
feeled impelled to include teacher union histories in their surveys or discussions on 
the Canadian labour movement.² Yet if the historiography of teacher unionism 
is uninspiring, the history of teacher unions in Canada, despite their recent origins 
(c. 1920), is rich and vibrant, and distinctive in character compared with their 
counterparts in the United States or the British Commonwealth of Nations. This 
essay hopes to generate a new historical interest in this fascinating, and relevant, 
field of inquiry, by attempting to fulfill two tasks. The first is to provide a critical 
discussion of what has already been written on Canadian teachers’ unions; this 
discussion will have the additional dimension of an international perspective. 
The second task of the essay is to suggest by insight and example that what has 
been written over the past fifty years, whatever its merits, provides a foundation 
for renewed effort and fresh enterprise.

As a starting point, one should acknowledge the “in-house” commemorative 
histories, often better known for their exotic titles than their contents. Among 
these are Chafe’s Chalk, Sweat and Cheers: A History of the Manitoba Teachers’ 
Society, French’s High Button Bootstraps—The Federation of Women Teachers’ 
Associations of Ontario 1918-1968, or my favourite title, Hopkins’ The Long 
March: A History of the Ontario Men Teachers’ Federation. Studies in this 
genre are written for the membership of a union to celebrate its development in 
terms of its leadership, policies, and institutional achievements. Progress or 
struggle is generally depicted as one-dimensional: the union overcomes conser-
vative political forces and membership apathy in its gradual evolution towards a modern, respected organization in Canadian provincial education. Such studies are of limited value to historians, except for their overall brevity, factual record from union sources, and, in a few cases, the reproduction of recollections of shared experiences in early teacher union journalism. R. Tyre’s history of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation borrows generously from C.S. McDowell’s doctoral dissertation on the Federation, which adds to the usefulness of the book. H.A. Cuff’s *A History of the Newfoundland Teachers’ Association 1890-1930*, published in 1985, which studies the union’s role in Newfoundland before the colony joined Confederation in 1949, straddles both the academic and the scholarly worlds. Essentially it is a slight revision of a 1971 thesis with an extended epilogue. Cuff, who was an assistant secretary of the NTA, is committed to writing a centenary history, and to quote from the book’s preface, “Barring divine intervention, Cuff’s definitive work on the history of the Newfoundland Teachers’ Association will appear shortly after the year 2015.”

The first phase of the serious study of teacher union history commences with the work of G.J. Buck, J.H. Hardy, and Kathleen MacNab. All wrote when provincial organizations were not more than thirty years old. Buck and Hardy were union officers when they compiled their survey histories. Buck’s two studies were the more ambitious because he attempted to cover most of the Canadian unions, while Hardy focused exclusively on Ontario. All three authors drew heavily, too heavily, on the printed records of the central organizations, but Buck and Hardy were also able to call on their own experiences, observations, and contacts in the Canadian Teachers’ Federation network. Buck’s dissertations became influential because in later years Paton, Muir, and McDowell uncritically used his information and interpretations to explain the growth of teachers’ unions. MacNab’s dissertation on the Alberta Teachers’ Association is a short, narrow, and descriptive study which glosses over its early history. The significance of these pioneering studies rests not on their quality, but on the fact that their authors placed teacher union studies in a “legitimate field” of inquiry for Canadian education research of the 1940s.

The second phase of that inquiry emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, when a spate of dissertations were presented for examination in North American universities. Despite the titles of many of these, all had a strong historical flavour and methodology. To give one example, R.A. North’s thesis “The British Columbia Teachers’ Federation and the Arbitration Process,” written in an economics and politics department, was a history of the BCTF’s role in salary determination and its relationship to the provincial system of compulsory arbitration between 1919 and about 1960. North read not only the entire run of the *BC Teacher* and several unpublished histories of the early BCTF, but interviewed leading BCTF members who had been involved in industrial issues over the years. From a variety of approaches, each provincial union and the Canadian Teachers’ Federation had its history written at least once, while there were also contemporary studies of some unions published in Canadian social science periodicals. The latter, al-
though primarily analyses of the contemporary behaviour of the teachers' unions, provide valuable material on the early stages of union growth. Some, like the commentaries of Paton and Muir, draw heavily on Buck's historical studies.  

Considered in total, the scholarly studies of the 1960s and 1970s are a disappointment for the student of teacher union history. There are individual exceptions, namely the excellent dissertations of Bryans, Ramsey, Roald, McDowell, and Topley, which stand out even more compared to the blandness of many other studies of this period. The chief complaint against Canadian teacher union histories is that they sacrifice historical sensitivity in their concern for organizational theories on the dichotomous relationship between trade unionism and professionalism. Teacher union growth was seen as a continuous struggle between the two concepts, with professionalism becoming, almost inevitably, the victor, or with teachers reaching the state of grace by engaging in "professional unionism." Of course, these types of studies are neither the invention nor the prerogative of North American scholars, as waxing and waning on professional status within teacher union growth can be found in histories written elsewhere.

These studies and their North American counterparts were undoubtedly influenced by the rise of teacher militancy in the 1960s. This concern for relevance to modern problems was accentuated in the North American situation where historians of Canadian teachers' unions were raised in schools of education, especially education administration. There was an anticipation based more on hope than experience that the teachers' unions would reconcile professional respectability with militant unionism at some Hegelian point, a professionally oriented teachers' union. Many of these historians of Canadian teachers' unions studied and taught in schools of educational administration, and/or were paid or elected officials of the teachers' unions themselves. Few were graduate scholars in history or history of education departments. In contrast, teacher union histories written in Australia seemed to be derived from a "love-hate relationship" between teachers and "the Department" (the State Education Department in each state), and the studies were written by students schooled at honours and graduate thesis levels in Australian history, itself sympathetic to the formal study of the Australian labour movement. It is not suggested here that there is any quintessential superiority of Australian work. Instead the point is to suggest that differences in intellectual sources have obviously influenced the writing of teacher union history.

The reading of teacher union histories of the Canadian organizations of this period reveals deficiencies in methods, admittedly found elsewhere, but which, because of their pervasiveness in the Canadian studies, call into question the adequacy of explanations of the development of Canadian teacher unions. These deficiencies are catalogued in the following way.

First, most were written outside the context of labour history or social history. Thus, while the major theses either incorporated Etzioni's semi-professions organizational model, or Eckstein or Dahl's studies of interest group behaviour, there was a conspicuous absence of seeing the relevance of the Webbs or other
labour development theorists, such as the American writers, Commons, Perlman and Dunlop. This may have been because of the authors' reluctance to see teachers in relation to workers or to working-class organizations. Again, it may have been because of the primitive status of labour history in Canadian history until the 1970s. Similarly, teachers' work and the managerial control of teachers in large school systems were neglected and teachers' grievances were measured in terms of simple economic conditions: salaries and pensions, tenure (or lack of it), or the low professional status of teachers. Overall, the study of Canadian teachers' unions as labour organizations in this period rested on an infertile bed of simple historical description, devoid of social theory or labour development theory, but heavily embossed with organizational and political influence models relevant either to professionalization or interest group behaviour. This characteristic becomes a deficiency in that the process of formation, and the early development of teachers' unions, were not treated as historical movements but as earlier episodes in the organizational momentum of a teachers' union.

To take just one issue. In union development theories at least three strategic, interrelated factors of growth are widely recognized: changes in technological and/or material conditions, a favourable socio-legal climate or framework, and organizational leadership. Most histories of Canadian teachers' unions explicitly identify the importance of material rewards in the formation of individual unions, but ignore or treat as superficial the significance of the other two factors. Leadership of the early teachers' unions was essential for their formation whether it were the more charismatic leadership by men, or the group, "teachers' club," leadership by women. Both types of leadership were critical if teachers were to be persuaded that they had to break away from the older education associations, or from unions controlled by men teachers. While it is currently unfashionable in labour history to emphasize charismatic or sectional leadership as a strategic variable of formation in dealing with school teachers of lower-middle-class origins, bourgeois values, and inherent conservatism, or at best, confusion about collective organization, a strong leadership presence was necessary to carry them past this cultural barrier. Leadership of teachers became a necessary condition in the emergence of teachers' unionism to harness teachers' collectivity from changes in their work situation, and to capitalize on the emergent favourable socio-political climate for white collar unionism. It was also necessary that leadership emerge to encourage the notion of a central union rather than disparate sections.

Canadian leadership of teacher unions also assumed other proportions. Immigrant teachers, especially from England and Scotland who came to western Canada before World War One, brought with them the ideas and experience of British teacher unionism. But no evidence was supplied by Canadian historians to indicate the actual numbers of teachers who came from Britain and stayed to teach (or returned home during the war), and none on the direct, personal links with former members of the National Union of Teachers (or the Educational
Institute of Scotland). An NUT influence is assumed as a leadership factor when its importance was found in cultivating the notion of a central union of teachers within a province. There are exaggerated claims that the central union of teachers in each province was a Canadian invention, or that it was an exceptional Canadian development,12 when this would seem to be a logical outcome, not only of the English model per se, but of Canadian teachers’ remoteness from the influence of the American Federation of Teachers. Why the local unions of teachers rejected the American alternative remains unclear; perhaps they did so because of their latent nationalism, or perhaps because of AFT’s direct links with organized labour. Perhaps Canadian teachers turned to the home country because it was just that, and they were of a generation not far removed from direct contacts with NUT. Perhaps the home country was more inspirational than exemplar. We just do not know. Moreover, the British notion of teacher unionism was contested by some Canadian teachers. In western Canada for instance, several provincial unions toyed with the idea of adopting an American Federation of Teachers type of organization, with the strength of the union being locally, not centrally, based. But because the AFT was also directly linked to the American industrial union movement (and obtained some of its strength in American cities from that link), Canadian teachers were probably dissuaded from such an organizational model because they rejected the need for affiliation with the local trade union movement.13

There is one final element in this question of the early leadership’s perceptions of what a teachers’ union should be in Canada. Initially many of the provincial bodies employed the title “union” to suggest a centralized decision-making structure in which the union’s executive acted on behalf of local associations. This was the modus operandi for England’s National Union of Teachers after 1870, and the way in which “English-type” teachers’ unions in Australasia, southern Africa, India, and the British Caribbean adopted the term in later years. Canada was undoubtedly influenced by this form of “cultural imperialism,” but the early provincial unions in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia were also anxious to display the “union” shingle to indicate that they were to be fundamentally different from the older education associations and teachers’ institutes.14 But when these same unions failed to attract new members (for a variety of reasons) and at the same time attempted to exist in a period of acute labour unrest between 1916 and 1920, which stigmatized the term “union,” then all but Nova Scotia’s teachers changed their organization’s title from “Union.” The change in title was not accompanied, however by a shift in perceptions about protecting teachers’ working conditions.

The second deficiency of Canadian teacher union histories of this period is a marked insensitivity to the wider historical processes of social formation. Most studies have failed to establish an essential dynamism between the formation of teachers’ unions, or early growth, and changing forces in the labour market or wider social movements. Thus Hobsbawn’s old, but valuable, theory of social turbulence influencing “explosions” of trade union formation was ignored as an
explanation of the early growth of women teachers' unions in Toronto in the 1880s (or Quebec in the 1930s), or for the more formative period of union growth during World War One. Similarly the influences of the "Wobbly" in western Canada is not tested in the formation of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, although the Wobblies movement did encourage the unionization of firefighters, police, and municipal officers. In Ontario there has been no attempt to see whether the social forces which influenced the formation of the Police Federation in 1918 were also related to the teachers' ambitions to establish teachers' unions between 1918 and 1920. If the police (or nurses, or civil servants) could establish an industrial organization modelled on the Police Federation of England, why should school teachers be denied a similar union?  

This type of question was never asked. Nason acknowledged in one sentence that the growth of trade unionism in Canada towards the end of the war, and the resulting gains to workers, "was not lost on the teachers."  

Other social movements and forces were also neglected in the treatment of teacher union formation and growth. None of the histories written in this period, with the exception of Wendy Bryans' incisive study of the Women Teachers' Association of Toronto, test whether there was any connection between the movement for women's enfranchisement and the impetus for women to establish their own unions or join the new province-wide unions. Urbanization was also neglected as a factor in explaining the early growth of provincial unions. Manzer did at least acknowledge its importance but claimed superficially that it "strengthened the movement for teachers' associations by increasing the possibilities for interaction among individual teachers". If this was the basis of its role then teachers in many cities would have unionized much earlier than 1916-20. What urbanization produced was the beginning of the centralized systematization of teachers employed by city boards. The teachers' response to this subordination to managerial control influenced their mentality towards collective organization. R.M. Stamp in his study of Calgary schooling did not consider the emergence of teacher unionism in the city, but his argument that the complexity of city life forced its school system, along with other public services, to move quickly beyond the frontier stage of the late nineteenth century "into the mainstream of the twentieth century" has more validity in terms of teachers' attitudes, than the mere opportunity for interaction. R.D. Ramsey's fine history of the Alberta Teachers' Association as a social movement takes a different tack. He explained the formation of the Teachers' Alliance (as it was first called) as a product of the prairies' "progressive movement," which encouraged teachers by the example of the farmers' association in rural towns and organized labour in Calgary and Edmonton to establish a teachers' union in 1917. The new union, however, lost the support of the United Farmers' Association once its teachers in Calgary and Medicine Hat threatened strike action, and the staff at Edmonton High School actually walked out for two weeks in April, 1921. As one local newspaper declared at the time, "the lightning strike is the weapon of IWW and
One Big Union."20 Such a union not only stampeded the farmers, it probably frightened off potential members for the ATA.

All these studies in the 1960s and 1970s acknowledge the impact of World War One on Canadian teachers’ attitudes towards organization. The obvious target is the relative decline, indeed deprivation, of teachers’ material conditions, especially their salaries after 1915. But of course the war also produced a social restlessness and questioning of the old ways in society.21 Some of this restlessness rubbed off on teachers’ ideas about collective organization. To his credit, Buck in 1949 noted this general wartime “unrest and the tendency towards self-expression.” Other historians such as Nason and McDowell, drawing on Buck’s approach, saw the war as a period when there was a break with the past, with nineteenth-century individualism to be replaced by the twentieth-century idea of community. Thus teachers were seen to have become impatient “with the failure of others (schoolmen and their Education Associations) to solve their material problems” and looked to other ways “to make their views known.”22

The formation of a teachers’ union was the most obvious strategy. Nevertheless, these historians, and others of the period, tended to subordinate changes in attitudes to a more immediate factor, the relative decline in teachers’ salaries (but not to other changes in the material conditions of teaching) in a period of wartime inflation. The weakness in this approach is that it ignores the basic question of why in earlier periods of economic dislocation, such as the 1890s, teachers in eastern Canada were not attracted to collective organizations.

No one, except J.D. Muir, attempted to explain the early growth of teachers’ unions in terms of the co-existence of a number of strategic factors of union development. Muir, who was a teacher of labour relations (Faculty of Business Administration, University of Alberta), was obviously aware of John Dunlop’s theories of trade union growth when he advanced four strategic factors in the formation of teachers’ unions in the 1910s. These were: teachers from Great Britain brought with them the ideas of union organization from their membership in the National Union of Teachers (and perhaps the Educational Institute of Scotland); teachers’ real incomes declined as a result of wartime and post-war inflation; the social impact of the war created an intense awareness of “the democratic process and the importance of education”; and Canadian teachers were aware of the advantages of organization from other employee groups who had unionized in this period, and who had obtained improvements in material rewards.23 The problem with Muir’s analysis is twofold. First, he did not undertake intimate research into the conditions themselves, but relied on existing studies, which we have seen were also limited in their attention to detail. For instance, how many teachers came from Great Britain in the period before 1916, and how many of these had been involved in unions at home? Second, he does not stress enough the role of leadership, the increasing systematization of urban teachers, or the socio-legal climate which would have been conducive to teacher union formation and growth. It is far too superficial to argue that an awareness
of "the democratic process" provided the necessary favourable climate for union formation.

The third deficiency in most of these studies in the 1960s and 1970s was that they were not concerned to dig beneath the alluvial soil into the pre-history or local history of teacher unions. These are the studies of informal groups, "the resistances-combination," which by historical definition were ephemeral and often unsuccessful organizations, and the attempts at teacher unionism in local centres, not only in urban areas but for instance in remote mining communities. Instead Canadian teacher-union histories adopt "a New Testament approach" and commence their study from the foundation of the modern union, or sweep away earlier attempts at unions, as aggrieved, disenchanted sections within the teachers' institutes or the education associations. Thus the process of formation of teachers' unions is seen as a natural evolution from an education association of "schoolmen" to teachers' unions, whereas the union/professional association tension continued within education associations for many years. Moreover, there were times, such as the 1880s in Ontario, when teachers formed their own unions in protest at, or in spite of, the ambitions of the education associations. The failure of these teachers' unions to gain legitimacy is often dismissed as due to teachers not being ready for this form of organization. Although Hardy's and Bryans' studies of Ontario teachers are exceptional for their interest in these early failures, they did not analyze the ways officialdom and schoolmen dissuaded teachers from supporting unions. Others relied on the evolutionary argument first suggested by Buck in 1938. His simplistic, and at times erroneous, description of the nineteenth-century teachers' unions finds its way without criticism into later studies.24 Later Buck does ponder why the older education associations largely disappeared once the teachers' unions became firmly established. His answer, "they gave so little concern to those real problems of the profession,"25 is hardly an answer, but it does suggest a reason why school teachers withdrew from such associations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. To be fair, some of the historians of this period, especially those who wrote the early histories of teacher unionism in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, emphasize that the early provincial unions were reactions to the unwillingness of education associations, controlled by school inspectors, to allow teachers to discuss issues affecting their working lives. McDowell's study of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation noted a similar attitude in the Saskatchewan Education Association, but he also found that the move towards a union was precipitated by a 1914 meeting of Regina school examiners who had been asked by the Premier to suggest ways of overcoming teacher shortages. The group recommended, among other things, that the payment of adequate salaries and the establishment of a pension fund would help alleviate the problem. These recommendations were rejected by the government, but the issue became the basis for establishing the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation in 1918.26

A fourth deficiency in the study of the growth of Canadian teacher unionism was that historians perceived such growth to be predicated on unified oligarchical
government of unions, rather than competing interests of factions and sections. As a result teachers as members of locals or sections, such as women, rural teachers, secondary teachers, tended to be ignored. There were only a few genuine attempts to examine closely the actual intramural workings of a union, as distinct from its operational roles with provincial departments and government. Watson’s study of the Nova Scotia Teachers’ Union is an exception because it considers the sectional differences between Halifax men teachers and the rest of the province’s teachers. Topley’s study of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers’ Federation is another which hints at rank and file anxiety about the principals’ control of the OSSTF in its first thirty years. Laliberté’s almost contemporary study of the CEQ in Quebec concentrates on the ideological factionalism in the federation. (See the bibliography for references.) The one study which focuses exclusively on a local section was Kojder’s study of the Saskatoon Women Teachers’ Association, which has existed since 1918 as a member of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation.\textsuperscript{27} It was a local which saw the importance of separate unions for women teachers, and at times operated almost independently from the Federation and certainly independently of the then Men Teachers’ Association in Saskatoon. Kojder’s study of this women’s local, and studies of women’s unionism in Toronto, are the only attempts to study the role of local association in school board politics.

The relative absence of sectional and factional studies in the histories of Canadian teachers’ unionism, compared with those in Australia and France, tends to be an outcome of relying on the union journals as major sources of information.\textsuperscript{28} These journals existed as organs of unity, in order that the central executive and general secretary might inform a dispersed and local rank and file. They were not in the business of highlighting internal problems or questioning the leadership. Nowhere can one find a policy statement that the journal expected to publish all members’ letters or accept without revision reports of local associations’ monthly meetings. Yet at times there was disputation and rancor at the top of the organizations. Harry Charlesworth, the general secretary of the BCTF, was occasionally in trouble with its executive, while in the early years of the ATA there was a power struggle between John Barnett, its secretary-treasurer, and the locals, and between Barnett and H.C. Newland, the journal’s editor.\textsuperscript{29} Nevertheless, in reading these histories one gains an impression that the internal histories of the unions were sanitized. Such approaches do little to convey the true momentum of a central union, where conflict, not consensus, was, and is, the way of life, nor do they help us appreciate the occupational condition of teaching, which is riddled with gender, hierarchical, and functional differences.

What was given prominence were the periods when these sectional differences led to actual fragmentation. Obviously Ontario’s experience of three separate unions invites attention. But surprisingly there was no systematic analysis of union fragmentation in the province. Thus we are forced to live with Buck’s embarrassing statement of 1939 that for “fortunate circumstances...there is sufficient number of teachers to make possible the formation and functioning of
three independent organizations." Yet the size of a teaching force has never been seen elsewhere as a potent factor in union fragmentation. Quebec's fragmented unionization of Catholic teachers between 1937 and 1946 also comes to mind, but again nothing has been attempted other than Dionne's sketchy outline of the emergence of three Catholic teachers' syndicates. This is distinct from Wright's useful study of inter-union relations between the CEQ, PAPT, and PACT between 1959 and 1969, which was not a study of union fragmentation because these teachers' unions operate in different systems of schooling. Nevertheless, Wright's study is valuable in highlighting the role schoolteachers played in Quebec's "quiet revolution," and the way the modernization of Quebec's education system as part of this "quiet revolution" forced the teachers' unions to employ new strategies and tactics. Wright found that while there was solid co-operation between the three unions on salaries, working conditions, and industrial relations policy, serious conflict occurred between the unions over language policy, school board restructuring, and jurisdiction of membership. The Quebec unions talked affiliation on a number of occasions, especially when they pursued more militant tactics towards the end of the 1960s, but they were unable to find a workable formula for some form of confederation. Wright's study has not been emulated in any of the histories of Ontario's organizations.

Within other studies of provincial unions attention was paid to the patterns and forces of breakaways (and potential breakaways) from central unions, even though such fragmentation was generally short-lived. In the western provinces, and especially in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, rural schoolteachers were dissatisfied with the handling of the 1930s salaries crisis by their provincial unions. In British Columbia, a Rural Teachers' Association was formed in 1935 but remained within the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, to become its most militant section throughout the late 1930s. In Saskatchewan, however, rural teachers were so dissatisfied with the Teachers' Alliance that they ceded to form the Rural Teachers' Association in September, 1932. They remained outside the provincial body until a new union was created, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, comprising the old Alliance, the Saskatchewan Education Association, and the Rural Teachers' Association, in January, 1934. A reverse situation occurred in Nova Scotia. There the dissatisfaction with the Nova Scotia Teachers' Union's handling of salaries reductions led to the better-paid male teachers of Halifax leaving the Union and establishing the Halifax Men Teachers' Federation in 1932. A period of intense and bitter rivalry followed between the two unions before the Halifax men rejoined the Union in 1937. Overall, unionization of teachers in Canada remained relatively low, despite the absence of widespread fragmentation, until the late 1930s.

One aspect of teacher union growth that did come under close scrutiny was the introduction of "automatic membership" provisions for teachers' unions. Unlike some Australian states where compulsory unionism for teachers was provided by state industrial legislation or inserted into teachers' awards by the industrial courts, in Canada automatic membership is provided for in the
provincial Teaching Profession Acts. The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation was the first union to obtain this “security clause,” in 1935, followed by the Alberta Teachers’ Association in 1936, and most of the other provincial unions in the 1940s. The electoral processes by which individual unions obtained this right to compel teachers to join the designated union is studied closely in most union histories. All of them focus on the membership’s support for such a provision and the pressure exerted by the union to secure the necessary legislation, rather than why provincial governments desired teachers’ unions to become incorporated into the state. The effect on union growth and status of this “uniquely” Canadian educational legislation was that in Saskatchewan and Alberta the teachers’ unions overcame their immediate problems of low and declining membership support in the early 1930s. For some, like W.E. Segall, the introduction of a Teaching Profession Act in Alberta produced the ultimate stage in union growth, the attaining of the status of “collective professional organization” characterized by compulsory membership, sole representation of all teachers, and teachers having sufficient powers to discipline themselves. One not only wonders what this means, but did the ATA members ever see themselves having such a grand organization? For most, the ATA continued to serve their needs as a trade union.

There is some debate whether the Teaching Profession Acts, or their equivalents in Quebec, were necessary for the unions’ survival and union growth. Manzer was bold enough to argue that in the other provinces automatic membership was a “convenience and status symbol” and that they would have survived as organizations without the state’s intervention. True, but his argument that this form of state coercion was unnecessary after the 1930s Depression fails to recognize that without it Canadian levels of teacher unionization would have remained significantly lower, as they had been in the 1920s, compared to, say, the rates in Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. Moreover, an automatic membership, and the level of funds which it subscribed to the union, changed the operational basis of Canadian teachers’ unions almost overnight. From small backrooms of union officials and hired halls, Canadian teachers’ unions became union bureaucracies offering a wide range of benefits and services to members. Manzer also ignores the salient fact that the Teaching Profession Acts guaranteed under law the preservation of the existing organizations and thereby reduced or even eliminated the risk of breakaway unions such as occurred in Britain, New Zealand, and parts of Australia. Often these breakaways arose from the disenchanted of secondary teachers or principals who felt that their economic interests were not being catered for in the larger central unions, now dominated by elementary classroom teachers. It is probable that similar sectional breakaways would have occurred in Canada in the 1950s and 1960s, but for the insertion of the existing union’s name in the appropriate Teaching Profession legislation.

Nevertheless, Manzer’s article is an elaborate discussion on the effects of the Teaching Profession Acts on teacher union growth in Canada. Significantly,
he relied on the historical work of others rather than complete detailed investigation of the unions’ roles in shaping the character of the legislation. The other important historical study of the Teaching Profession Acts, again “via the back door,” is Lyn Hall’s thesis on the history of teachers’ salary determinations in Alberta. Before considering the Alberta situation, Hall provides a brief but useful analysis of the origins of the idea of automatic membership in western Canada. It was an idea born out of the desperation of hard times in the Depression years, which once successfully applied to Saskatchewan spread like a prairie grassfire across the rest of Canada. Hall then focuses on Alberta to demonstrate the effects, not only of automatic membership on teachers, but of the legislative recognition of the Alberta Teachers’ Association, and particularly how this assisted the union to secure a number of almost immediate material improvements for teachers, including a board of reference for dismissal cases and minimum salaries legislation. Despite the quality of these two studies, and the historical details of others on this issue, no one in the 1960s and 1970s asked the now obvious question: were the Teaching Profession Acts in Canada a form of state control over teachers and their unions? Again it was Manzer who hinted at this form of professionalism as a controlling device over teachers, but he only cited the warning of the British Columbia Minister for Education in 1968 that the BCTF should desist from its constant opposition to government funding policies, or else it could lose its rights to automatic membership (as has since come to pass in the 1980s).

The 1960s and 1970s as a period of inquiry was marked by the proliferation of studies on Canadian teachers’ unions which were disappointing in approach, content, and analysis. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that so few of these studies saw the light of day as serious publications.

The last decade has seen a revival in the writing of teacher union histories in Britain, France, and Australia. The reasons for this revival are obscure, but are probably related to two movements: first, the impact of the social history of work and the “new” sociology of education, both of which have emphasized work and the changing labour process, the working-class characteristics, if not location, of white collar employees, and the state and its professional control over teachers; second, the dilemmas facing teacher unions as a result of both the “crisis in public education” (and the restructuring of teaching forces), and conservative attacks against trade unionism, including public-sector union power in post-industrial societies. Armed with a new intellectual orthodoxy, and inspired by the contemporary struggles of teachers’ unions, historians have turned to the re-writing (and the extension) of histories of teachers’ unions to demonstrate the historical legitimacy of such organizations.

Canada (and the United States) have not fully embraced this revivalist process, for reasons which are obscure to an outsider. Perhaps their historians’ pre-occupation with the continuing debate over nineteenth-century public schooling has ensured an exclusion of teacher union history, because most of today’s organizations were only established in the second decade of the twentieth century. Perhaps as Urban suggests in his article on teacher activism, North
American historians are not closely involved with teacher unionism or with the politics of public schooling. Perhaps in contrast to Australia, historians have not been encouraged by today’s unions to explore their uncertain past, or perhaps these historians do not wander into areas where others have already trod, however tentative those steps have been.

Certainly Canadian historians of education have become fascinated by the concept of teachers’ work, but even the exquisitely crafted studies of Alison Prentice and the late Marta Danylewycz on gender and class differences in teachers’ work in nineteenth-century Toronto and Montreal stop short of studies of the collective resistance of teachers. They admit to this in a 1986 discussion on the history of teaching in Canada, claiming correctly that they had at least demonstrated “both the fact of organized teacher-resistance by the turn of the century and the variety of forms it could take.” Prentice had already examined the personal lives of Toronto’s first women teacher unionists in the 1880s, and the work and employment conditions of women teachers generally, in her feminist essay on the formation and growth of the Women Teachers’ Association of Toronto. The study is a brief one, almost a cameo union history, but it adds immeasurably to our understanding of the difficulties and dilemmas facing early teachers’ unions in Canada, and indeed nineteenth-century women’s organizations generally.

A similar feminist approach is evident in Marise Thivierge’s study of the origins, formation, and growth of the Fédération Catholique des Institutrices Rurales (FCIR) in Quebec between 1900 and 1959. Thivierge’s article was taken from her thesis on the social history of lay women teachers in Quebec’s Catholic schools between 1900 and 1964. The article does not address the relationship of teachers’ work to syndicalization with the same forcefulness or clarity as Prentice’s study of the Toronto women’s union, but it is an improvement on Pierre Dionne’s account of the rise of Catholic teacher unionism in Quebec.

In one section of Dionne’s thesis, he focused on the stage of “L’Éveil” (the awakening) in the slow movement towards unionization of Quebec’s Catholic schools. The role of women teachers in forming the first teachers’ union is the centrepiece of this stage. Dionne briefly mentions changes in working conditions, especially the decline in salaries in the 1930s, and how the Catholic Church, which dominated study circles and education associations, failed to become interested in rural teachers’ material conditions. The response of rural women teachers is seen through Laure Gandreault’s role in establishing and promoting the FCIR in 1936–37. Other Catholic teaching sections followed suit and Dionne briefly notes how these first teachers’ syndicates formed a province-wide Catholic teachers’ federation in 1946. Dionne’s main emphasis is to explain the evolution of this federation (Vers La Maturité) into the powerful labour union, the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec (CEQ), in 1968. Dionne’s study is disappointing because of the way he slips quickly over the emergence of the early syndicates, and largely underplays the importance of working conditions and changing socio-political climate in Quebec between the wars. He should have
avoided these oversights because he was trained and supervised in Laval University’s labour relations school.

Thivierge’s article concentrates exclusively on the emergence of the FCIR and its growth in Quebec schooling until the beginnings of the “Quiet Revolution.” Her article does not acknowledge Dionne’s work, but it is more thorough in its examination and decidedly more illuminating in its interpretation. She devotes considerable attention to the educational context of teaching in Quebec, the changing nature of teachers’ work (and not just salary levels), and the women teachers’ supportive (or sisterly) roles in Gaudreault’s calls for a syndicate of rural women teachers. She is also clearer in explaining the state and church’s responses to the new union, and the union’s role in the first provincial federation of Catholic teachers. It must be stressed that Thivierge’s study, like Prentice’s piece on Toronto women teachers, is a short article, at times a summary of this important stage in the growth of Quebec’s teacher unionism. Unfortunately there are no other recent studies, which is surprising given that the history of Catholic teacher unionism virtually starts only fifty years ago, and thus historians have easier access to oral and written sources than elsewhere in Canada. The CEQ and its forerunners almost begs the attention of labour historians and historians of education because its colourful growth can be used as a microscope on modern social formation in a society that has undergone rapid transformation. No other Canadian teachers’ union can hold this form of attraction for historians.

The only other histories of teacher unionism completed in the 1980s are H.J. Smaller’s studies of nineteenth-century teacher-resistances and early teacher unionism in Ontario, and Sandra Gaskell’s study of the Federation of Women Teachers’ Associations of Ontario between 1944 and 1954.51 As a doctoral thesis researched between 1983 and 1987, Smaller’s work exploits to full advantage the various strands of the new teacher historiography written outside of Canada. He argues convincingly that the urge for economic organization and action over teachers’ material conditions was evident in Ontario’s town schools as early as the 1860s. He also demonstrates that school teachers through early associations promoted and resisted the imposition of both teacher professionalism and centralized control of schooling and that professionalism was (and would be in the twentieth century, according to his dissertation’s epilogue) a deliberate strategy employed by the state’s agents to promote this control of schooling and to divorce teachers from their attachment to local communities. Smaller also re-examines the rise of the Women Teachers’ Association of Toronto, emphasizing how it attempted to resist the increasing subordination of women teachers to both school management and educational associations comprised of men. He also explains the importance of the “women teachers’ club” phenomenon (found also in other parts of Canada, for example Ottawa, and in the United States and in parts of Australia) and how this “room of their own” helped bring women teachers closer to collective action in Toronto. Of course, Smaller’s studies are restricted by the scope of his formal dissertation research, and he therefore examines in depth only the origins and emergence of teacher unionism in Ontario before 1910. He
promises to extend the saga by examining the impact of teachers’ work and the state on the growth of teacher unionism at least up until 1945. If these studies are as challenging as his examination of nineteenth-century teacher organizations, then we can finally obtain an appreciation of teacher union development in Ontario denied to us by the earlier studies cited in this essay.

Gaskell’s thesis has a modern flavour to it, covering the FWTAO’s role in Ontario elementary schooling in the post-World War Two years. She adopts a conventional view of union activities, examining the FWTAO’s responses to teachers’ material and professional problems. But the study avoids any serious discussion of the impact Ontario’s Teaching Profession Act on the FWTAO, let alone any discussion of the reasons for the state’s introduction of such legislation. The virtue of the study lies in Gaskell’s discussion of women teachers’ tenure, which is examined by use of individual case files (problems and complaints) held by the FWTAO. Her study reveals that despite an inert conservatism in Ontario’s teacher unionism, the FWTAO and its women members did occasionally challenge, and challenge successfully, the iniquitous school system that was insensitive to the needs of women teachers. One hopes that Gaskell will be persuaded to extend her themes into the more turbulent era of the 1960s and 1970s, so that we can enjoy a major “longitudinal” study of Canada’s only province-wide women’s teachers’ union.

The one disturbing feature of Smaller’s and Gaskell’s work is not their enterprise, but that it is the only Canadian research of the 1980s that represents the best in teacher union historiography. If the 1960s and 1970s were marked by disappointment over the inadequacy of a large number of studies, the 1980s are marked by the overall paucity of studies. There is just too little done. And most of these are only an opening bid rather than a firm transaction. Obviously the concentration on early women’s teacher organizations in Thivierge, Prentice, Smaller, and Gaskell has been a valuable increment to feminist histories of teachers. But it is not a substantial contribution, nor does it pretend to capture the whole story, even of early teacher unionism in Ontario and Quebec. In sum, although the writing of Canadian teacher union history has been almost a continuous enterprise for half a century, it has failed to find “a place in the sun” in either the history of education or labour history.

Having issued such a critique, one readily acknowledges the special, though not unique, problems in the writing of teacher union history in Canada. Four problems come to mind. First, the local dimensions of Canadian schooling, especially the large number of rural school districts, make the writing of a union history an onerous task. At this level, union organization was weak, incipient, and even concealed by teachers from the view of hostile school trustees. Moreover, Canada did not have large urban school systems, except in Toronto and Montreal, which encourage local and detailed, rather than provincial, studies. And as there was some local control and community interest, teachers’ unions have not held a natural primacy in the study of educational politics as they have in the highly centralized systems of France or Australia. In these two countries
the teachers' unions were often the only countervailing interest against government and bureaucracy and therefore they became an immediate attraction to the historian.\textsuperscript{53}

Second, in nineteenth and early twentieth-century Canada there was an absence of clearly defined teaching service with its attendant career hierarchies, promotions committees, province-wide salaries, and job security or tenure. This results in a paucity of technical material on teachers' work and working conditions. The contrast can again be made with nineteenth-century Australia and France where bureaucracy had become an art form and large educational bureaucracies developed in each Australian state and in Paris. The administrative machinery necessary to regulate public school teachers produced a wealth of sources on teachers, their work, working conditions, individual and group grievances, as well as material on the roles of their unions in centralized school systems.\textsuperscript{54} Such sources and information in Australia include not only the obvious forms of Education Department records (including in some states special files on individual teachers in dispute with their employer) but records of the Civil Service Commission, State Superannuation Boards, Workers' Compensation hearings, and after 1920, decisions and related materials of the State Industrial Courts.

Third, while Canada has a strong tradition of official inquiries in education, there have been few inquiries into teachers as employees.\textsuperscript{55} Again this relative absence compared to Australia, where such inquiries often included confidential responses from aggrieved teachers (as in France, later published as \textit{Nous Les Maîtres}) means that material on teachers' work, perceptions of management, or their own organizations is non-existent in public records. It is difficult to find evidence in archives of teachers' subordination to managerial and economic controls. Studies have had to resort to Althouse's type of study which emphasizes the tangible rewards (or lack of rewards) in salary changes, pension funds, and training, and this gives a bland, rather than intimate, indication of teachers' sense of the need for collectivity.

Fourth, in Canada there has been an absence of a strong "labour tradition," compared to European, British, and Australasian countries.\textsuperscript{56} By "a labour tradition" one means the social acceptability of trade unionism, the growth in political representation of labour, and an elaborate industrial relations system which gives appropriate attention to trade unions. At a specific level, the growth of Canadian teacher unionism belies the observation that wherever the British went they took their teachers' organizations with them. At a more general level, Canadian teacher unionism suffered from endemic weaknesses, internal differences in national organization, American influences (or clerical influence in Quebec), and the lack of political expression through a social democratic political party (until more recent times). The importance of a Labour Party for instance in Australia was crucial to teacher union growth, because state Labour governments extended the protective arm and positive encouragement of the compulsory arbitration to white collar unions, including teachers.\textsuperscript{57}
I am not certain of the connection between a "labour tradition" and the study of labour history, but in Canada, labour history was a late starter. It has also tended to bypass the old institutional histories for the culturalist emphasis of E.P. Thompson and others.\textsuperscript{58} The jump may have been at the expense of the study of white collar union history, including that of teachers, while the dominant view that "real" labour history is about working-class work and culture probably has militated against teacher union history. This is not to deny that Canadian labour historians have not produced some worthwhile studies of white collar groups, or that the recurrent interests in the state and labour process will not be beneficial to future studies of teacher unions.\textsuperscript{59}

Nevertheless, these problems are impositions, rather than prohibitions on the writing of teacher union history in Canada. The major barrier to this variety of scholarship is one of attitude. Canadian scholars have not yet fully recognized that the study of teacher union history is a valuable way to shed light, not merely on the organizational growth and character of teachers' unions, but on the changing work processes in teaching, the relation of teachers and their unions to the state, and the critical role teachers' unions play in the politics of schooling. Once this perspective is acknowledged the fields of disappointment may well be transformed into fertile, permanent tracts.

NOTES

* Much of this material was gathered during visits to OISE, Toronto, during 1983 and 1989, and to the University of British Columbia in 1983, and the University of Alberta in 1985.


4. See bibliography for Buck (1938; 1949), Hardy (1939), and MacNab (1949). This discussion of the first histories in Canada excludes C.L. Campbell's study (1930) of the BCTF, which I have not seen, or M.C. McLean and J.E. Robbins' contemporary survey of Canadian teachers' unions published in 1935 (see bibliography also).

5. J.M. Paton, \textit{The Role of Teachers' Organizations in Canada} (Toronto, 1962); J.D. Muir, "Canada" in \textit{Teachers' Unions and Associations}, ed. A.A. Blum (Urbana,

7. The best contemporary studies are Muir (1969), Harp and Betcherman (1980), and Manzer (1969). All three articles draw heavily on the historical development of particular Canadian teachers’ unions.

8. Known officers or officials of provincial unions who wrote on union history were J.H. Hardy (OSSTF), G.J. Buck (STF), C.S. McDowell (STF and CTF), G. Nason (CTF), and H.A. Cuff (NTA).


14. Kratzman, "Alberta Teachers’ Federation," 43-45; McDowell, "Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation," 30. For a broader discussion of the NUT’s influence in Australia see Spaul, "Teachers’ Unions," 152-56. I find it curious that Nova Scotia’s teachers, presumably with a strong Scots influence and background, did not adopt the Scottish equivalent of the NUT, the Educational Institute (of Scotland), as was
the case in the naming of the New Zealand Educational Institute (1883), because of similar backgrounds of South Island teachers in New Zealand.


31. For theoretical discussion on teacher union "breakaways" see A.D. Spaull, "Teachers and Politics: A Comparative Study of Teachers' Unions in New South Wales and Victoria since 1940" (Ph.D. diss., Monash University, 1972), 204-12.
34. I.L. Kandel, ed., Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers’ College, Columbia N.Y. 1935 (New York, 1935). This volume is devoted to the early growth and roles of teachers’ unions in some twenty countries.
37. See bibliography for McDowell on STF; Hall, Ramsey, Segall, and Odynak on ATA; and Skolrood on BCTF. For a critical account of the introduction of the Teaching Profession Act in Ontario, 1944, see H.J. Smaller, "Teachers’ Protective Associations, Professionalism and the State in Nineteenth-Century Ontario" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1988), 286-93.
45. In Australia, John O’Brien, A Divided Unity: The Politics of New South Wales Teacher Militancy Since 1945 (Sydney, 1987); A.D. Spaull, "The Establishment of a National Teachers’ Federation in Australia 1921-1937," History of Education Review 18, 1 (1989): 26-42; and Spaull and Sullivan, Queensland Teachers’ Union, were sponsored or commissioned by respective unions. Currently the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Victorian Secondary Teachers’ Association, and the Technical Teachers’ Union of Victoria have commissioned histories of their organizations.
47. Ibid., 140.


52. Ibid., 66-112; 154-89.


54. For example, I have found a paucity of teacher union material and files relating to teacher union material and conditions during the 1930s in both the Archives of Ontario and Toronto School Board Archives, compared with the type of material available on Australian teachers in state archives and Education Department records. See bibliographies in Mitchell, *Teachers, Education and Politics*, and Spaul and Sullivan, *Queensland Teachers’ Union*. See also J. Ozouf, *Nous Les Maîtres d’École* (Paris, 1967), work autobiographies of men teachers in France between 1880-1914.

55. C.F. Goulson, *A Source Book of Royal Commission and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education, 1787-1978* (Toronto, 1981) indicates that there have been few inquiries into teachers’ working conditions and even then such inquiries were limited to salaries and superannuation.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Hardy, J.H. "Teachers' Organizations in Ontario: Their Historical Development." Ph.D., Toronto, 1939.


Kojder, Apolonja, M. "In Union There is Strength: The Saskatoon Women Teachers' Association." Canadian Woman Studies/Les cahiers de la femme 7, 3 (1986): 82-84.


