

Origins of University Federation in Canada

DANIEL W. LANG
University of Toronto

Abstract: This paper will examine the evolution of university federation in Canada in two periods, one from approximately 1875 to 1925, involving mainly secular instruction, and one beginning in the late 1950s and continuing into the early 21st century, involving mainly theological colleges, in both cases seeking to define different models of federation and affiliation, and the academic and fiscal motivations for each.

Resume: Cet article portera sur l'évolution de la fédération universitaire au Canada pendant deux périodes, une de 1875 à 1925 environ, comprenant principalement de l'enseignement laïque, et une période commençant au début des années 1950 et se poursuivant jusqu'au début du 21^e siècle, comprenant principalement des collèges théologiques, dans les deux cas cherchant à définir divers modèles de fédération et d'affiliation et les motivations scolaires et fiscales pour chacune.

Introduction

In 1908 the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, speaking to an assembly of American college and university presidents, advocated the adoption of institutional federations based on legislation introduced in Manitoba in 1877. Ontario introduced similar legislation soon after in 1887, and Saskatchewan later in 1909. In 1923 King's College and Dalhousie University formed a federation that did not require provincial legislation. The president of the foundation, Henry Pritchett, went so far as to write a personal letter to the governor of Ohio advising him that, if he wanted to bring higher education in his state up to standards and perform efficiently, he should look to the Manitoba model (Pritchett, H. (1909, June 9). [Letter to Judson Harmon]. CUCFAT). In 1923, Robert Falconer, president of the University of Toronto, called university federation "a distinctly Canadian creation" (Falconer, 1923, p. 279). Vincent Massey,

writing as Canada's minister to the United States, described it as "unique" and recommended it as a "demonstrated success" to American Association of University Professors (Massey, 1929, pp. 439-440).

In the 1920s, the Maritime provinces fully developed and nearly adopted an inter-provincial plan for a new federated "central university" (Learned and Sills, 1922). Later, after a nearly five decade hiatus, several provincial governments, seeking to expand capacity of public university systems, returned to the federation model to tap denominational and secular capacity and diversity. Today the number of nominally federated Canadian universities stands at 23, each with several affiliated colleges or universities.

Some histories of higher education in Canada have tended to assume that university federation in Canada was a singular and somewhat Whiggish phenomenon, as if it arose from a common origin that then evolved and improved over the course of nearly a century, beginning with the University of London. This assumption merits serious consideration because the University of London itself said that this was so (University of London, 1912) as did the governments of Nova Scotia and Manitoba in the first articles of the acts that founded respectively the University of Halifax in 1876 and University of Manitoba in 1877. The assumption has been repeated as recently as 2013 (Davies and Bjarnason, 2013; Smith, 1999).

There were, however, those who then and now saw the history differently. In addition to Falconer's 1923 description of university federation as "distinctly Canadian," Murray, writing as president of the University of Saskatchewan in 1928, described university federation as a natural extension to higher education of the model of parliamentary confederation introduced in the British North America of 1867, which was, as Watts (1991) and Vipond (1989) later explained, neither English nor American in content or origin. It was a Canadian construct. Massey's 1929 recommendation of the Canadian model to an American audience reversed what otherwise could be seen as colonial artifact. Sissons described university federation in Canada as an invocation of "the federal principle [by which] the idea which had created the Dominion of Canada twenty years before was applied to higher education (Sissons, 1950, p.166).

There were, in any case, from the start substantive differences among provincial plans for university federation. What *federation* meant in Manitoba, was different from what it meant in Ontario, which in turn was different what it would have meant in the Maritime provinces had a 1922 "central university" plan been

adopted, and different again from what it meant in Saskatchewan. None was really like the University of London model, nor was it like the Quebec model of affiliation of *collèges classiques* with Laval and, later, Montreal. In 1906 in Ontario, a royal commission described the model of federation in that province as a “complete reversal” of the University of London model (Flavelle, 1906, p. xvii).

This paper is the first part of an investigation that takes as a working hypothesis that the history of university federation in Canada is really two histories, the first of about 75 years duration from approximately 1850 to 1925. This was the foundation period when, mainly to afford improvements in academic quality and at the same time balance competing sectarian and secular factions, universities, provincial governments, and religious institutions began efforts to forge formal federations. By the early 20th century Canadian university federation was a recognized but broad concept, indefinite and in some aspects mis-understood. What, then, did university federation look like in the 19th and early 20th century? What motivated it? What problems was it devised to solve, and in whose interest? Were there aspects common to all models of federation, and others that differed from province to province? Finally, the paper will seek to clarify the functional differences between *federation* and *affiliation*, which in some recent literature have been used loosely and inter-changeably.

The second period spans approximately 1960 to 2005, during which time sectarian universities were secularized as provincial governments, in response to growing demands for access, sought to efficiently and quickly expand capacity while still allowing room for theological programs.

1852 Charte Royal de la Creation de l'Universite Laval

We do further for us our heirs and successors further will and ordain and grant that the said Universite Laval (Laval University) shall as such university hereby constituted have possess and enjoy all such and the like privileges as are now enjoyed by our universities of our united Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland so far as the same are capable of being and possess and enjoyed under and by virtue of this our Royal Charter and that the said University Council shall have the power and liberty to

grant and confer on all students whether they be or not be students in the said Seminary or university or any other college or university within our said province which shall be affiliated with and connected to said university as examiner after provided who shall be found duly qualified according the statutes rules and ordinances aforesaid to review the same degrees of a Bachelor or Master and Doctor in the several arts and faculties and the said University Council shall have power and liberty within itself of allowing to be performed all scholastic duties for the conferring of such degrees in such manner as shall be directed by the Statutes ruled and ordinances aforesaid.

We do further for us our heirs and successors will ordain and grant that the said University Council have possess and enjoy the right and power to affiliate and consort with the Seminary or Seminaries public institutions or institutions of education with said province as to the said Council as may seem fit subject nevertheless to the rules and ordinances aforesaid.

The royal charter thus invested the new university with two powers. The first was, like the University of London, the authority to act as an examining institution and confer degrees without providing instruction itself. The second was the power to affiliate according to its own judgement. The university was not required to affiliate, nor were other colleges promised the right to seek affiliation. The university-affiliate relationship worked in one direction only. Whether affiliation happened at all, and, if it did, on what terms, was entirely up to the university.

Given that the charter was written more than 150 years ago, caution must be taken not to read too much into particular language, but the use of *consort* as meaning something different from *affiliate* should not go unnoticed. *Consort* and *consortium* originated at the same time in the early 19th century. By using the term *consort* apart from *affiliate* the charter may have at least imagined a systematic arrangement with multiple participants working towards the same goal.

**1876 PROMULGUANT LA BULLE INTER
VARIAS SOLLGITUDINES QUI ÉRIGE
CANONIQUEMENT L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL.**

Province de Québec à faire en sorte que leurs Séminaires et Collèges soient affiliés à l'Université Laval, qui a fourni et fournit encore tant de preuves de sa saine doctrine et de l'intégrité de sa foi ; afin que les élèves soient de mieux en mieux préparés à fréquenter cette institution. Nous recommandons aussi à tous les Archevêques et Evêques de la Puissance du Canada, de faire leur possible pour envoyer à cette Université les jeunes gens de bonne espérance qui pourront y faire leur cours d'études ; pour persuader aux parents de ne pas laisser leurs fils jouir de leur propre liberté en leur permettant d'errer dans la ville de Québec, mais de les confier plutôt à ce pensionnat construit exclusivement pour surveiller leur conduite morale et leur faciliter l'avancement dans l'acquisition des sciences ; pensionnat élevé au prix de si grands et de si nombreux sacrifices par le Séminaire de Québec ; pensionnat au soutien duquel ont contribué, avec une si grande libéralité et uniquement pour le bien de la jeunesse studieuse, les professeurs et directeurs eux-mêmes, à l'exemple de leurs devanciers.

This papal bull had in Quebec the force of a government charter for l'Universite Laval. The origins of higher education in Quebec began with the Grand Séminaire de Quebec, and the Petite Séminaire de Montreal, both theological colleges preparing candidates for the priesthood. When Laval received its royal charter as a university faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine were added to Theology. The faculty of Arts, however, provided graduate instruction only. Undergraduate instruction, which amounted to two years, was the responsibility of *collèges classiques*. The result, in comparison to the University of London model and nascent models in Manitoba and Ontario, was a hybrid. Laval was, at the undergraduate level, an examining university for the colleges and for some professions. At the graduate level it was a teaching university, and theology remained an integral part of the university. The colleges, as affiliates, were seen as preparatory schools, as *collegiates* were regarded in the Maritime provinces. Although other models were

designed either to deny or to limit denominational participation, the Laval version of federation deliberately promoted it. As the 1876 papal bull illustrates, it was the Vatican that conferred degree-granting authority. Laval itself was financed by the archbishopric, not the province (Harris, 1976, p. 32).

There was, however, one aspect of the trajectory of federation in Quebec that was ironically like that in other provinces. When l'Université Laval was founded, the expectation was that the *collèges classiques* would promptly join federation as affiliates. Some did. Some initially did not. Local bishops, under whose authority the colleges functioned, were reluctant to accept the archbishop's invitation to participate (Sylvain, 1971), just as Protestant sects in other provinces were wary of plans to form public systems of university federation (Lang, 2022). The secular royal charter had made affiliation possible, but did not promote or require it. By means of the 1876 papal bull, the Vatican stepped in to profess affiliation to be "saine doctrine et de l'intégrité de sa foi." It was a matter of faith not to be sidestepped by the provincial bishoprics. Roman Catholic francophone universities in New Brunswick adopted the Quebec model, albeit without formal legislative sanction (Brown, 1997).

The papal bull of 1876 also called for Laval to open a branch campus – not an affiliate – in Montreal. When the campus became the l'Université de Montréal in 1920, *collèges classiques* could affiliate with it or Laval on the same terms. The branch, as opposed to affiliate, model was broadly similar arrangements in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Nova Scotia 1876 The University Act

Whereas it is desirable to establish one University for the whole of Nova Scotia, on the model of the University of London, for the purpose of raising the standard of higher education in the Province, and of enabling all denominations and classes, including those persons whose circumstances preclude them for following a regular course of study in any of the existing Colleges or Universities to obtain academic degrees . . .

Persons shall be admitted as candidates for the respective degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, and Doctor of Laws, Bachelor of Science and Doctor

of Science . . . on satisfying the Senate that they respectively have completed in any of the Institutions herein mentioned, whilst in connection with the University hereby created . . . the course of instruction which such Senate shall from time to time by regulations in that behalf determine.

The institutions cited in the act were King's, Acadia, Dalhousie, Saint Mary's, and Saint Francis Xavier. Notably and perhaps surprisingly, a sixth college outside the province was included: Mount Allison in neighbouring New Brunswick. Each of these institutions, under the act, became full members of the university corporation, and participated equally in its management.

By 1876, virtually every Christian denomination in Nova Scotia was clamoring for financial support from the government. Until passage of the act the provincial government had been providing small occasional grants to the province's denominational colleges, The provincial assembly, facing the rising and unaffordable cost of the demands, established the University of Halifax, based loosely on the University of London, as an examining institution. All instruction was provided by the member colleges.

There were, however, two significant exceptions. In passing the University of Halifax act the provincial assembly clearly stated the intention that the, while the university might begin as an exclusively examining institution within the federation, it would soon become a teaching institution as well (Healy, 1973). The other exception was that the provincial government retained considerable control of the university's senate and reserved to itself final control over its budget. The University of Halifax was essentially an agency of the government.

Recognizing that the act might be unpopular among the denominational colleges and their supporters, the government, in an attempt through the act to pre-empt further internecine sectarian budget battles, cancelled all previous financial commitments to the colleges, thus, in practical effect, buying them out with one-time financial payments to be paid-out over the ensuing five years.

Facing continuing opposition from every denomination, the university limped along until 1881 when the provincial assembly dismantled it and proceeded to withdraw public funding from all the colleges, denominational and non-denominational. In its short lifespan the university conferred only ten degrees. Whether the

University of Halifax was or was not an exact replica of the University of London, experience revealed three practical obstacles to adoption of the London model. The first was geographic accessibility for colleges not located in Halifax. The second was the absence of an adequate pool of faculty with sufficient qualifications to prepare students examination by the university, and in some cases to perform as examiners (Healy, 1973, p.53; Waite, 1994, p. 121). Halifax was not London. The third obstacle today could be described as market behaviour. Student participation in the University of Halifax was voluntary. Students could choose either to receive degrees conferred by the university as an examining body or degrees that, under the 1876 act, their respective constituent colleges still had the authority to confer. By a wide margin, most students chose the latter (Healy, 1973, p.47).

Manitoba 1877 An Act to Establish a Provincial University

Whereas, it is desirable to establish one University for the whole of Manitoba (on the model of the University of London,) for the purpose of raising the standard of higher education in the province, and of enabling all denominations and classes to obtain academical degrees; therefore . . .

XXVI. The following colleges incorporated at the time of the passing of this act shall be in connection with the University of Manitoba for the . . . , that is to say: the college of St. Boniface, the college of St. John and the Manitoba college, . . . the council may from time to time affiliate other incorporated colleges, with such university, on being satisfied of such colleges being in operation and possessed of the requisite buildings and sufficient staff of professors and teaching officers, to entitle such colleges in his judgement thereto.

Within this legal language several hallmarks of the Manitoba model can be identified. The purpose was to raise academic standards. A college was not a university. The university would be supra denominational, and in this sense non-sectarian. The authority to add other colleges to the federation did not belong to the university;

it resided entirely with the government. The university thus was *the* provincial university. The three founding colleges could choose to become part of the university; they were not required to be, nor was the choice, once made, permanent. Wesley College became the fourth founding college in 1924 when it merged with Manitoba College to form United College in providing Methodist instruction on theology. Brandon, the provincial Baptist college, initially did not seek to become a founding member, and instead entered a credit transfer arrangement with McMaster University, also Baptist. In 1938, with local support, and on the condition that college become non-denominational (President of the Brandon Board of Trade, November 6, 1938, College Papers, Evans Era, Series 1B, Subseries 1, 1937-1938, Box 1, File 6, BMA) Brandon affiliated with the university.

In certain aspects the new university was, as the founding act said, like the University of London. It was an examining body, providing no instruction on its own. In other respects, it was not. Although at its founding in 1836 the University of London had several affiliated colleges, in 1877 it did not, following amendment of its charter in 1858 (University of London, 1912). Although like London in that it could not provide instruction in its own, the new university could confer degrees by right. Morton (1957) and Bumstead (2001) both doubted that the University of Manitoba was ever intended to be like the University of London. In any case, in 1892, the University of Manitoba Act was amended in two significant ways. "On the model of the University of London" was removed from the preamble to the act, and the university was given authority to provide instruction directly. Thus, what began as an examining university exclusively also became a teaching university under a homegrown model.

The 1892 amendment was not without controversy that reveals how federation was initially understood to function in Manitoba. St. Boniface, a Roman Catholic college under the authority of the provincial archbishopric, insisted that it had entered federation only on the assumption that all instruction would be delivered in one of the denominational colleges. In other words, examining could be secular but teaching would be sectarian. The issue came to a head over the terms of a land grant from the federal government, and specifically about the access of St. Boniface College to it, which the college insisted it had by right. The archbishopric argued that any changes in the terms of the land grant in regard of access to the land grant to finance instructional facilities would nullify the

university's constitution, including St. Boniface's membership in the federation. In the end, the college alone voted against the changes but did not withdraw. For the question at hand, however, the incident is evidence that at least one of the university's founding colleges believed that federation was reversible.

In 1910 a royal commission was struck to review and report on the "good government and management of the University of Manitoba" (Royal Commission, 1910, p.6). The commission was quick to conclude that the 1892 amendment to remove the reference to the University of London was correct. Whatever might have been the aim of the 1877 legislation, the reality that ensued was not the London model, nor did the commission think that it should have been.

The commission clarified the question of nomenclature. To that time, in addition to *federation*, other terms were sometimes used to described the arrangement: *affiliation*, *confederation*, and even *republic*. The commission consistently and exclusively referred to the University of Manitoba as a *federation* (Royal Commission, p. 53).

The commission also clarified the issue of reversibility as raised by St. Boniface College over the issues of teaching and revenue from the university's land grant. The commission was blunt in its conclusion that it was the intention of the province to create a new provincial non-sectarian university and that, while the founding colleges could withdraw from the federation, they could not by doing so "destroy" the university or lay claim to its assets, meaning the land grant (Royal Commission, p.22). In other words, if they withdrew all they could take with them was whatever they had brought in at the start.

The commission, significantly, expanded the purpose of federation beyond the raising of scholastic standards, as in the 1887 act, to include efficiency and good management. The commission was charged the responsibility to devise "changes necessary or advisable to accomplish a closer and more efficient relationship between the . . . colleges and educational institution " (Royal Commission, p. 8). In charging the commission thusly the government tacitly recognized the case put forward by the president of the Carnegie Foundation that denominational colleges did not have the resources to raise academic standards and at the same time provide ecclesiastical preparation. Although the term *consortium* was not used, that in practical effect was what the commission had in mind. Federation was a means for the colleges

and the university acting together to expand and improve higher education – secular and sectarian -- in the province in ways that no one of them could do acting independently.

Ontario 1887 An Act Respecting the Federation of the University of Toronto and University College with Other Universities and Colleges (The Federation Act)

Whereas, it is desirable that the Universities and Colleges of the Province of Ontario should be permitted to enter into such relations with the University of Toronto as would enable them to avail themselves of the instruction given by the Faculty of the said University.

The curriculum in Arts of the University shall include subjects of Biblical Literature, Christian Ethics, Apologetics, the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion and Church History, but any provisions for examination and instruction in the same shall be left to the voluntary action of the federating Universities and Colleges, and provision shall be made by a system of options to prevent such subjects being made compulsory upon any candidate for a degree.

When any University in the Province of Ontario that suspends its power to confer such degrees as it may be authorized to confer (excepting degrees in Theology) shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate of the University of Toronto as hereinafter provided and shall, during the term of suspension of such power as aforesaid, be known as a federating University with right to all the privileges and franchises hereinafter mentioned. `

Is it desirable, in the interests of higher education in this Province, that these certificates or diplomas, as evidences of scholastic training and literary culture, should issue from a high central authority alone, or from half a dozen different sources, having varying standards, and degrees of indeterminate value?

The Federation Act, as it came to be known, in contrast to the corresponding Manitoba legislation introduced a decade earlier, was different in three key aspects. From the start, the University of Toronto, as the provincial university, would teach as well as examine. On the teaching side, the act resolved the question that was left largely open in Manitoba about in the division of instruction between the university and the colleges federated with it. The Ontario legislation went into detail about in what subjects the university would provide instruction and, by omission, what subjects would be delivered by the federated colleges and universities.

The legislation went further to specify a key difference between *affiliation* and *federation*. Federated universities were entitled to be represented on the senate of the University of Toronto; affiliated colleges were not. Graduates of federated universities were entitled to “the same degrees, honors and status in the University of Toronto as they previously held in the federating University.” Graduates of affiliated colleges were not. At the time of the act’s passage the university already had *affiliates*. Knox College, Wycliffe College, and St. Michael’s College were ecclesiastical, sub-baccalaureate, and not in receipt of public funding. One – the Ontario Agricultural College – was also sub-baccalaureate, but non-denominational, and in receipt of government grants that did not flow through the University of Toronto. None of them offered instruction or conferred degrees in liberal arts. The Federation Act did not change that status or otherwise amend the working definition of *affiliation*. The definition was working in another aspect. As far as affiliation was concerned, most of it was in place before 1887, and was embodied in an understanding that was reached in 1884 among the colleges with the blessing of the government. What was new was the provision for federation.

Like federation in Manitoba, the role of the university senate in Ontario under the Federation Act was limited. Academic appointments were not made by the university; they were made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Colleges and universities voluntarily seeking participation in federation had to enter under the authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The reverse, however, was not the case: the university senate had authority to remove a federated member, and members could leave federation at will. The Lieutenant Governor in Council also reserved the authority to review annually the university’s budget and operations.

The heavy-handed logic behind the Federation Act was quid pro quo: government fiscal support required government supervision.

These limitations on the role of the university's autonomy through its senate were more than legislative fine print. A practical example can be found in an attempt by Victoria University in 1909, by then federated with the University of Toronto for nearly twenty years, to gain access to the Carnegie Foundation pension fund by dint of its federation with the university, which had been accepted into the pension fund. Did the acceptance of the University of Toronto into the pension fund extend to the denominational universities federated with it under the Federation Act? Victoria assumed that it did (Friedland, 2002; Sissons, 1952). To this, however, Toronto responded without equivocation. Robert Falconer, Toronto's president, informed the foundation that he could not "lay their case before the board [of the Foundation] or enter in negotiations on their behalf" because he was "in no way responsible for any of their [faculty] appointments" (Falconer, R. (1909, May 19). Letter to Henry Pritchett, Falconer Papers, UTA, Box 33). Under the Ontario Federation Act, he could not exercise an authority that was not vested in him.

The act had a further provision about the possibility of another university federating with the University of Toronto. Western University received a charter in 1878, but in 1877 its founders were still in uncertain negotiations with the provincial government. Gwynne-Timothy (1978, P. 83) explains that the provision within the act for a further university within the University of Toronto was meant as the fall-back position for a university in southwestern Ontario. In 1908 Western's charter was revised to allow it form a federation with affiliates, which it began to do a year later.

At the time of passage, federation was largely nominal: the university and University College, as the teaching body of the university, were the only members. They were joined by Victoria University in 1892 and Trinity College in 1904. Victoria's and Trinity's decisions to seek entry into federation, more than a decade after the act's passage, did not come easily. Their hesitation turned mainly on fiscal issues. Victoria took pains to estimate in detail the comparative costs of independence and federation (Allen, 1889, p. 27-31, VUA, 2011.02V, 2-15). The conclusion was that Victoria could not possibly afford the additional faculty, library collections, and laboratory equipment necessary to offer courses in the natural sciences, and at the same time meet the costs of relocating to Toronto. Cost was a pressing concern for Trinity, less because of

relocation, and more because of a financial crisis which it had only recently worked its way out of. Trinity passed a series of resolutions aimed, among other things, to ensure that none of the costs federation, mainly programs in natural science, would fall on the college, and would be met by provincial support for the university (Trinity College Resolutions, 1890, VUA, 2011, 02V-3-21). Queen's University, seeing the plans for federation and costs of natural science programs, petitioned the Lieutenant Governor in Council to establish a School of Practical Science in Kingston, as a condition of which Queen's would raise its matriculation standards to meet those of the newly federated University of Toronto (Memorandum submitted for the Information of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, March, 1887, VUA, 2011.02V, 3-3). Thus, federation in Ontario offered a collateral benefit beyond its constituency.

Ontario 1906 The University of Toronto Act

Every university and every college federated with the University and every college affiliated with the University shall continue to be so federated or affiliated, subject to any statute in that behalf and to this Act.

A college affiliated with a federated university at the time of its federation with the University, whether such federation has heretofore been or shall hereafter be entered into, shall be deemed to be affiliated with the University.

The Senate may remove from federation or affiliation with the University and college, now or hereafter federated or affiliated with the University which becomes an integral part of or federates with any other university which has and exercises the powers of conferring any degrees other than those in theology.

The model of federation embodied in the 1887 Federation Act remained in place for nearly two decades. Instruction in the sciences and other non-denominational subjects was provided by the University of Toronto. Instruction in arts and humanities was provided by constituent colleges, each preserving its denominational identity. Constituent members held their degree-

granting authority in abeyance. All this at the prerogative of the provincial government.

In 1904, in response to rising concerns about the political interference in the affairs of the University of Toronto and the inadequacy of funding it as a federation, a royal commission was struck with instructions to report on, among other things,

Article 1. A scheme for the management and good government of the University of Toronto in the room and stead of the one under which the said University is now managed and governed. . . Article 4. Such changes, as in the opinion of the Commissioners, should be brought about ibn the relations between the said University of Toronto and the several colleges affiliated or federated therewith, having regard to the provisions of the Federation Act (Flavelle, 1906, p. iv).

Insofar as federation was concerned, the principal difference between the 1906 legislation and the 1887 legislation was the relocation of authority from the provincial government to the senate of the University of Toronto. This was the most significant effect of the Ontario model of federation elsewhere in Canada. Successively, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia introduced legislation that made allowance for federation but otherwise left the who, what, and why of federation to a single public and secular university.

Although the commission expressed doubts about the division of curricular responsibilities in the 1887 act (Flavelle, 1906, p. xxiv), no changes were made. The composition of federation as it was prior to 1906 was left in place, including the limitation of senate membership, made more important by the new act, to federated universities. The 1906 act did, however, lead to some modifications the Ontario model of federation. Other universities and colleges could federate and affiliate, but if they, did, they could not also be federated or affiliated with the University of Toronto. In other words, multiple federation or affiliation was not permitted. Affiliated colleges, for the purpose of federation, were tied to their respective universities. If the university chose to leave federation or was forced to by the senate, any college affiliated with it would have to leave too. For example, St. Hilda's, college affiliated with federated Trinity, was not entitled to stand alone affiliation.

Implicitly, these provisions in the 1906 act presumed the possibility of future university federations in the province.

Saskatchewan 1907 An Ordinance to Establish and Incorporate a University for the North-West Territories and The University Act

The senate may from time to time affiliate any incorporated college or colleges with the university on being satisfied that such college is in operation and possessed of the requisite buildings and a sufficient staff of professors and other teaching officers to affiliate.

The senate may provide for the affiliation with the university of any college established in his Majesty's dominions for the promotion of art or science or for instruction in law, medicine, engineering, agriculture or any other useful branch of learning.

Any college affiliated with the university under this Ordinance may be removed from such affiliation by the senate of the university.

No other university having corporate powers capable of being exercised within the province shall be known by the same name; nor shall any other university have power to grant degrees except in theology.

Plans for the University of Saskatchewan were based in part on the *Report of the Royal Commission on the University of Toronto* (1906), in part on the University of Wisconsin, which the founding president, Walter Murray, took as a model for a new “peoples” university (Alcorn, 2013, p.117) and in certain respects to Manitoba. Unlike Manitoba at inception, Saskatchewan was from the start, an examining and a teaching institution, which Manitoba, perhaps through trial and error, eventually came to adopt, and which Ontario introduced from the start. Also, unlike Manitoba, where three already established colleges sought to federation with a new public university, and were built into federation by the government’s founding legislation, in Saskatchewan decisions to federate and with what college were left to the discretion of the

university, not the government. Like Ontario and unlike Manitoba, there was no founding college *per se* in Saskatchewan. The final distinguishing characteristic of the Saskatchewan model was the extension of its scope to universities and colleges outside the province.

The counterpart of King's College in Saskatchewan was Emmanuel College. Both held royal charters, both were staunchly denominational, and both sought status and funding as the provincial university. In other words, they were competitors. In the end, Emmanuel decided that its status as a denominational institution in a province politically ambivalent about sectarianism in the public sector would be better served by being part of the new university than not (Thompson, 2019). In 1909, Emmanuel, gave up its charter status as a university and affiliated with the new university, in accordance with the founding act, exclusively as a theological seminary.

Although the act did not provide for affiliation with organizations other than theological colleges, the term *affiliation* was also used to identify professional associations – for example, the Institute of Chartered Accountants -- for which the university was the examining authority, and secondary schools that were certified through a committee of the university council that set examinations for them, the results of which were formally recognized for admission (Morton, 1959). Through these roles the university fulfilled its obligations as the provinces' sole university, but they were not indicative of any expectations on the part of the university that **It** needed federation or other forms of affiliation to deliver instruction in arts, science, or professional subjects.

There was also a geographic competition. The decision to found a public university for the province preceded the decision about its location: Regina in the south or Saskatoon in the north. Regina, being the province's capital and largest city, expected to be chosen. So did Walter Murray, as the incoming president of the new university (Alcorn, 2013, p.191). Regina was shocked and politically offended. In 1910, as a 'consolation prize,' a two-year junior college was founded in Regina (Alcorn, 2013, p. 171). Murray did not object to the founding of Regina College as a junior college and "feeder" to the provincial university (Alcorn, 2013, p. 172). He, however, objected strenuously to there being a second university in Regina or anywhere else in the province. Murray, who would later serve on the board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, was fully persuaded by the message contained in the

foundation's 1909 commendation of the Manitoba model of federation as a means of avoiding "useless competition" among colleges and universities (Murray 1984, p.99). To obviate the possibility of competition for public funding, the university built a fiscal firewall: a college could not be an affiliate unless it was "self-dependent, self-supporting, and self-governing" (Morton, 1959, p.92).

Whether through Foundation's influence or not, the founding legislation of the University of Saskatchewan allowed for but not require federation. What it would look like and when was left to the discretion of the university. The arrangement initially worked as long as Regina College was satisfied to remain a junior college. This lasted until 1928 when the college sought federation on terms like those in place at the University of Toronto. The university refused; the college was not granted funding and authority to expand to four-year baccalaureate status. When the dispute came to a head in 1929, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was invited to arbitrate. The commissioners were W.S. Learned, an assistant secretary of the Foundation, who was joined by E.W. Wallace of Victoria University, which was by then federated with the University of Toronto.

The university, invoking its standing as the provincial university, argued that the college could only do that as a constituent college of the university, and that, under the founding act, it was up to the board of the university, not the government, to determine when and if the college met the requisite standards.

The commissioners' report, in supporting the university's position, reaffirmed the Foundation's principles, already promoted by President Murray, and put forward by the Foundation in a proposal for a pan provincial university federation in the Maritime provinces (Learned and Sills, 1922). The report found that Regina College, like three other junior colleges then in place in the province, did not meet the standards to offer a four-year baccalaureate and could not afford to do so. Murray praised the report as a "masterpiece" (Pitsula, 2006, p.19). The commissioners went on to advise Regina College and the other junior colleges that, if they wanted to raise their academic standards, they should seek efficiency through collaboration. That report thus repeated a principle that the Foundation had set in motion at the start and with which the Foundation had kept faith: whether or not a university followed its recommendations, for example, like those put forward in 1909, academic standards would have been set and

institutions would aspire to meet them, either directly or indirectly, which is what the report said Regina College should do, and, in turn, how the University of Saskatchewan should judge the college if it later came forward for promotion to four-year baccalaureate status, which it successfully did in 1959, becoming the second campus of the University of Saskatchewan. Unlike Alberta College, which affiliated with the University of Alberta very shortly after the founding of the provincial university, Regina College never became an affiliate of the University of Saskatchewan. Along with three other junior colleges in the province it was *accredited* by the university in 1925. Accreditation meant compliance with the university's standards for matriculation.

What was the contemporary meaning of *junior college* in Canada? According to the commission, a junior college could provide instruction of equivalent quality to the first two years of the four year university degree. Equivalence was based on inspections of the colleges by university officers and on examinations conducted by university examiners. As in Ontario, the staffs of the colleges were entirely independent of the university. Learned and Wallace drew a geographic distinction in agreeing with the inspection and examination regime. Because junior colleges in Saskatchewan: they were in urban areas, a system was needed to matriculate rural and urban students on an equivalent basis (Learned and Wallace, 1932, p.6)

Furthermore, the report reaffirmed the Foundation's long-held confidence in planned systems of public higher education. Local details of the dispute between Regina College and the University of Saskatchewan aside, elementally the Learned and Wallace report conveyed to Saskatchewan the same message that the Foundation sent to the governor of Ohio in 1909, which he called the "guiding principle of concentration" (Henry Pritchett. H. (1909, June 9). [Letter to Judson Harmon]. CUCFAT).

The commissioners called the Saskatchewan model of public higher education a defining Canadian characteristic that recognized "the financial obligation of the state for education in all its phases" and "the determination of these western provinces to educate their people, to support and supervise the process" all without "social control," which was a polite allusion to sectarian higher education (Learned and Sills, 1932, p.4). The report was less circumspect about political control. The Learned and Sills report had bluntly labelled educational policy in every Maritime province "a political product." Learned and Wallace were even more blunt. Speaking

about political influence that promoters of Regis College had brought to bear on the provincial government and on the Foundation's commission, the report said "The moment this happens and the institution finds itself in the hands of the Provincial Treasury, any student of education understands that the way is wide open for all sinister 'log-rolling' that has characterized this phase of state education both in Canada and the United States for a century back. (Learned and Wallace, 1932, p. 18). The commission, in refusing to be bypassed by political interests, thus reaffirmed the University of Saskatchewan's right and responsibility to define and set standards for admission to federation, and in turn define by its own lights the composition of a public system of higher education for the province. This was the most notable aspect of federation which differentiated the Saskatchewan model of federation from other models.

The other highly notable differentiating aspect was the legislative assignment of authority about what federation should look like to the university, and allowed the formation of no other university. In practical effect, the University of Saskatchewan was granted a monopoly to invoke federation when and if it was in its interests, and, when it was, what its composition should be. This was unlike any aspect of federation in other provinces.

Alberta 1908 An Act to Establish and Incorporate a University for the Province of Alberta

Article 31 The senate may from time to time affiliate any incorporated college or colleges with the university on being satisfied that such college is in operation and possessed of the requisite buildings and a sufficient staff of professors and other teaching officers to affiliate.

Article 32 Any college affiliated with the university under this Act may be removed from such affiliation by statute of the senate of the university

Aware of the initial debate surrounding the status of teaching at the University of Manitoba, and knowing that Saskatchewan would be a teaching as well as an examining body (Johns, 1981, p. 1), the territorial legislature, in founding the University of Alberta, pre-

empted the debate: the new university was from the start to be a teaching and an examining institution. Also from the start, like Toronto, the new university sought to be clear about what *affiliation* meant, and also drew distinction between *affiliation* and *federation* (University of Alberta Senate minutes, February 18, 1910, p.2).

As in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, there were colleges that preceded the founding of a non-denominational public university in Alberta: Calgary College, Mount Royal College, and Alberta College. Calgary College collapsed soon after the new university opened. Mount Royal continued under the auspices of the Methodist Church. Alberta College, also a Methodist institution, soon affiliated with the university, later as St. Stephen's College. The terms of the agreement between the University of Alberta and Alberta College provide insight into how affiliation worked at the new university.

The college's land and building were transferred to the university for the sole purpose of supplying educational and residential facilities for a denominational college providing theological instruction to candidates for the ministry of the Methodist Church, and such other instruction as may time to be given with the approval under direction of the University. . . but shall not teach therein subjects nor or hereafter at any time taught in any of the courses at the University of Alberta (Agreement Between the Governors of the University of Alberta and Alberta College, May 6, 1912, p.2). In 1926 St. Joseph's College affiliated with the university on similar terms but with some notable differences.

St. Joseph's College was founded to serve Roman Catholic students, but was not a seminary, as St. Stephen's at least partially was. "All subjects taught by the University shall [sic] be open on equal terms to students of the College." College instructors could teach courses in the University curriculum either by what today would be called *cross-appointment* to a university department, or by teaching courses on conditions defined by the University:

hours of instruction, grade of work, the quality of instruction, and attendance and discipline shall be approved by and be consistent with the standards and established and maintained by the Senate of the University [in either or both cases] the courses of study and the examinations therein prescribed by the University shall be followed, the instructors of the College co-operating with the members of the

University Departments concerned (Agreement Between the Governors of the University of Alberta and St. Joseph's College, April 28, 1926, p. 4).

The only subjects in which the college could offer courses in its own right were History and Philosophy on condition they met the university's standards, but not on condition that they followed the university's curriculum. This arrangement was the same as one reached between the University of Toronto and St. Michaels College under the Ontario 1887 Federation Act, St. Joseph's, like St. Michael's, were both under the Basilian Order. At St. Joseph's students could apply two courses – one in Philosophy and one in Catholic Apologetics – as credit toward an University of Alberta degree in arts.

St. Joseph's and St. Stephen's were both represented on the University of Alberta senate, but also important was equal representation with the University of Alberta on a Joint Matriculation Committee established by the government education department (St. Stephen's College Senate minutes, January 21, 1916).

As in the Manitoba and Saskatchewan models of federation, the model in Alberta was not to construct an organization or a multi-institutional system of higher education. The objective was to establish and promote a single provincial, non-denominational university. What federation would look like, and when it would be deployed depended on the universities. In the case of Alberta what the model amounted to what today would be called *outsourcing* undertaken when the university needed educational facilities – notably residential capacity for students – and instruction in specific courses delivered under explicit and strict rules set by the university, which in turn required agreements on sharing revenue from tuition fees.

1908/1911 An Act to Establish and Incorporate a University for the Province of British Columbia

It shall be the duty of the Senate and it shall have power to . . . To provide for affiliation with any college established in Canada for the promotion of art or science or for instruction in law, medicine, engineering, agriculture, or any other useful branch of learning, and

for the dissolution of such affiliation or the modification or alteration of the terms thereof.

Any Normal School organised by the Department of Education or the instruction and training of teachers in the science of education and the art of teaching may be affiliated with the University, upon such terms and conditions, not repugnant to any law or system of education in force in the Province, as the Senate may think fit, provided that the terms and conditions of the affiliation of any such Normal School shall be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Nothing herein contained shall interfere with the right of any affiliated College to make such provision in regard to religious instruction and religious worship for its own students as it may deem proper, and to require the same to be observed as a part of its own discipline.

The act establishing the University of British Columbia contained some provisions that set it apart from previous federation legislation in other provinces. There was no blurring of the line between sectarian and secular instruction. Religious instruction was outside any association with the university. Also significant is the absence of any mention of Victoria College, Columbian College, and the McGill University College of British Columbia. The opening of the university resulted in the closing of Victoria College. As in Saskatchewan, whether federation was needed at all, and, if it was, what shape it would take, was up to the university. UBC decided that the province neither needed nor could afford two post-secondary institutions (Johnson, 1964, p. 85). As in Alberta and, eventually, Manitoba, concentration was the fiscal answer to the affordability of higher education, with expanded federation as a failsafe. Later, Victoria would re-open as an affiliate offering the first two years of instruction in arts and science, an arrangement that a century later could better be described as a transfer pathway than as an affiliation.

McGill University College of British Columbia, founded in 1906, was also a transfer credit pathway, in this case between McGill and Vancouver College, which initially was a normal school. The arrangement with McGill was similar to one that Alberta briefly considered but rejected. The UBC board invited McGill

University College to continue as an affiliate for two years, until UBC enrolled its first entering class in 1915. After that, UBC expressed no interest in continuing the relationship as an affiliation, and the college closed for lack of enrolment.

Columbian College was a Methodist school offering courses in arts and theology, founded in 1892. Again, the UBC board did not seek an affiliation. With the opening of UBC, Columbian's arts enrolment collapsed. Instead of seeking affiliation for its theological school, Columbian merged with United Theological College.

Like Saskatchewan and Alberta, British Columbia allowed, but did not require, federation or affiliation. The choice was up to the governors of the university. It was a choice that they rarely exercised.

1922 Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada/Conference of Representatives of the Universities and Governments of the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland

Representatives of the universities and governments of the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland met . . . to consider the improvement of the means of higher education in the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland, and particularly to consider a paper on "Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada" prepared for the Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching by Mr. William S. Learned and Dr. Kenneth Sills.

At the said Conference certain resolutions and recommendations hereinafter put out was arrived at which are now submitted to all bodies concerned, governmental or otherwise, for consideration and appropriate action.

There shall be a confederation of the higher education institutions of learning, which may now or hereafter wish to enter the federation.

That all such higher institutions of learning shall move to Halifax and become constituent colleges of the New University.

That constituent colleges moving to Halifax shall retain each its name, its endowment and property, its charter and its governing body.

Conference of Representatives of the Universities and Governments of the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland, Report, December 12, 1922

Whereas, representatives of the colleges and universities of the several governments of the Maritime Provinces of Canada and of Newfoundland have agreed on a plan whereby the facilities for higher education in these Provinces and Newfoundland, now scattered and ill-developed, may be made effective through federation and creation of a strong and adequately supported central organization for the service of each institution; and

Whereas, such an association of institutions would constitute an entity that could properly and profitably be aided to a large extent by the governments of the respective provinces in the interests of the whole body of citizens, thereby providing in an economical manner facilities for providing university education of an exceptional character; and

Whereas, the representatives of the said institutions and governments have asked the Carnegie Corporation for an indication both as to its attitude toward such an undertaking and as to the extent to which it might find it possible to contribute; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the trustees and the Carnegie Corporation express, and they do hereby express, their interest and sympathy with these far-reaching proposals, and their desire to assist in bringing a plan so sound and promising to a successful conclusion;

And be it resolved further, that the trustees declare their willingness to appropriate from the fund of the Carnegie Corporation applicable to Canada and the British Colonies the sum of three million dollars for the aforesaid

purpose as soon as essential features of the whole undertaking shall have been effectively and formally agreed upon by the institutions and provincial governments concerned.

Carnegie Corporation Board of Trustees, January 12, 1923.

Although the University of Halifax experiment came to an unpropitious end in 1881, discussions of federation-like agreements between King's and Dalhousie, and St. Mary's and Dalhousie continued to arise, but did not come to fruition. In 1901, a joint committee of Maritime universities proposed formation of a multi-university federation, but did not specify how the system would work. Thus, the idea of some form of inter-university federation among the Maritime universities was no longer a new idea, when in 1919, in response to formal request from the government of Nova Scotia, the Carnegie Foundation commissioned a study "with a view to suggesting a constructive policy particularly of the institutions that had applied for aid" from several universities in the Maritime provinces (Learned and Sills, 1922, preface). In 1922, the consequent report -- *Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada* (Learned and Sills, 1922) -- recommended a pan provincial federation of six Maritime universities: Acadia, Dalhousie, King's, Mount Allison, New Brunswick, and Saint Francis Xavier

Having visited and reviewed all the colleges and universities in the Maritime provinces and Newfoundland, the commissioners came to the conclusion that, denominational status aside, only two -- Dalhousie and Saint Francis Xavier -- met the Foundation's academic standards. Of the two, only Dalhousie was a "true university." The rest were judged to be "something other than genuine colleges." (Learned and Sills, 1922, p. 31). These were not arbitrary judgements. They followed a rule for acceptance into the foundation's pension fund and other funding programs (for example, libraries) that the Foundation adopted in 1910 to exclude institutions that were in practice post-secondary but sub-baccalaureate. The status of Mount Allison and Acadia could rise, according to the report, if they were to separate themselves from the lay seminary and preparatory departments embedded in them.

In Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland they judged the colleges to be "collegiate institutes," more like advanced secondary schools than universities (Learned and Sills, 1922, p. 31). They expressed the same concern about the University of New

Brunswick, recognizing, nevertheless, that its charter gave it nominal university status.

The report came to the conclusion that “to seek to perpetuate the present arrangements, therefore, is foregone defeat” (Learned and Sills, 1922, p. 32). The commission’s recommendation was to form a confederation. The term *confederation* was used instead of *federation* only to signify inter-provincial participation. To resolve the obvious question of what form the federation should take, The commission, by that time with the experiences of five other provinces at hand, first examined forms that the reorganization of Maritime higher education might take: differentiation, selection, and confederation.

Institutional *differentiation* or specialization was the model that the Foundation several years before had commended to the state of Ohio.. This is some aspects was the way the commission viewed the model of federation in Ontario, where, hub and spoke, arts and theological instruction were distributed among several member institutions, with professional, science, and graduate instruction concentrated in the university. Learned and Sills concluded that differentiation would be unworkable in the Maritimes due to the intensity of sectarian division which they believed was an unscalable endemic barrier.

Selection, by which the commission meant, the elevation of the status of a single non-denominational university in which all government and Carnegie support would be exclusively invested, as in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. The report on one hand identified Dalhousie as an obvious choice. On the other hand, in the report’s realistic few, selection as an organizational model would not work or even be accepted because Dalhousie was not sufficiently representative of the Maritime provinces at large and, despite its non-denominational charter, was seen by the public and other colleges as Presbyterian, which according to enrolment data collected by the commission it was. The commission could not re-write sectarian history, which was also a problem in Ontario and to some degree in Manitoba, but not in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia where federation could begin with a clean slate. That selection was discussed at all sent a significant message to the denominational colleges and the University of New Brunswick: the only path to future financial efficiency and fiscal support was through some form of inter-institutional cooperation.

Learned and Sills settled on *confederation* as the only workable path for reorganization under which an entirely new pan-provincial

university in Halifax to which Dalhousie would delegate all its rights, assets, library, and control of its professional programs to the “New University” to which all other professional programs in Maritimes provinces, present and future would be added. Dalhousie would continue to deliver liberal arts instruction as a constituent college of the new university, as would Acadia, King’s, Mount Allison, New Brunswick, and Saint Francis Xavier, each of which would relocate to Halifax, with the entire cost of transition met by Carnegie Corporation. The cost of superannuation, which no Maritime university could afford, would be met by the through the Carnegie pension fund (Savage, 1953).

With the report in hand, the universities and colleges and their respective governments met in conference three times in 1922 to devise and come to agreement on a specific plan for carrying out Learned and Sills’ proposal for confederation. The plan – *Conference of Representatives of the Universities and Governments of the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland* (December 12, 1922, ua-3-173-7-02, DAL) – was evidence that the report was taken seriously. One month later the Corporation formally agreed to provide the funding for which the report called (Henry Pritchett to A. Stanley McKenzie, January 17, 1923, CUCFAT; March 5, 1923, CUCFAT Henry Pritchett to W.E. Thompson, March 5, 1923, CUCFAT). The plan was more detailed than the report. It was, as the Foundation hoped, a blueprint for a complete system of higher education that crossed jurisdictional boundaries.

The plan was evidence that its framers understood that decisions to participation or not would be final; a university would either be in or out of the federated system. The plan named only Acadia, Kings, and Mount Allison, to which were added “a Presbyterian college, a Roman Catholic college, [and] a non-denominational college.” Dalhousie would be the non-denominational or Presbyterian constituent college on its own, within the “New University” proposed by the plan. Saint Francis Xavier would be the Roman Catholic college. All liberal arts and pure science students in would be registered in and pay fees to their respective constituent colleges, but the new university would set and conduct examinations for all students in all programs, except for Theology.

Under the plan, each member college would remain denominational and offer its own first year liberal arts curriculum. With differentiation still in mind, upper year courses would be delivered jointly, in the expectation that colleges would choose to

specialize and concentrate resources in certain disciplines. This arrangement, the report argued, would be “particularly effective in handling a genuine honours curriculum” that Learned and Sills saw as a “precious feature of English and Canadian universities.” Each constituent college would have an *ex officio* seat on the new university’s board of governors, as would the government of each province and Newfoundland. This resembled the arrangement that the Royal Commission had in mind for Manitoba in 1910.

In summary, what the plan proposed was what today would be called a *system* of higher education. The Ontario and Manitoba models, the report noted, were elective; denominational colleges and universities could choose at any time to federate or not. Election in turn meant that there was no over-arching design or concept of system. In other words, a system by chance. In the case of the Maritimes, however, the result would be a system by design. In addition to the plan itself, this was made possible by the terms of the Carnegie funding. Unlike federation models in Ontario and Manitoba, the Maritime model made no provision for opting in or out after the fact. The transitional funding was a fixed, one-time, take it or leave it offer, as was access to the pension fund.

The universities and their provinces stewed and argued over it for the next five years without reaching a consensus that could satisfy all sectarian interests (Brison, 2005; Lang, 2002; Reid, 1984; and Waite, 1994). However, there were early signs that the odds that an agreement on confederation was reachable were impossibly long. As early as 1923, Acadia took a position that revealed a dimension of the sectarian debate that the report failed to recognize, and which Ontario had faced head-on, and Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia had pre-empted legislatively. Also based on the experience of federation in Ontario, where McMaster had refused to enter federation, the report could have realized that some sectarian opposition would be so theologically fundamental that it could not be offset by the prospect of funding and access to pension plans. Baptist colleges and universities in Canada and the United States had long drawn a distinction between tax supported public funding – a financial matter – and state control – a jurisdictional matter (Longley, 1939; Potts, 1971; Johnston, 1976). Acadia took this distinction further by expanding state control to include any form of public control, with or without legislative authority. Acadia did not want to alienate its Baptist constituency by ceding control or being in any way beholden to a new university as proposed by the conference plan.

The disposition of Saint Francis Xavier's University participation revealed another dimension of the sectarian debate that Learned and Sills did not foresee: that there may be divisions of opinions within denominations. Saint Francis Xavier was pulled in four directions within the Roman Catholic community, exemplifying in the extreme the dilemmas faced by all the Maritime denominational universities. Late in 1920 the university's board passed a resolution instructing the president to invite the Foundation to include the university in what would become the Learned and Sills study (Board of Governor's minutes, December 17, 1920, StFXUA; Henry Pritchett to H.P. MacPherson, January 4, 1921, CUCFAT). When the report appeared, the parishes and dioceses in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland supported confederation, perhaps because of the attention that Learned and Sills paid to improving the quality of teaching in schools, a problem that the university's board acknowledged in another resolution passed on December 17, 1920. The incentive of access to the pension fund had been attractive enough for the university in 1921 to amend the composition of its board by increasing the number of lay members and decreasing the number of priests. All this before the report was written. In 1922, only days after the report's publication, the university's faculty, with the prospect of pension eligibility principally in mind, informed the Corporation that they unanimously supported the report (Henry Pritchett to A. Stanley McKenzie, February 3, 1922, CUCFAT). The university's board, still interested, sought exemption from relocation to Halifax (Reid, 1984). Despite support from local parishes and the expressed desire of the faculty, after nine months of fence-sitting, the board decided against confederation (Board of Governor's minutes, October 20, 1922, StFXUA).

The report also did not fully foresee the implications of relocation. Among the models of federation by then in place, none except the conference plan required relocation. New Brunswick from the start refused to consider relocation. Two other universities—Mount Allison and Saint Francis Xavier—indicated a willingness to participate in confederation if they did not have to move to Halifax. Mount Allison briefly considered the prospects of federation with Dalhousie and Kings (*Mount Allison and the Carnegie Plan for University Federation, Appendix 1*, April, 1928, MAUA). In the end, however, Mount Allison's president concluded that having to study outside the province would too great an economic burden on students (Reid, 1989), which was one of the

problems that undermined the University of Halifax nearly fifty years before (Healy, 1973).

Evidently, it did not occur to the commissioners that there was a practical and seriously problematic inconsistency between relocation and the recommendation that the denominational colleges separate themselves from the lay seminary preparatory departments embedded in them. If the colleges were to do both, they would exacerbate economy of scale problems that were already precarious and, ironically, that the report promised to solve. The Maritime universities were prepared to accept the relocation of existing and new professional programs to the new central university, but dug-in their sectarian heels to insist on their autonomy over under-graduate liberal arts programs, a problem that the Federation Act has sorted out in Ontario in 1877. Nevertheless, in 1924, in the midst of much hand-wringing over the conference plan and sectarian independence, they agreed to participate in a common examining board for matriculation (MacNutt, 1973), much like the Joint Matriculation Committee in Alberta.

In 1928, by which time the Maritime universities were still unable to come to a mutual agreement, the Carnegie Corporation withdrew its offer to finance confederation. A variety of reasons explain the failure. Sills may have written the report's epitaph right at the start when told the president of Dalhousie that, if the report did nothing else it was of some use "stirring up interest in higher education in the provinces (Kenneth Sills to A. Stanley McKenzie, March 16, 1923, CUCFAT). It indeed did that. MacNutt (1973, p. 447) summed-up the attempt to build a university confederation well: in the end the Maritimes "preferred a judicious division of scarcity" amidst what proved to be an intractable sectarian political culture.

1923 Agreement of Association, Dalhousie University and the University of King's College

Whereas it has for a long time been thought by many interested in liberal and professional education in the said Maritime Provinces that the circumstances existing in such Provinces render it expedient that some method be adopted by which such educational work might be carried on with greater efficiency than is possible under present conditions.

And Whereas it is thought by the parties to These Presents that the cause of higher education in the Maritime Provinces would be much advanced by the adoption of a scheme of federation in which the resources of the various existing institutions of learning may be so combined that the duplication of effort incident to the maintenance of a number of colleges and universities might be avoided and an institution established capable of supplying the requirements of the people and at the same time preserving, so far as possible, the traditions of the constituent colleges,

King's shall remove from Windsor to Halifax, and locate on the Dalhousie campus.

A long history preceded the decision of Kings College and Dalhousie University to enter into federation. King's is the oldest English-speaking university in Canada, founded as a university by royal charter in 1802, and once described as the "mother of Dalhousie (Roper, 1991, p. 444). King's status in Nova Scotia was almost identical to that of King's College in Ontario , including all the infighting between sectarian and secular interests that surrounded it.

Dalhousie, founded as a college in 1821, received university standing in 1841. Neither college was funded by the government. In the case of Dalhousie, the university's charter required that it rely on tuition fees and charitable giving. King's, although supported by occasional grants from the provincial assembly, relied principally on an endowment that its Loyalist founders brought with them from New York during the American War for Independence (Akins, 1865).

When Dalhousie, as Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, promoted the founding of Dalhousie College in 1820, he had visited King's College and come away with the opinion that it was in parlous condition, and that the province needed a healthy non-sectarian institution (Roper, 1991). There was already a "college question" before the provincial assembly doubting, regardless of the state of education at King's whether the province needed two colleges (Akins, 1865, p.41; Roper, 446). The governors of the two colleges in 1824,, thinking along the lines of Learned and Sills a century later, tried to forge a union. However, what Dalhousie and the governors mis-calculated was the extent of religious diversity in the province, and the impact of a seemingly minor clause in King's

royal charter that required that all students take the oath of supremacy to the Church of England. To that the Anglican church would not object, but other denominations – Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians -- would and did. The plan of union failed and the province was set on the road to an inefficient and, for that reason, expensive tragedy of the commons in higher education.

The collapse of the University of Halifax experiment in 1881, and the consequent discontinuation of government funding hurt King's more than any other of the province's denominational universities, all of which had stronger endowments, enrolments, allied seminaries, and local support. The discontinuation of provincial funding was phased in over five years. In 1885, King's again proposed federation with Dalhousie. The overture was rebuffed. By the turn of the century King's was in a seriously weakened financial condition. To this parlous state of affairs, In 1920 the college's building was destroyed by fire.

Despite Dalhousie's having before turned aside proposals to enter federation with King's, with the Learned and Sills report in hand and the prospect of Carnegie funding, King's made a further overture to form a federation with temporary support from the Corporation (A. Stanley McKenzie to W.S. Learned, February 20, 1922, CUCFAT; A. Stanley McKenzie to W.S. Learned, March 8, 1922, CUCFAT).

With the encouragement of Sills (Kenneth Sills to A. Stanley McKenzie, February 2, 1922, DAL) and planning for confederation underway, and with the full support of the King's' faculty, the discussion was re-opened with the Foundation about a fully developed plan under which Dalhousie and King's would form their own federation that would be supported financially under the aegis of the Learned and Sills report whether or not other universities could be brought on board (W.S. Learned to G.F. Pearson April 14, 1923, DAL). A few days later the Foundation advised Dalhousie that the proposal was a "wise move regardless of the ultimate decision of other institutions" (W.S. Learned to G.F. Pearson April 26, 1923, DAL). In this letter Learned also told Pearson, who was vice-chair of Dalhousie's board, that the proposal could be made public as a "striking object lesson of how federation was going to work," and that the Foundation would make a decision on the proposal within one month, which it did by approving the proposal and awarding a \$750,000 over five years to finance the transition. This was exactly what King's and Dalhousie asked for in their proposal for federation

The Foundation may have overplayed its hand by acting too quickly on the King's-Dalhousie federation, while the larger conference plan was still under negotiation. The Foundation went ahead believing that the King's-Dalhousie federation would serve as an "object lesson" of the benefits of federation (Learned, W. S. (1923, April 26). [Letter to G. F. Pearson], DAL (UA-3-173-7-06). The object lesson was good. The terms of the King's-Dalhousie federation agreement were clear: academic quality could be maintained and raised through efficiency and removal of duplication. In the case of King's and Dalhousie it was. Their federation has lasted for nearly a century. But the lesson also was that some of those benefits, with Carnegie funding and private funding leveraged by it, could be realized through means other than large-scale federation (Lang, 2022).

Discussion

By the early 20th century Canadian university federation was a widely recognized, but indefinite, concept. Although assumed to be a single model, federation was in practice at most a composite of loosely related models, sometimes with the mutual motivation and different solutions, and sometimes the reverse. Federation as a concept was not a generalization. There were substantive differences among the early applications of the concept. *Affiliation* and *federation* were not synonyms.

In most provinces federation began as a government decree. There were, however, differences among the enabling legislation from province to province. In some cases the government not only created the legal basis for federation, it formed the federation, leaving no choice to the participating colleges and universities. In other cases, the legislation allowed room for institutions to elect or reject membership in federation. In two other provinces – Ontario and Nova Scotia – the momentum towards federation began with colleges and universities themselves, only later sanctioned by government.

In the case of the University of Halifax the model was *federation by decree without election*. The provincial legislation established the university and declared every college in the province to be federated with it, including Mount Allison in New Brunswick, whether they sought to be federated or not. Most at the time did not, nor were they required to hold their degree granting authority in abeyance.

In Manitoba and Ontario before 1906 the model was *federation by decree with elective participation*. In Manitoba, St. Boniface, St. John's, and Manitoba colleges, each denominational, agreed, albeit reluctantly, to enter federation with the single provincial university before the government legislatively proclaimed federation. They could have refused, as Baptist Brandon College did, and they could have withdrawn on their own initiative, an option that St. Boniface seriously considered.

In Ontario, colleges and universities had among themselves reached and outlined an agreement to federate three years before the government legislatively sanctioned it. Further expansion, however, was a prerogative of government in response to applications to join federation. In 1906, the model shifted to *federation by mutual election*, when federation became the prerogative of the University of Toronto senate. The expansion and definition of federation then became a matter of mutual advantage and choice, sometimes for denominational reasons and sometimes for fiscal academic reasons.

In Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia governments created a legal basis for federation but did not actually form federations. Federation was a one-sided: *federation by university election*. For example, the University of Saskatchewan could elect to federate with other institutions, but was not required to do so. The discretion to federate, and with which institutions was left entirely in the hands of the university. It could refuse to federate, and in the case of Regina College it did.

The conference plan for a federation of Maritime universities did not come to fruition. If it had, it could have been described initially as *mutual election* in a federation that, like a consortium, the members would mutually control. All colleges and universities expressed interest in it, and invited the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to investigate and make recommendations for it. Provincial governments stepped back. The invitation to federate came from the colleges and universities themselves in committee. Although the Maritime plan did not look like either the Saskatchewan or the Ontario model, the presidents of both universities enthusiastically endorsed it.

Although the Foundation saw the federation of King's and Dalhousie as an object lesson to promote the larger plan for federation, and financed the federation from the funding set aside for the plan, the motivation to federate and the form that the

federation took, however, were determined by the institutions alone. In other words, *federation by independent choice*.

The model of confederation envisioned by the conference plan, however categorized, shared a fundamental objective with the models already in place in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia: they all imagined planned systems of higher education around a single, public, non-denominational university.

Even if the definitions of *federation* and *affiliation* were not always precise, evidence is clear that, where the terms were used together, the respective colleges, universities, and governments thought they were different. In the case of Ontario and Quebec, the differences were clearly demarcated. In other cases the demarcation was found more in actual practice, for example, in matriculation and curricular requirements, than in legislation. *Affiliated* institutions, whether called “universities” or “colleges,” were post-secondary but sub-baccalaureate, offering only one or two years of instruction, except in theology, creditable to four-year degrees at the host university according to standards set by the university as an examining body. Denied membership in host university senates, they did not participate fully in federation governance. They were almost always self-governing and ineligible for government financial support. They owned their land, buildings, and libraries, which they by agreement could and sometimes did transfer to the host university. Morton (1959, p. 92) likened an affiliate to an “adopted son” of the host university. Federation legislation in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, and Ontario after 1906, allowed for two additional forms of affiliation, one with secondary schools and one with self-regulated professions. Neither led to participation in federation.

Federated institutions, again whether called “universities” or “colleges,” always conferred baccalaureate degrees and above, and offered four or more years of instruction, sometimes independently and sometimes through formal agreement with other four-year institutions, as was the case in at Toronto and King’s-Dalhousie, and as would have been the case in the Maritimes under the conference plan. Federated universities, on terms that varied from province to province, were eligible for government funding. Constituent members participated fully in the governance of their respective federations. In some respects the working of a federation can be compared to the difference between permeable and semi-permeable membranes in micro-biology. Between four-year baccalaureate institutions in a federation, students and course

credits could move freely in either direction. All students were registered as degree candidates in the host university and could take courses for credit in any constituent member of the federation, whose degree-granting authority was retained but held in abeyance. By mutual agreement, natural science, mathematics, and professional instruction was provided by the host university, and arts by the constituent members.

Curricular movement between two-year affiliates and four-year universities, however, was in one direction only, the recognition of credits controlled by the senate of the host university, of which, as affiliates, they were not members. Recognition of credits could take three forms. The senate could review the curriculum of the courses and the qualifications of the faculty teaching the courses. The university could require students from an affiliate to sit matriculation examinations, regardless of their performance in the affiliate. Third, in Alberta, for example, was a cross-appointment arrangement under which university faculty could be assigned to teach courses in the affiliate (Governors of the University of Alberta and Governors of the University of Alberta and Alberta College, Agreement, May 6., 1912. 22042711_57-43, UAA). In all cases denominational affiliates retained their authority to award degrees in theology.

Under this model it is important to draw a distinction between *program* diversity and *denominational* diversity. Except in Quebec and in the Maritimes, had the conference plan succeeded, denominational diversity was neither promoted nor expanded by federation. In Ontario denominational diversity was, on one hand, accommodated and in practical effect perpetuated in order to resolve intense sectarian bickering and, on the other hand, to reduce the cost of program diversity in natural and physical science. Elsewhere federation was accommodated only as practical means towards secular ends, and only then when, in the judgement of provincial universities, it was fiscally advantageous.

Whatever the motivation towards federation, it became apparent that university federation had geographic limits. It did not work long-distance. Relocation was a major impediment to federation in the Maritimes and Ontario. In Quebec the problem was pre-empted by adoption of a branch campus model. In Ontario, shortly after the question was resolved for federating the University of Toronto, the government replicated the arrangement by amending the charter of Western University to enable it to federate.

No other provinces promoted relocation as a means of securing federation. No new federations would be established until the late 1950s, when some provincial governments began absorbing denominational universities into public systems as a means of rapidly expanding capacity in response to “baby boom” demand.

Bibliography: Manuscript Collections

Brandon University McKee Archives (BMA)
Canadian Baptist Archives, McMaster University Archives (McMUA)
Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Carnegie Corporation (CUCC)
Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CUCFAT)
Dalhousie University Archives (DAL)
McGill University Archives (MUA)
Mount Allison University Archives (MAUA)
University of Toronto Archives (UTA)
Queen’s University Archives (QUA)
Saint Francis Xavier University Archives (StFXUA)
University of Alberta Archives (UAA)
Victoria University Archives (VUA)

Note: An earlier version of this paper was presented to Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, May 15, 2022

References

Akins, T. B. (1865). *A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment and Progress of the University of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia*. Halifax, NS: Macnab & Shaffer.

Alcorn, K. (2013). *Border Crossings: US Culture and Education in Saskatchewan, 1905-1937*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Allen, J. (1889). Facts concerning Federation, The Alumni Association, VUA, 2011.02V.3-21.

Brown, S. (1997), in Jones, G. A. (Ed.). (1997). Higher education in Canada: Different systems, different perspectives. Garland, 189-219.

Bumsted, J. M. (2001). The University of Manitoba: An Illustrated History. Univ. of Manitoba Press.

Davies, G., and Bjarnason, S. (2013). "After Empire: The 'London Model' Transformed since the Second World War." Universities for a New World. New Delhi: Sage and Association of Commonwealth Universities: 27-40.

Falconer, R. (1923).. "University Federation in Toronto," The Dalhousie Review, 3, no 3, 279-285.

Flavelle, J. W. (1906). Report of the Royal Commission into the University of Toronto and University College 1905-06. Government of Ontario, 1906.

Healy, D. (1973). The University of Halifax 1875-1881. The Dalhousie Review.

Lang, D. (2022). "The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Division of Educational Enquiry and the Shaping of Canadian Higher Education," Canadian Journal of Higher Education. 52, no.2. 31-51.

Learned, W.S. and Sills, K. (1922). Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin Number 16.

Learned, W.S., and Wallace, E.W. (1932). Local Provision for Higher Education in Saskatchewan, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin Number 27.

MacNutt, W. S. (1973). The Universities of the Maritimes-A Glance Backwards. The Dalhousie Review. Pp. 431-445.

A. Stanley McKenzie to Henry Pritchett, June 20, 1922, CUCFAT.

Massey, V. (1929). "University Federation in Canada." Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955) 15, no. 6: 438-440.

Memorandum submitted for the Information of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, Delegation of Municipalities, March, 1887, VUA, 2011.02V, 3-3).

Morton, A. (1959). Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan. University of Toronto Press.

Morton, W. L. (1957). One university: A history of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952. McClelland and Stewart,

Murray, R. A. (1984). The Prairie Builder: Walter Murray of Saskatchewan. NewWest Publishers.

Murray, W. C. (1928). "University development since Confederation" *The Dalhousie Review*, 17, no, 4, 279-285.

Pitsula, J. M. (2006). *As one who serves: The making of the University of Regina*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Roper, H. (2018). *King's College, New York, and King's College, Windsor: Their Connection in Fact and Legend*.

Sissons, C.B. (1950). "University Federation at Toronto: A Canadian Experiment," *The Canadian Historical Review*, Volume 31, Number 2, 166-176.

Smith, G. T. (1999). *Federation and fullness, a history of the early years of federation at the University of Toronto from the viewpoint of the three denominational colleges* (Doctoral dissertation).

Sylvain, P. (1971). *Les difficiles débuts de l'Université Laval. Les Cahiers des dix*, (36), 211-234.

University of London. (1912). *The Historical Record (1836-1912) Being a Supplement to the Calendar Completed to September 1912*. Hodder & Stoughton.

Thompson, W. P. (2019). *The University of Saskatchewan*. In *The University of Saskatchewan*. University of Toronto Press.

Trinity College Resolutions, (1890), VUA, 2011.02V.2-15.

Vipond, R.C. (1989). "1787 and 1867: The federal principle and Canadian confederation reconsidered." *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 22, no. 1 (1989): 3-26.

Author and Affiliation

Dr. Daniel W. Lang
Professor
Faculty of Education
University of Toronto
Email:dan.lang@utoronto.ca