

The Educational Policy of the Commission of Government

Phillip McCann

Volume 3, Number 2, Fall 1987

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/nflds3_2art02

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Faculty of Arts, Memorial University

ISSN

1198-8614 (print)

1715-1430 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

McCann, P. (1987). The Educational Policy of the Commission of Government. *Newfoundland Studies*, 3(2), 201–215.

The Educational Policy of the Commission of Government

PHILLIP McCANN

NEWFOUNDLAND'S ECONOMIC crisis of 1932 probably affected education more profoundly than any other sector. The grants for 1930-31 stood at just over a million dollars; in 1932-33 they had been reduced to exactly \$500,000.¹ Since 90% of the grants went to pay teachers' salaries, these were effectively halved, leaving many teachers at the bare subsistence level.² The initial policy of the Commission of Government with regard to education was ostensibly simple and straightforward—the restoration of the balance of cuts made in teachers' salaries; changes in the organisation of the Department of Education; and a reconstruction programme for school building and teacher training.³

The programme appeared to be largely administrative and financial in nature. But to the Amulree Commission, the Dominions Office and the British Commissioners of Government, the education question was more than a matter of accounting and administrative procedures. The Amulree Commission, made up of a Scottish peer and two Canadian bankers, had given somewhat greater prominence to "greed, graft and corruption" than the international economic crisis in its diagnosis of Newfoundland bankruptcy.⁴ The iniquities of the social system, it maintained, had led to "a blunting of the moral sense which had tended to undermine the moral character of the people", had weakened "the fibre of the people", "demoralised . . . and warped their outlook", and so on, adding that denominational divisions had also played their part in "the general demoralisation".⁵

If the Commission did not itself draw the logical conclusion that, in order to repair the damage to the Newfoundland psyche, education had to play a major role in the policy of the Commission of Government, this was certainly drawn by the officials of the Dominions Office in London, to whom the British Commissioners were directly responsible. The link between the Amulree Commission and the Dominions Office was Alexander Clutterbuck, who had been secretary of the Commission and had assisted in the preparation of the Report, and who, together with his colleagues Eric Machtig and St. John Chadwick (who later wrote a history of Newfoundland) were the leading Newfoundland experts at the Office, and continuously in touch with the Government and the three British Commissioners. Almost from the beginning, the Commission of Government envisaged "a sound and practical mental training" as the basis of improvement in the social, industrial and economic condition" of the people.⁶ In 1935 the Commission asserted that education was "the most important question of all."⁷ A year later Governor Walwyn was emphasizing that the problem in Newfoundland was as much a moral as a material one, and attached "the utmost importance" to education as an essential and integral part of any long-term programme for reconstruction.⁸ Similar statements were made on other occasions, and Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Dominions during the later 1930s, several times made it clear that he was convinced that improved education was the essential factor in the rehabilitation of the island.⁹

What kind of education had the Dominions Office and the Commission in mind? A pointer had been given by C. A. Richardson, an Inspector of Schools in England, who had been invited by Frederick Alderdice in the last year of his Premiership to study and comment on the Newfoundland educational system in general and the curriculum in particular. Richardson issued his Report in October 1933, in the same month as that of the Amulree Commission, and it was clear that he was guided by an educational theory very different from that prevailing in Newfoundland. He was a committed supporter of the theory of inborn ability, an ideology then flourishing in Britain under the inspiration of the leading educational psychologist Cyril Burt. The practical significance of this theory was that, differences being innate and normally distributed, children could be differentiated by intelligence tests and classified—and taught—according to their apparent level of ability.¹⁰ This was in contrast to the old faculty theory, which emphasised similar mental endowments in all children, on which basis all developed and learnt at much the same rate. In practice this generally meant

a common, formal curriculum, and drill and memorisation in preparation for a common examination¹¹—very much the system in operation in Newfoundland.

Richardson's Report was less important, however, for its recommendations concerning the curriculum—which basically were along the line of abandoning the formal, academic subjects taught in all Newfoundland schools in favour of practical subjects and life skills in addition to the basics¹²—than for the effect which his investigations, indeed his very presence, had on the Churches. Of the Churches making up the four main denominations on which the educational system was structured—the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, the United Church and the Salvation Army—the former two were pre-eminent and, like much else in Newfoundland, still a part of the nineteenth century. They had helped successfully to keep at bay the ideas of Darwin, Marx and Freud, and were jealous guardians of the political and educational status quo. The denominational educational system had been regularised in the 1927 Education Act, which had established a Bureau of Education to exercise control over all education in the Island. The Bureau rarely met, however, and effective power lay in the hands of three denominational Superintendents, representing respectively the Anglican, Catholic and United Church congregations.¹³ According to J. A. Winter, Commissioner for Education 1936-41, they were “a law unto themselves”; they met together, decided on policy, and allocated their denomination's share of the government's grants. There was not one but three Departments of Education, admitted Winter, “all receiving assistance from the Government, but over whom the Government had no control.”¹⁴

The Superintendents, and the Bishops of the Anglican and Catholic Churches, interpreted Richardson's enquiry as an attack on the denominational system and, according to the Dominions Office, the unfortunate Richardson was held a prisoner in St. John's for a fortnight before he could even begin his work, “while frantic attempts were made by Mr. Alderdice to pacify the bishops.”¹⁵ This he succeeded in doing, but even so Richardson was enveloped in an atmosphere of suspicion wherever he went,¹⁶ and felt constrained to give a pledge not to attack the denominational system in his Report.¹⁷ It was, in fact, the “highly nervous and excitable condition” of the Churches which convinced the Amulree Commission to make only a passing reference to education in its Report.¹⁸

Though Richardson did not criticize the denominational system in his Report, one of his suggestions, that 10% of the ablest children be selected

by means of a standardised intelligence test for a superior academic education at the denominational colleges in St. John's in order to produce future leaders,¹⁹ further alarmed the Church leaders. It was evident that he intended to change the character of these schools, which educated a small minority of the wealthy (however limited in character and intelligence they might be), by introducing a "circulation of elites" by which children of high intelligence but of lower-class origin could rise to the top. The Richardson Report had thus made the Churches suspicious of the intentions of the British even before the Commission of Government was set up. The Dominions Office, on the other hand considered Richardson a "first-rate man for the job", and hoped that his report would prepare the way for radical reforms within the educational system.²⁰

But even the Dominions Office was scarcely prepared for the radical reforms which the Commission announced early in 1935, few of which had been specifically recommended in Richardson's Report. The Commission unanimously resolved that the principle of compulsory education was to be established; a new curriculum was to be put in place the following September; examinations for all grades under VIII were to be eliminated; the offices of Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent were to be abolished; the abolition of local (i.e., outport) Boards of Education was to be considered; state schools would be established in St. John's for children not attending school because of lack of facilities; and Lloyd Shaw (a Prince Edward Islander and apostle of contemporary educational theories) was appointed Secretary for Education. W. R. Howley, Commissioner for Justice, was instructed to draft a bill to abolish the post of Superintendent.²¹

The pace had been set by the British Commissioners, Sir John Hope Simpson, E.N.R. Trentham and Thomas Lodge,²² with the support of J. C. Puddester of the United Church, Commissioner of Public Health and Welfare;²³ Alderdice at Education and W. R. Howley at Justice had apparently acquiesced. The latter was later to complain that the United Kingdom Commissioners determined policy among themselves, then sprung it on their Newfoundland colleagues.²⁴ At a subsequent meeting Howley, the only Roman Catholic member of the Commission, read a letter from his Archbishop protesting at the lack of consultation with the Churches; Lodge and Trentham, however, persisted with their intention of forcing through the bill and were prevented only by Howley narrowly winning a vote to give the Churches a fortnight in which to present their views.²⁵

The United Church accepted the proposals, with minor qualifications. The Catholic hierarchy and the Anglican Diocesan Synod were, however,

violently opposed. Both condemned the lack of openness of the Commission with regard to its policies and plans, both condemned the abolition of the post of Superintendent as inimical to the very principle upon which denominationalism was based, both felt that a state system would destroy the religious ambience of their schools and sever the link between the community, the school and the church, whose members had invested so much in the system. The Church of England communicants, declared their bishop, "have too much at stake. We have convictions and vested interests which must be respected. At considerable sacrifice Church of England people have erected and kept in repair school buildings at a present estimated value considerably over One Million Dollars. . . ." More ominously, both Churches warned that the implementation of the proposed legislation would lead to social strife. It would evoke "hostility" among Anglicans, resulting in "controversy and acrimonious feeling of the deepest kind," and the Catholics forecast "discontent, disaffection and resentment" that would be "bitter and prolonged."²⁶

Revolt, or even a political crisis, in any part of the British Empire, was the last thing the Dominions Office wanted. Clutterbuck had warned his colleagues that the Churches could stir up a hornet's nest and the disgruntled political elements would not be slow to take advantage of it.²⁷ He had in mind Sir Richard Squires, an improbable revolutionary, but active in 1935 in organising opposition among those suffering economic hardship and opposed to what appeared to be an aloof and bureaucratic Commission.²⁸

The Churches' statements led to heated but inconclusive arguments in the Commission. In a final attempt at a solution, Howley was given an afternoon to see what he could do with the Churches, and to everyone's surprise returned with a revised draft of the bill in which he had secured the concurrence of the Churches—at a price. The abolition of the post of Superintendent was secure, but as a set-off the Churches obtained a denominational Committee to act as a buffer between themselves and the Department; the appointment of Supervising Inspectors on a denominational basis, with inspection limited to their own schools; and the appointment of local boards of education to be made by the Committee.²⁹

The Dominions Office was angered by the whole episode. Clutterbuck considered the Churches' attitude to be not unreasonable, but condemned the action of Lodge and Trentham in forcing the issue as "indefensible."³⁰ "The Commission have got quite enough on their hands," one Minute ran, "without going out of their way to antagonize the Churches."³¹ The final result of the whole episode, the Office bitterly concluded, was that "the

denominational system is now more firmly established than ever.”³²

The Education Department set up under the subsequent Amending Act of 1935 had as permanent head a Secretary, now known as the General Superintendent of Education (Lloyd Shaw), assisted by three officials—the Chief Executive Officer, the Research Officer and the Accountant—who had been selected irrespective of denominational affiliation and had no official contact with their respective religious bodies. In addition there was the Advisory Committee composed of representatives of the major denominations, but its members had little contact with the administrative work of the Department.³³ If we add the fact that the government had complete control of the issue and expenditure of educational grants, it is clear that a secularised Department was administering a denominational school system.

In the circumstances of the time, with the Churches smarting under the settlement forced upon them, conflict was bound to ensue. The occasion was a proposal by the Commission, in 1937, to establish a committee to revise the Education Act of 1927, which was vague, contradictory and difficult to administer. The Churches, who regarded the 1927 Act as a sort of Magna Carta, stood by it as “best suited to the conditions in Newfoundland,” and accused the British Commissioners of unilaterally declaring that local legislation was “mistaken,” and that the panacea for Newfoundland’s educational ills was to bring its legislation into as close a conformity as possible with English practice.³⁴ In the view of Governor Walwyn, the Churches regarded the reorganisation of 1935 with “plain distrust.”³⁵ Faced with a *fait accompli* and fearing that the Commission’s aim was to tamper with the denominational system, the Churches had felt it politic, in the two years following the 1935 Act, to adopt (in Winter’s words) “an attitude of passive resistance.”³⁶ In order to make it possible to set up the reform committee, the Commission was forced to make concessions to the Churches. The Department was once again reorganised, and the three professional officials were replaced by Executive Officers representing the main denominations, these to form the majority on a Council of Education, which would be the authority for all educational policy. Lloyd Shaw was to continue in his post under the title of Director.³⁷

The officials at the Dominions Office were seriously concerned at these developments, and summoned Winter, the Commissioner, to London for discussions.³⁸ These lengthy talks, as might be expected, resolved themselves into a clash between Commissioner Winter and Dominions Office and Board of Education officials, the former taking his stand on the necessity of maintaining the denominational system, the latter pressing for “the ultimate

goal of State education." The denominational system was too deeply rooted in "sentiment and tradition," maintained Winter, for any fundamental change to be practicable. The officials in the end had reluctantly to agree that though they considered the denominational system "wrong in theory," and the re-introduction of denominational officers a retrograde step, there was no alternative in view of the attitude of the Churches. The Dominions Office and the Secretary of State were consoled with the fact that the Government still retained more control than it had prior to 1935, and urged that if the Commission were able to make a break, even on the smallest scale, in the denominational framework, they should do so; government control in return for increased state funding in the form of Reconstruction grants was mentioned as a possibility.³⁹

Reconstruction was, of course, the other arm of Commission's educational policy, but it was not until the Second World War that this policy began to develop on a large scale. The Commission in the pre-war period had, in fact, done little to make the Island self-supporting. Unsettled world conditions, difficulties in international trade, and an economic situation too depressed to attract capital to new enterprises formed the context in which the Commission worked. Though it financed many schemes to expand earning power and to bring government machinery and social services up to a minimally-acceptable standard, Newfoundland had little possibility of paying its way before the war, and each year the budget had to be balanced by a grant-in-aid from the United Kingdom; in 1938-39 this reached nearly £1 million.⁴⁰

Educational reconstruction was relatively slow, partly because of the need to restore the cuts made in teachers' salaries before any real progress could be made. The pre-emergency level of education expenditure was not exceeded till 1937, and teachers' salaries were not restored in full until 1939.⁴¹ Another reason for the slow progress was the relatively low level of educational facilities which the Commission inherited. Richardson, in 1933, had found children writing on brown paper bags and teachers underfed and badly clothed.⁴² In the autumn of 1935 a survey of the system by the newly-appointed Inspectorial staff revealed that only 41% of schools were in good condition and that one in five was unfit for use; more than half lacked ordinary school equipment and 85% had not a single book of any kind for reference or general reading.⁴³ The 1935 census revealed that 14,000 children, 25% of the age group, had not attended school for even one month during 1934-35, "an appalling fact for the Department of Education to be compelled to face," asserted Governor Walwyn in a special despatch

in March 1936.⁴⁴ The chief cause of this was the fact that Newfoundland's expenditure per head on education was only a third of the Canadian average. If the internationally-recognised "normal" expenditure on education in developed countries was 15% of total expenditure, then Newfoundland needed \$1.7 million per annum; in fact it received only \$1 million, for a service far below normal standards.⁴⁵

These revelations naturally impelled the Commission to make a request to the Dominions Office for special grants. The earliest, by Alderdice in late 1934, for \$2 1/4 million per year, was described by Clutterbuck as "quite fantastic,"⁴⁶ and the following year demands for an extra \$1/2 million by Shaw, and even for \$50,000 by Walwyn, were imperiously dismissed as "out of the question."⁴⁷ The Office and Treasury were forced to sanction an ex-gratia payment of \$16,000 at the end of 1936 only under the threat of schools having to close.⁴⁸ The Commission was thus forced to limit improvements to those which cost least money; the most important development was the change in the curriculum introduced in 1936. Following at some distance behind the Richardson Report and subsequent Commission of Enquiry recommendations, the curriculum in schools was reorganised to introduce a less formal kind of education, emphasis being given, in addition to the basic subjects, to Health, Social Education and Industrial Training.⁴⁹ It is clear that the main educational effect of the Richardson Report had been to stimulate revision of the curriculum rather than a reorganisation of the structure. Nothing was said in the Newfoundland Commission of Enquiry's Report about the selection of the top 10% of the pupils by intelligence tests for education in the Colleges, though a separation was made between Grades I-VIII and IX-XII.⁵⁰ In fact the curriculum finally offered to the schools was largely based on that of Nova Scotia.⁵¹ But the low salaries of teachers, inadequate teacher-training facilities and lack of compulsory attendance legislation were still barriers in the way of progress.⁵²

The revelations of the very serious deficiencies in educational provision with which the Commission bombarded the Dominions Office in the mid-1930s forced the latter to recognise that a problem existed, even if adequate financial aid was not forthcoming. The despatches, a Minute noted, were "a clear indication, despite the denominational difficulties, [that] it is essential to face the task of the reorganisation of the system;" the Dominions Secretary concurred as to the necessity of improving and extending educational facilities.⁵³ Financial constraints, however, were not the only reasons for the slow progress of reform; political considerations also entered the picture. The Dominions Office and the Commission were

caught in a web of contradictions. On the one hand they realised the crucial importance of educational reform in the long term rehabilitation of the Island, and for this a "long period of political peace", in MacDonald's words, was necessary.⁵⁴ On the other hand, there was the fear that a too-vigorous program of reform could ignite religious and political agitation, which MacDonald and his colleagues were anxious to avoid at all costs. Clutterbuck expressed the office's dilemma very clearly when he pointed out that publication of Governor Walwyn's despatch of 27 March 1936 (detailing the deficiencies of Newfoundland education and their causes and requesting additional finance) might awaken the public conscience and prod the Churches into action; on consideration, however, he felt that "the circumstances are doubtless too delicate for us to suggest this." "We might," he added, "be faced with a lot of awkward questions in Parliament."⁵⁵ Fear of the reaction of the Churches (for there might be a point at which pressure for improvement could begin to impinge upon the denominational structure) and a desire to keep Newfoundland political life stable and the British Parliament quiet, thus helped to limit educational reform. Walwyn, in 1938, put the matter succinctly; replying to a Dominions Office criticism of the alleged lack of drive of J. A. Winter as Education Commissioner, he reminded the Office that "any spectacular fellow trying to reform education would have split the country fore and aft."⁵⁶

It is thus not surprising to find, on the eve of the Second World War, that the educational policy of the Commission of Government was foundering. An address of the Anglican bishop to the Diocesan Synod of 1938 had convinced the Office that the Churches were prepared to cooperate with the Government only on their own terms,⁵⁷ the teachers were up in arms about low salaries and conditions in the schools,⁵⁸ and improvements—in enrollments, textbooks and the provision of an inspectorate—had been modest and did not involve much expenditure.⁵⁹ The Dominions Secretary felt that the Commissioner for Education was content to deal with purely routine matters and not inclined "to raise the question in a big way."⁶⁰

MacDonald suggested to the Governor that the only way forward would be to integrate educational reform—particularly in the areas of improvement in school accommodation and teaching personnel—in the proposals for long range reconstruction which the Dominions Office was then beginning to formulate.⁶¹ The Commission took the hint and in April 1938 put forward a proposal for educational reconstruction. The ultimate aim was stated as "a system of complete and universal compulsory education," but before this could be approached an extensive programme for building and

equipping schools would be necessary, at a total cost of \$500,000, spread over five years. The cost for the 1938-39 financial year, which would cover the inauguration of Folk Schools, industrial education, school book expenditure and the restoration of teachers' salaries, would be \$250,000.⁶² This was approved by the Treasury⁶³—who by now were convinced that long-term planning was necessary, though stringent conditions were attached to grants-in-aid⁶⁴—but a cut-back had to be made in the school building programme because of a set-back in the economic situation.⁶⁵

From this time onwards the development of education became part of what came to be known as the Long Range Reconstruction Programme, to be merged in 1942 with post-war planning under a specially-convened Reconstruction Committee.⁶⁶ Educational development had been stimulated and informed by the Report on Newfoundland's future made in 1938 by J. H. Gorvin, a Colonial Official, later a Commissioner for Natural Resources. Gorvin interpreted education broadly to include technical instruction in fishery and agriculture, household management, and technical education in mining, forestry and farming, as a means of rehabilitating unemployed fishermen.⁶⁷

Though the plans and reforms of the 1938-1942 period were entirely concerned with the fabric of education, the Churches were still not satisfied with their position in the educational structure. The three denominational Executive Officers which the Churches had succeeded in getting installed in 1938, far from leaving Lloyd Shaw, the only non-denominational officer in the Department, a freer hand in carrying out his professional duties, had encroached so far on the responsibilities of their nominal superior as to reduce his work to mere routine. Shaw, feeling that he had been reduced to a cipher, wished to leave the Department, and in 1942 the Commission took the decision that "the office of Secretary for Education be vacated and left for the time being in obedience," and the three Executive Officers assume the Secretary's duties.⁶⁸ Shaw, wrote Governor Walwyn, though a most energetic and capable man, had found himself frustrated at every turn, and was now anxious to take over the direction of Vocational Education.⁶⁹ Sir Wilfrid Woods, Commissioner for Public Utilities, dissented, arguing that the Department's one professional post, which did not invade the religious authority of the Churches, had effectively been eliminated, and that education would now become the football of inter-denominational rivalry.⁷⁰

The Commission's decision caused consternation in the Dominions Office, and the various despatches were noted and minuted at great length by seven or eight officials. The proposal to vacate the Secretaryship was

declared to be “a thoroughly retrograde step” and completely contrary to Dominions Office policy, which had never considered a denominational system either “desirable or inevitable”; state education was declared to be the goal for Newfoundland, though it was recognised that this would cause an “uproar” in that country if it were to be made public. The Office did not acquiesce in the proposal, and sent Alexander Clutterbuck to Newfoundland to sort out the situation.⁷¹

With his usual talent for reconciliation Clutterbuck soothed the fears of the Commissioners with diplomatic talk about not upsetting the present arrangement “under which there was a balance at the centre of control between the professional and denominational points of view,” and managed to find a compromise by suggesting that the Senior Executive Officer—an Anglican—should become Secretary of the Department, and relinquish his official link with his denomination, and the resulting vacancy be filled on a denominational basis. Privately Clutterbuck blamed Shaw, “who, though an excellent man, had somehow or other put his foot wrong with the Churches, with the result that nothing he now says or does is right in their eyes.” A change in the appointment of Secretary, Clutterbuck felt, was thus “essential in the interests of smooth working.”⁷²

The whole issue, as Eric Machtig prophetically lamented, was “a parting of the ways and the end of any hope of progress towards a state system of education in any foreseeable future.”⁷³ But the Dominions Office, with little room left to manoeuvre, held fast to its policy of trying to influence the Commission to take “every opportunity, however small . . . to lever the Church out of their [sic] present position and introduce the State into educational affairs, whenever a chance to do so crops up.”⁷⁴ The only chances that cropped up from then until the end of the Commission’s life were the encouragement of the establishment of common schools—including those at Deer Lake, Buchans, Bay Roberts, Gander, Hampden and North West River⁷⁵—and the opening of non-denominational schools in the Government-sponsored Land Resettlement Communities at Markland, Haricot and elsewhere.⁷⁶

From 1942 onwards educational policy and the policy of the Commission in general became inextricably bound up with the political future of Newfoundland. In the summer of 1942 a Parliamentary delegation of three British M.P.s had visited the Island to report on future policy, and in December 1943 the War Cabinet issued a Statement of Policy announcing that machinery would be provided immediately after the war to enable the people of Newfoundland to choose the form of government they desired.⁷⁷

In 1944 details were released of a new Reconstruction Programme covering all aspects of development, which would cost \$100,000,000 over a ten-year period, with Education receiving an allocation of \$8,500,000.⁷⁸ Most of this would be spent on school building, including the construction of twelve regional high schools with boarding accommodation, described as “an entirely new departure in educational policy;” the faint hope was expressed that these might eventually become common schools. Vocational Institutes, commencing with a large central Institute, and library services, were also planned.⁷⁹

The sum of \$100,000,000 became entangled with the political future of Newfoundland; the refusal of the British Treasury to countenance it played a crucial role in Britain’s post-war loan negotiations with Canada and the U.S.A. and ultimately in Britain’s decision to persuade Canada to take Newfoundland into Confederation—a situation I have analysed in detail elsewhere.⁸⁰ During this period, the last two or three years of the Commission’s life, the Education Department was carrying out mostly routine business. In the words of H. L. Pottle, the last Commissioner for Education, the shortcoming of the Commission in its last years was that “we were looking too fixedly to the time when we were going to change our constitutional cap.”⁸¹

The achievements of the Commission in the field of education should not, however, be underrated. Though it failed in its aim of instituting a secular state system of education in Newfoundland, it succeeded not only in restoring the status quo of 1931 but in going some considerable way beyond it—by 1949 it had built 555 new schools and renovated 264 others, spending \$3,400,000 on school construction between 1938 and 1949.⁸² The curriculum had been broadened and improved, and the 1942 Act for free and compulsory education had increased attendance.⁸³ The Commission also widened the conception of education to include vocational and industrial instruction and introduced the idea of regional high schools—concepts taken over, without acknowledgement, by the Liberal governments which succeeded it. To a greater extent than has been recognized, both the successes and failures of the Commission of Government were to influence the structure and direction of Newfoundland’s educational system in the ensuing decades.

Notes

¹R. L. Andrews. *Integration and Other Developments in Newfoundland Education 1915-1949*. 151.

²DO 114/58 1175/97, Amulree to J. H. Thomas, 22 May 1933.

³DO 739 N 131/9, Note of Discussion on Newfoundland Education Programme, 30 May 1938.

⁴Cf. S. J. R. Noel. *Politics in Newfoundland*. 217 ff.

⁵Newfoundland Royal Commission Report (1933). pp. 81, 83, 89, 192.

⁶DO 41/20, Minutes of the Commission of Government, 26 January 1935.

⁷DO 35/493 N 1007/11, cited in Note by P. A. Clutterbuck, 30 April 1935.

⁸DO 114/80 N 11/1, H. Walwyn to D.O., 24 December 1936.

⁹DO 35/493 N 1007/29, Newfoundland Education. Reorganisation, Minute by Malcolm MacDonald, 5 May 1936; DO 114/80 N 11/3, MacDonald to Newfoundland Government (Despatch) 31 March 1937; DO 35/726 N 11/26, MacDonald to Walwyn, 11 January 1938.

¹⁰Cf. L. S. Hearnshaw, *Cyril Burt: Psychologist*. New York 1981, esp. Chs. 4 and 7; B. Simon. *Intelligence, Psychology and Education*. London 1971, pp. 208-36.

¹¹Cf. Board of Education Consultative Committee, Secondary Education With Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools [Spens Report], 1938. App. IV, pp. 429-38.

¹²C. A. Richardson, *Certain Aspects of the Educational System of Nfld.* 10 ff.

¹³18 Geo v, cap. 14, An Act Respecting Education (6 September 1927).

¹⁴DO 737 N 131/9, Note of Discussion on Newfoundland Education Programme, 30 May 1938.

¹⁵DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. Clutterbuck, 30 April 1935.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁷DO 35/493 N 1007/2, Report of Meeting on Reorganisation of Educational System, 18 January 1934.

¹⁸DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. Clutterbuck, 30 April 1935.

¹⁹Richardson. *Educational System of Nfld.* 8, 19-20.

²⁰DO 35/493 N 1007/2, Newfoundland. Reorganisation of Educational System. Minute by P. A. C., February 1934; DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

²¹DO 41/20, Minutes of the Commission of Government, 26 January 1935.

²²DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

²³DO 35/739 N 131/24, St. J. C., "A Survey of Elementary Education in Newfoundland." 7 July 1942.

²⁴DO 35/493 N 1007/16, Newfoundland Education Policy, Minute by P. A. C., 15 May 1935.

²⁵DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

²⁶DO 30/493 N 1007/10, W. H. Horwood to J. H. Thomas, 12 March 1935, encl. memorandum of Roman Catholic Hierarchy, 8 March 1935; Memorandum of Diocesan Synod of Newfoundland, 8 March 1935; Memorandum of the United Church of Canada. Newfoundland Conference, 7 March 1935.

²⁷DO 35/493 N 1007/A1, Newfoundland Education. Church of England College, Memorandum by P. A. C., 19 October 1934.

²⁸Noel. *Politics in Newfoundland*. 233 ff.

²⁹DO 35/433 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

³⁰*Ibid.*

³¹DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Newfoundland Education, Minute by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

³²DO 35/493 N 1007/11, Note by P. A. C., 30 April 1935.

³³1935 No. 11, An Act to Amend the Education Act 1927. 6 April 1935.

³⁴Andrews. *Developments in Newfoundland Education*. 242-44.

³⁵DO 35/739 N 131/74, H. Walwyn to C. R. Attlee, 6 May 1942.

³⁶DO 35/739 N 131/9, Educational Reconstruction Programme, discussion at Dominions Office, 30 May 1938.

³⁷DO 114/80, W. H. Horwood to Dominions Office, 30 March 1938; Andrews.

Developments in Newfoundland Education. 249-50.

³⁸DO 114/80, Dominions Office to Newfoundland Government (Telegram), 21 April 1938.

³⁹DO 35/739 N 131/9, Educational Reconstruction Programme, discussion at Dominions Office, 30 May 1938; DO 35/739 N 131/10, Minute by E. G. M., 16 June 1938, E. J. Harding to Secretary of State, 20 June 1938; DO 35/739 N 13/2, H. Walwyn to E. J. Machtig, 19 August 1938.

⁴⁰DO 35/1342 N 402/29, Lord Cranborne to Sir John Anderson, 22 September 1944, encl. Note: Newfoundland (n.d.).

⁴¹*Ibid.*, App. A; Andrews, *Developments in Newfoundland Education.* 251; DO 114/80, D. O. to Newfoundland Government (Telegram), 23 June 1938.

⁴²DO 35/493 N 1007/2, Report of Meeting on Reorganisation of Educational System, 18 January 1934.

⁴³DO 114/80 N 11/1, H. Walwyn to D. O. (Despatch), 24 December 1936.

⁴⁴DO 35/493 N 1007/29, H. Walwyn to Malcolm MacDonald, 27 March 1936.

⁴⁵DO 114/80 N 11/1, H. Walwyn to D. O. (Despatch) 24 December 1936.

⁴⁶DO 35/493 N 1007/A1 Newfoundland Education, Church of England College, Minute by P. A. C., 29 October 1934.

⁴⁷DO 35/493 N 1007/25, L. W. Shaw to Sir John Hope Simpson, 28 November 1936, encl. Memorandum; DO 35/493 N 1007/28, Newfoundland Education. Reorganisation, Minute by P. A. C., 22 April 1936; DO 35/493 N 1007/25, Newfoundland Department of Education, Financial Provisions for 1936/37, Minute by P. A. C., 3 January 1936.

⁴⁸DO 35/493 N 1007/35, Newfoundland Government to D. O. (Telegram), 30 November 1936; Minute, 5 December 1936.

⁴⁹DO 35/493 N 1007/29, Extracts from Press Communiqués of Commission of Government, 24 April, 18 May and 15 June 1936.

⁵⁰Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Present Curriculum of the Colleges and Schools in Nfld. St. John's 1934, p. 13 and *passim*.

⁵¹Andrews. *Developments in Newfoundland Education.* 184-85.

⁵²DO 114/80 N 11/1, H. Walwyn to D. O. (Despatch), 24 December 1936.

⁵³DO 35/493 N 1007/29, Newfoundland Education. Reorganisation. Minute by E. J. H., 24 April 1936; Minute by Malcolm MacDonald, 5 May 1936.

⁵⁴DO 35/504 N 1051/25, Malcolm MacDonald to Governor, 22 October 1936.

⁵⁵DO /493 N 1007/29, Newfoundland Education. Reorganisation, Minute by P. A. C., 22 April 1936.

⁵⁶DO 35/726 N 11/26, H. Walwyn to E. G. Machtig, 14 February 1938.

⁵⁷DO 35/739 N 131/12, Governor's Views on Educational Proposals, Minute by A. W. S., 29 August 1938.

⁵⁸DO 35/739 N 131/3, R. H. Morgan, M.P., to Malcolm MacDonald, 24 January 1938.

⁵⁹DO 114/80 N 131/9, H. Walwyn to D. O. (Despatch), 21 April 1938.

⁶⁰DO 35/726 N 11/26, Malcolm MacDonald to H. Walwyn, 11 January 1938.

⁶¹DO 114/80 N 11/26, Malcolm MacDonald to H. Walwyn, 25 January 1938.

⁶²DO 114/80 N 131/9, H. Walwyn to D. O. (Despatch), 21 April 1938.

⁶³DO 114/80 N 131/10, D. O. to Newfoundland Government (Telegram), 23 June 1938.

⁶⁴Noel. *Politics in Newfoundland.* 242.

⁶⁵DO 35/739, E. G. Machtig to H. Walwyn, 18 July 1938.

⁶⁶DO 35/1156 N 7181/1, "Review of the Dominions Press", 16 April 1943.

⁶⁷DO 35/726 N 11/38, Papers Relating to Long-Range Reconstruction Policy in Newfoundland. Interim Report of J. H. Gorvin, C.B.E., Vols. I and II; DO 35/726 N 11/43, Walwyn to D. O., 13 February 1939.

⁶⁸DO 35/739 N 131/24, H. Walwyn to C. R. Attlee, 6 May 1942.

- ⁶⁹DO 35/739 N 131/24, H. Walwyn to E. G. Machtig, 6 May 1942.
- ⁷⁰DO 35/739 N 131/24, Sir Wilfrid Woods to H. Walwyn, 4 May 1942.
- ⁷¹DO 35/739 N 131/24. Reorganisation of Educational Administration, Minutes by J. G., St. J. C., M. T., E. G. M. and others, 24 June—21 August 1942.
- ⁷²*Ibid.*, Minute by P. A. C., 8 October 1942.
- ⁷³*Ibid.*, Minute by E. G. M., 10 July 1942.
- ⁷⁴*Ibid.*, Minute by St. J. C., 4 July 1942.
- ⁷⁵DO 41/30, Minutes of Commission of Government, 20 October, 1944, 1 November 1946, 21 February and 18 July 1947.
- ⁷⁶W. G. Handcock. "The Origin and Development of Commission of Government Land Settlements in Newfoundland 1934-1969."
- ⁷⁷DO 35/1342 N 403/29, Newfoundland: Commission Government, Note: Newfoundland (n.d., c. September 1944).
- ⁷⁸DO 35/1342 N 403/29, "Summary of Outline Reconstruction Programme Covering a Period of Ten Years." (n.d., c. October 1944).
- ⁷⁹*Ibid.*, App. c.
- ⁸⁰McCann. "Confederation Revisited: New Light on British Policy."
- ⁸¹McCann. *Blackboards and Briefcases*. 32.
- ⁸²Andrews. *Developments in Newfoundland Education*. 370.
- ⁸³DO 35/1142 N 402/61, Commission of Government Factual and Economic Statement (June 1946), p. 13.

References

- Andrews, R. L. *Integration and Other Developments in Newfoundland Education 1915-1949*. St. John's: Harry Cuff Publications (1985).
- Handcock, W. G. "The Origin and Development of Commission of Government Land Settlements in Newfoundland 1934-1969." M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1970.
- McCann, Phillip. "Confederation Revisited: New Light on British Policy." unpublished typescript, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1983.
- (ed.). *Blackboards and Briefcases*. St. John's: Jespersion Press, 1982.
- Newfoundland Royal Commission Report (1933).
- Noel, S. J. R. *Politics in Newfoundland*. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1971.
- Public Record Office, London, Dominions Office files, 1933-1947.
- Richardson, C. A. *Certain Aspects of the Educational System of Nfld.* St. John's, 1933.