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ABSTRACT

Despite the growing body of literature regarding residential schools, few studies have focused on the men and women who staffed the schools. This study is a detailed examination of the staff members of four Presbyterian-run boarding schools and their experiences from 1888 to the early 1920's. By using Presbyterian Church and Department of Indian Affairs documents, this study has reconstructed the staff perspective of the early decades of residential schooling. The findings reveal that residential school employment, regardless of position, was very stressful. All positions, and particularly that of the principal, entailed a diversity of duties and responsibilities. Too often staff members were unprepared for at least some of the tasks expected of them. The findings also reveal the inhospitable working conditions that existed, which were due largely to the lack of financial support. In some cases, parental opposition contributed to the pressure, as did strained staff relations. Not surprisingly, the majority cited illness as the reason for resigning. It is suggested that more congenial working conditions would have resulted in better management and possibly, less physical abuse of students. It is also argued that staff experiences varied greatly depending on the school at which one was employed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Aboriginal residential school system has come to the attention of the Canadian public via media accounts of abuse. Former students of these residential schools have disclosed experiences of psychological, physical and sexual abuse, as well as linguistic and cultural suppression at the hands of those who staffed such schools. The residential school experience continues to adversely effect many individuals and their communities. As Chrisjohn and Young (1997: 167) maintain, research regarding Canada’s residential school system is important in order to understand the current situation of Aboriginal peoples within Canadian society: “residential schooling is connected up, in an uncountable number of ways both subtle and obvious, with the past and present (and therefore future) lives of First Nations people across Canada. This single fact is reason enough for all of us to want to know as much as possible about residential schooling.” The residential school is a microcosm which reflects the complex relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the Euro-Canadian colonizers.

The residential school system has been a topic of study for a number of decades, and yet the area remains considerably understudied. The existing literature on residential schooling covers various topics, time periods and geographical areas. Topics of study include overviews of the entire residential school system, histories of individual schools and oral histories by former students regarding their experiences. As a result of an extensive review of the existing literature regarding residential schooling in Canada,
Trevithick (1998: 78) found that few studies exist on residential school staff members: “the average staff at the schools remain not only nameless but except for a few general inferences, largely faceless.”

Chrisjohn and Young (1997: 174) equate researching residential schools to finding pieces to a puzzle: “the puzzles of residential schooling have many pieces, fitting together in various levels. No level is more complex than another, and each deserves serious attention.” The purpose of this study is to contribute to the knowledge of residential school staff members: one of the pieces to that puzzle. Euro-Canadians have begun to realize the importance of studying the role their ancestors played in the residential school system. For example, Jan Derrick Moore, a non-Aboriginal therapist who assisted the Lytton band in uncovering a history of abuse at the St. George’s Residential School, argues that the residential school system is a “white issue” and Euro-Canadians need to acknowledge our ancestors’ role in the establishment and perpetuation of the schools (York, 1990: 37-38). In her book Distant Relations: How My Ancestors Colonized North America, Victoria Freeman (2000) succeeds to do this on a personal level as she traced her family lineage back in order to discover the role her ancestors played in colonization and the relationships they had with Aboriginal peoples. This included her grandfather who had been a principal at the Cecilia Jeffrey Residential School in northwest Ontario.

Similarly, Milloy (1999) argues that the residential school system is “our history, our shaping of the ‘new world’” and

As such, it is critical that non-Aboriginal people study and write about the schools, for not to do so on the premise that it is not our story, too, is to marginalize it as we did Aboriginal people themselves, to reserve it for them as a site of suffering and
grievance and to refuse to make it a site of introspection, discovery and extirpation - a site of self-knowledge. . . (1999: viii).

This study contributes to understanding the role of Euro-Canadians in the residential school system, specifically of those employed at the schools.

Staff members of residential schools were often considered to be surrogate parents and they were responsible for creating the reality experienced by students of residential schools. School policies and, to a large extent, curriculum were designed by government officials, yet it was the staff members who put such policies into practice. Staff members, especially principals, had a degree of latitude available to them, allowing for the implementation of their own interpretation of government policies and their view of education appropriate for Aboriginal children. This ability on the part of staff members to engineer the educational experiences of students makes them an important topic for residential school research.

Much of the current research deals with the period of residential schooling after 1923. This study examines the initial wave of government-sponsored residential schooling in the Canadian West, the late 1880's to 1923. During this period, residential schools were referred to as either boarding or industrial schools. The research for the current study was limited to a small group of schools (Presbyterian schools operating in and close proximity to Manitoba) in order to facilitate a more in-depth study and to avoid generalizations. Data about and often written by staff members were examined in order to acquire background information, their perceptions of Aboriginal children, what they hoped to accomplish through residential education and their experiences and challenges.
Many Aboriginal children suffered various forms of abuse in these schools. On the positive side, there were also students who remembered certain staff members with fondness and admiration. Staff members had an instrumental position in the residential school system. Thus acquiring greater knowledge of those who created the conditions of the schools and the experiences of former students is essential.

This study is a detailed examination of the staff members of four Presbyterian-run boarding schools and their experiences from 1888 to the early 1920's. By using Presbyterian Church and Department of Indian Affairs documents, this study has reconstructed the staff perspective of the early decades of residential schooling. The findings reveal that residential school employment, regardless of position, was very stressful. All positions, but particularly that of the principal, entailed a diversity of duties and responsibilities. Too often staff members were unprepared for at least some of the tasks expected of them. The findings also reveal the inhospitable working conditions that existed, due largely to the lack of financial support. In some cases, parental opposition contributed to the pressure, as did strained staff relations. Not surprisingly, the majority cited illness as the reason for resigning. These, and other facets of boarding schools will be discussed in greater detail.

The next chapter delineates the context of this study via an examination of the existing literature regarding residential schools. Chapter Three consists of a discussion of the research design. The backgrounds and experiences of staff members are examined in six chapters. In Chapter Four, the desirable qualifications of residential school staff members, the actual qualifications and the duties expected of each position are discussed. The
relationships school employees had with Aboriginal people and their children are examined in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six, the working conditions and living arrangements of the schools are described. The importance of and difficulty in maintaining harmonious working relationships is the focus of Chapter Seven. The topic of Chapter Eight is the degree to which individuals successfully filled their positions. Chapter Nine addresses the length of time staff members stayed for and the reasons for resignations.
CHAPTER TWO

THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following is a review of existing literature which deals with the general topic of Aboriginal residential schools and the more specific topic of residential school staff. Research questions were developed based on this extant literature.

Residential School Literature

The existing literature on residential schooling covers various topics, time periods and geographical areas. Agnes Grant (1996) provides an overview of the residential school experiences, but it is quite general, and thus is adequate as an introduction to the topic. Miller (1996a) and Milloy (1999) each contribute a comprehensive examination of the history of the residential school system and the conditions that existed at the schools. Pettit (1997) considers specifically the industrial school system: its development from Ontario to British Columbia, its evolution and ultimately its failure. Titley (1986) also discusses the history of the industrial school system, but limits his study to the western Canadian experience.

Most studies take a narrower perspective than those above by focusing on one specific institution or region. Titley (1993) and Scott-Brown (1987) contribute histories of the Rupert's Land and Calgary Indian Industrial Schools respectively, examining the origins and operations of each school. Pettit (1993) discusses the history of the Mohawk Institute in Brantford by examining various aspects such as the initial goals of government and church officials, the place of the industrial school in Canadian Aboriginal policy, the
circumstances of the institution including the management styles of various principals and Aboriginal responses to the school. Dyck’s (1997) work studies the administrative dimension of Aboriginal residential schooling in Prince Albert from 1867 to 1995. Dyck does not limit his focus to the policies and intentions of religious and government officials, but also stresses the continued efforts of Aboriginal communities to pursue their own educational goals. Gresko (1975) similarly highlights Aboriginal agency via opposition.

The author examines the Aboriginal-Euro-Canadian interactions that occurred in and through Qu’Appelle Industrial School and its tributary reserves and argues that the continuance of traditional Aboriginal ceremonies is an indication of resistance to education and its assimilative goals. The work of Pettit (1993), Dyck (1997) and Gresko (1975) demonstrate the increased academic attention to Aboriginal agency and resistance in regards to education.

Much of the more recent research has endeavoured to give the Aboriginal peoples a voice regarding the residential school experience. The body of research that best achieves this is that which utilizes oral histories of past residential school students. Knockwood’s (1992) autobiographical work is supplemented with stories from other past students in order to highlight everyday life at the residential school in Shubenacadie, Nova Scotia. Johnston (1988) presents a bittersweet portrayal of his experiences and the day-to-day operations of the Jesuit-run St. Peter Claver’s Residential School in Spanish, Ontario. Haig-Brown (1988) takes the perspective of former students of the Kamloops Indian Residential School and constructs their experiences, including modes of resistance. Bull (1991), Assembly of First Nations (1994) and Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council (1996) also
depend on oral histories of past students to help delineate the students’ experiences, positive and negative, and to assess the impact of the residential school system.

Another body of residential school literature relies on government documentation as a main source of data. In her examination of the Mount Elgin and Mohawk Institutes, Graham (1997) uses both oral histories of past students as well as government documents in order to present the “voice of experience” (that of the students) and the “voice of authority” (that of the administration). Furniss (1992) uses government archives in order to retell the story of the tragic deaths of two former students of the Williams Lake Residential School, thus contributing to the knowledge of abuse at such schools. Miller (1996b) uses unconventional sources of archival data, such as photographs and poetry, and argues that this method of using oral and visual history will enable the researcher to better reconstruct the roles and contributions of Aboriginal peoples to residential schooling.

School Staff

Two studies having some similarities to the present one were located. Gagan (1992) examines the lives of female Methodist missionaries working in Canada and Asia for the period 1881 to 1925. Home mission workers included those working among the French in Quebec, Asian immigrants in British Columbia, eastern European immigrants in northern Alberta, inner-city missions and Aboriginal peoples in Alberta and British Columbia. In comparison to women employed in foreign missions, Gagan argues that home missionaries had less education, training and previous work experience. They also tended to be older and fewer had parents who had been professionals. These drawbacks were most
pronounced in women working among Aboriginal populations. Some of these women worked at schools for Aboriginal girls. Gagan explores some of the women's experiences and challenges, and contends that women working in Aboriginal missions were often quickly disillusioned with their chosen vocations and thus had the shortest mission careers among all home and foreign missionaries.

Simon et al. (2001) examine the Native Schools system in New Zealand. This was a government funded and controlled system of village primary schools for Māori. The students were not boarded at these schools, however the schools were to play an important role in assimilating Māori into Pākehā society. Interviews with former teachers and students of these schools were the main source of data for this study. In each chapter, an aspect of the Native Schools system is explored, beginning with the perspectives of students and teachers and then these viewpoints are juxtaposed with related official policy. The authors draw upon the oral testimonies of former teachers in order to explore topics such as why Pākehā teachers entered the Native Schools service, what knowledge and values they brought, the relations they developed in Māori communities, how they interpreted official policy and to what extent they translated it into practice.

A few studies exist on individual residential school staff members. Dobbin's (1961) article addresses Mrs. Catherine (Gillespie) Motherwell's life as an educator and missionary amongst various Aboriginal peoples of Saskatchewan. This biography presents her as a dedicated woman whose positive influence is not only seen in her pupils but also in the Aboriginal people of surrounding reserves. This is proven, Dobbin argues, by the relatively high rate of attendance in schools under her management, which in turn
represents a greater appreciation for education on the part of Aboriginal parents.

Raibmon (1996) examines the role of Reverend George Raley as a principal at the Coqualeetza Residential School. Raibmon found that principals had some degree of latitude in running such schools, and Raley utilized this flexibility by instating various initiatives to alleviate the institutional atmosphere of the school and attempting to accommodate an Aboriginal presence. This study stresses the heterogeneity of the residential school experience.

Nock (1988) discusses the life of the founder and principal of the Shingwauk and Wawanosh Residential Schools, Edward Francis Wilson, in the context of his evolving attitudes towards what appropriate government policies regarding Aboriginal peoples should entail. Nock argues that while this Victorian missionary was managing these residential schools, he supported the government-advocated policy of cultural replacement. Yet later in life, influenced by anthropological and historical writings on various Aboriginal nations, as well as by his travels amongst the Cherokee of Oklahoma, Wilson gained a greater appreciation for Aboriginal cultures as well as for their social, political and economic institutions. He then advocated that in order to improve the situation of Aboriginal people in Canadian society, the federal government should rely more on policies of cultural synthesis and autonomy rather than cultural replacement.

The following is a brief overview of what is known about residential school staff as expressed in the above studies.

**Qualifications**

Who were the individuals who staffed these schools; what type of qualifications did
they have and what motivated them to seek employment in the field of Aboriginal education? According to the literature, residential school staff were generally non-Aboriginal, incompetent, otherwise unemployable and often religiously motivated. The isolation of the schools and low salary offered largely prevented the recruitment of highly qualified individuals.

The poor quality of staff was a chronic problem plaguing the Aboriginal residential schools. Due to limited budgets, the schools were forced to rely on unqualified staff. For example, a study conducted by the DIA in 1948 found that over forty percent of the teachers had no professional training and some had not graduated from high school (Milloy, 1999: 176). This was not a new complaint; concerns proliferate throughout school inspection reports. In 1886, school inspector J. A. Macrae stressed the incompetence of staff referring to some of them as “illiterate persons, ignorant of the first elements of teaching and powerless to impart any ideas they may have possessed regarding the most simple subjects” (Milloy, 1999: 177).

To a large extent, it was the responsibility of the churches to appoint the various staff members. Thus much of the staff was derived from the ranks of the churches. This meant that often too great a focus was paid to religious zeal as a requirement to the detriment of other relevant qualifications such as desirable personality qualities, knowledge and skill (Milloy, 1999: 178). Miller exemplifies this when he describes the first principal of the Battleford Industrial School, Thomas Clarke, as being “better prepared theologically than pedagogically” (1996a: 105). Clarke did have previous experience as a day school teacher, however he had no formal teaching education nor a
background in educational administration. Similarly, Raley was hired as a principal primarily on the merits of his missionary work. Raley had only a grammar school education yet he had over twenty years of experience as a missionary with the Aboriginal peoples of British Columbia prior to his appointment as principal of Coqualeetza Residential School (Raibmon, 1996: 70).

Overemphasis on missionary zeal was not the only charge against the churches when it came to hiring residential school staff. Miller (1996a: 130) refers to the schools as “a dumping ground for less-competent Church staff.” In 1932, the Department of Indian Affairs’ Superintendent of Education, R. T. Ferrier, admitted that the churches tended “to assign to Indian work reverend gentlemen and instructors who have not been too successful in other fields of activities” (Milloy, 1999: 178). Furthermore, churches tended to be reluctant or unable to filter out staff who had been guilty of misconduct. Some problem and abusive staff were dismissed but many others were merely reprimanded informally, thus disregarding the best interest of the students (Miller, 1996a: 321). With the limited funds granted to the schools, the churches were unable to compete for qualified staff who preferred the remuneration and locations of public schools.

Although it appears to have been the exception rather than the norm, some staff were competent, educated and dedicated individuals. Johnston (1988) speaks highly of one teacher at the Spanish school, Brother Edmund O’Keeffe. He taught various courses and also was able to instil in his pupils an appreciation of literature as he had often read classic novels to them. Johnston proclaims Brother O’Keeffe to have been the “most gifted and accomplished” staff member, as well as the one to have had the most positive impact on
his students (1988: 65). Kate Gillespie (later Mrs. Motherwell) is portrayed by Dobbin (1961) as a capable, qualified teacher who had a genuine interest in the Aboriginal peoples with whom she worked.

According to the existing literature, residential school staff members tended to be unqualified and lacked relevant experience, but little has been written about their actual training, education and work experience.

**Motivation**

The extant literature reveals little about the motivations that drove individuals towards employment at Aboriginal residential schools other than that many were otherwise unemployable in the church or public school system. There were other reasons for accepting such a position. Explanations of what drives one to work with Aboriginal children is often discussed only briefly. Dobbin (1961) for example, merely states that Kate Gillespie's initial encounters with Aboriginal children had moved her and drew her to the work. Johnston (1988) summarized the reason that many of the supervisors and teachers at Spanish residential school were employed there. Upon completing a four-year novitiate, a candidate for the Jesuit priesthood was placed at one of the Jesuit schools or institutions throughout Canada for two years as a requirement for candidacy. Spanish residential school was one such school. According to Johnston, many of those occupying teaching positions at Spanish were there against their wishes: “Spanish was known as an institution that made or unmade priests, and young men who had just completed their four years of novitiate at Guelph must have dreaded assignment in northern Ontario” (1988: 54).
In regards to the education of Māori children in New Zealand, Smith et al. (2001) found that Pākehā teachers sought employment in the Native Schools system for either idealist or pragmatic reasons. Under the idealistic umbrella were those who were genuinely interested in working with Māori. They were likely to have close ties with a Christian church and generally believed they were contributing positively to the wider society. Among those joining for pragmatic reasons, were men and women more interested in the material benefits. Married couples were often hired as teacher and assistant, and they were provided with a house. As in residential schools in Canada, some Pākehā teachers had experienced difficulties holding down employment elsewhere.

According to Gagan (1992: x), Methodist women who participated in missionary work viewed it as a respectable career opportunity “whose supportive female atmosphere provided a congenial alternative, albeit sometimes only temporarily, to marriage, a family, and the strictures of a patriarchal society.” Missionary work was one of only a few professional opportunities for women.

Nock (1988) details Wilson’s compulsion towards missionary work in Canada and his subsequent desire to start a residential school for the Aboriginal children of the Sault Ste. Marie area. Nock contends that Wilson yearned for adventure, but did not want to rebel against his family. By the 1880's it was becoming an acceptable and common practice for those from the middle class to volunteer for missionary work. Wilson had received a “calling” from Christ, as was common in Evangelical circles. Wilson had moved to Ontario with the initial intent to pursue farming, but shortly after his arrival, Christ had “put it into [his] heart to become a Missionary” (cited in Nock, 1988: 26). Then, while
stationed in northern Ontario, he decided that the Ojibwa people of the area required assistance in their transition from a hunting and gathering lifestyle to an agriculturally-centred lifestyle necessitated by encroaching European settlers. Compatible with government policy and public opinion, he believed that the assimilation of Aboriginal peoples could be best achieved via the development of a school system, and thus founded the Shingwauk Residential School.

Determining the motivations of residential school staff members is imperative in order to understand their frame of mind upon entering their respective schools and their attitudes towards their students. Did most teachers and principals take the job as last resort employment or were they largely compassionate individuals dedicated to working with and helping Aboriginal children and youth? This will be considered in Chapter Four.

*Philosophy of Aboriginal Education/Management Styles*

In the 1830's, the Evangelical view that the combination of Christianity and 'civilization' was a necessity for non-European peoples came to be an element of imperial policy (Nock, 1988). Upon Confederation, the assimilation of Aboriginal peoples became official policy of the Canadian government. It was the goal of the Canadian government to transform the Aboriginal person into an imitation European and to eliminate Aboriginal values through education, Christianity, new economic and political systems, and the concept of private property (Tobias, 1991: 132). The aspired result was for the Aboriginal person to become a “Christian, British-oriented, proletarian who would work for other people either as a tradesman, unskilled worker, farmhand or as a domestic servant” (Nock, 1988: 71). The continuation of cultural transferral from one generation
to the next was to be stopped, and thus residential schooling was seen as the solution as it was most efficient in separating the children from the influence of their traditional culture. Education was the primary instrument in the cultural replacement of Aboriginal peoples.

Many missionary teachers and principals truly believed in the rationalities behind the Department of Indian Affairs’s (henceforth DIA) educational policies and thus incorporated them into their teaching or management styles. Reverend W. A. Burman, principal of the Rupert’s Land Industrial School from 1890 to 1893 is an example. Senior officials of the DIA argued that in order for Aboriginal people to abandon their spiritual beliefs and customs something (presumably) preferable, Christianity, must be offered (Milloy, 1999: 36). Titley (1993) contends that Burman, like the DIA, stressed the importance of the children’s grasp and acceptance of Christianity. This is illustrated in the comfort and pride he took in his accomplishment of bringing the children of his school (and in some case their parents) to accept Christianity. Titley (1993) states that Burman’s curricular focus was on manual labour to the detriment of academic training. The DIA instated the half-day system in which manual or industrial training was provided for half of the day and academics were taught the other half. Burman supported the half-day system and its emphasis on manual labour:

The rule of half-day classwork has been carried out as far as practicable, though, owing to the lack of larger children for necessary work, some of these have frequently had to work at their various occupations full time. It has, however, the advantage of preparing them gradually for the kind of life they must expect in the near future (cited in Titley, 1993: 384).

Under the principalship of Burman, the manual labour of Rupert’s Land students was complemented with a maximum of three hours of academic education daily. It is clear that
Burman felt that his students could aspire to be no more than labourers and domestic servants, and thus his curriculum reflects this belief.

Nock (1988) portrays Reverend E. F. Wilson as a principal who to some degree abided by federal policy in the administration of the Shingwauk Residential School. Nock (1988) explains that Wilson was very stringent on his forbiddance of the use of Aboriginal languages. Cultural replacement was a primary goal for residential schools and language was acknowledged for its centrality to culture: culture, world views and values are expressed and transmitted via language. Thus, federal policy targeted Aboriginal languages and only English was to be used in the schools. Wilson believed in the importance of English. Initially, Wilson showed some flexibility by allowing Aboriginal languages to be spoken during tea time (between six and seven o’clock in the evening) and also during religious exercises. He used a reward system in order to entice the students to use the English language. When the government subsequently called for additional restrictions on the use of Aboriginal languages, Wilson adhered and began to rely on punishment to enforce the English-only regulation. He bragged that after six months at the institution, his students spoke only English, even while playing.

Nock (1988) cites other ways in which Wilson ran his schools in accordance with the policy of assimilation. Wilson, like the DIA, desired minimal contact between his students and their parents in order to separate the children from the influence of their traditional culture. Wilson achieved this by limiting the amount of summer holidays granted to the students. Wilson did not encourage cultural continuity. All forms of recreation allowed were European: British and Canadian civil and religious holidays were observed and no
Aboriginal songs or music were allowed, being limited to patriotic, religious and popular songs.

Yet, Nock (1988) reveals that Wilson did deviate from government Aboriginal educational policy in one respect. As mentioned above, academic training was not to be the primary focus of Aboriginal education, and students were encouraged to learn trades suitable to the lower classes of industrial-capitalist society. Prior to being pressured by Reed of the DIA, Wilson had implemented a curriculum which dedicated more time to classroom instruction and less to trades and agriculture. As well, he wished that at least some of his graduates would excel beyond the proletariat (Nock, 1988: 83). While most of the boys were taught trades and farming, a few were trained in white collar occupations. The same was not true for the girls though; they were all trained in domestic duties with the expectation that they would either become wives of Shingwauk students or employed as domestics.

The principal of Coqualeetza Residential School from 1914 to 1934, Reverend G. H. Raley as illustrated by Raibmon (1996), was a staff member who attempted to institute his own vision of Aboriginal education, which was not always congruent with policies advocated by the federal government and the DIA. His initiatives, however, often reinforced prevailing ideology. Raley hoped to offset the institutionalizing effects of the residential school through a cottage system. He was opposed to the congregate dormitory system common to such institutions. According to Raibmon (1996), Raley envisioned a cottage to be a self-contained unit with its own kitchen and dining room, accommodating no more than thirty children, eight years of age and younger. Raley’s dream to establish a
full cottage system was limited by a lack of financial support. This limited version consisted of two outside cottage-like dormitories for the younger students and semi-private rooms for the senior students. Thus, Raley’s efforts helped to mitigate the institutional atmosphere at Coqualeetza school, yet did not question the removal of children from their families, communities and culture.

Raley’s school curriculum departed from that which was authorized by the DIA in several important ways. Unlike some schools in which religion was ubiquitous, the moral component at Coqualeetza dealt more with ethics and character building than theological instruction. However, Raley’s conceptions of morality and character were of course influenced by Christianity and the Bible. Contrary to expectations of the DIA, Raley held intellectual achievement in high regard. He did not believe Aboriginal children to be intellectually inept, and therefore expected his students to complete one grade per year, despite the half-day system. Under the management of Raley, Coqualeetza Residential School produced approximately twelve boys and girls annually who proceeded to Chilliwack high school. In the area of manual training, Raley set himself apart from many other principals in that he “was intent on making manual training more directly relevant and sought to provide concrete occupational skills and opportunities for his students” (Raiibmon, 1996: 85-86). Residential schools often focused on trades and skills that would be of little use to the student upon their leaving the school (see Milloy, 1999: 162-163). The manual training at Coqualeetza consisted of boat building and Aboriginal art and handicrafts. Raley felt that boat building would be more beneficial to the students’ future lives than agricultural skills. Raley’s introduction of Aboriginal carving and basket
weaving into the curriculum demonstrates his sensitivity to Aboriginal culture. Even though Raley’s initiatives did help to alleviate some of the more negative aspects of the residential school experience, they fundamentally reinforced rather than denounced the residential school system.

Raibmon (1996) contends that the example of principal Raley illustrates that a degree of flexibility and autonomy was available to principals of Aboriginal residential schools. This latitude allowed Raley to put his philosophy of Aboriginal education into practice. The major impediment he experienced was the lack of financial support from the DIA for his initiatives. Principals’ management styles may have also been constrained by federal and church policy.

In examining the administration of Mount Elgin and Mohawk Institutes, Graham (1997) concluded that “although the personalities of the individual principals had a profound effect on the running of the school at any time, the pattern of events was remarkably similar at both schools as external factors changed” (1997: 13). Graham contends that prior to 1900, the principals of both these institutions focused on the education and contentment of the children. Later when the DIA demanded greater accountability on the part of residential schools, principals showed less concern with the satisfaction of the students and greater concern for efficient management. This generated discontentment which was manifested in incidents of arson and increased parental complaints (Graham, 1997: 15). Even though the Mohawk and Mount Elgin schools were managed by different churches for different periods of time, Graham found more similarities between their administrative policies and procedures than differences.
Similarly, Pettit (1993) argues that management styles of the various principals at the Mohawk Institute, while somewhat dependent on personal ideologies, were also considerably influenced by church and government policies.

Management styles of the different principals at the various residential schools were not homogeneous. Raibmon's (1996) study illustrates that a degree of autonomy existed for principals in residential schools. Although Raley had "room to manoeuvre within the parameters of the social values of the day and of the Canadian residential school system," he did at times find his initiatives hindered by lack of financial support from the DIA (Raibmon, 1996: 96). Graham (1997) and Pettit (1993) reveal how a principal’s latitude could be restricted by government and church policies. The literature describes various management styles, often reflecting the individual’s philosophy of Aboriginal education, and the latitude afforded as well as the limits confronted.

The Presbyterian staff members’ views on Aboriginal education are addressed in Chapter Five.

Perceptions of Aboriginal Children

The literature generally fails to discuss staff members’ attitudes toward the Aboriginal children under their charge. Miller (1996a: 186) notes that because of their first hand experience with Aboriginal people, residential school employees tended to have a more complex understanding of Aboriginal culture and paid greater attention to non-material aspects of Aboriginal life than did government officials. Yet, the continued interaction with Aboriginal people did not prevent them from judging Aboriginal society by Euro-Canadian standards and thus it was not uncommon for them to display negative opinions.
of the worth of Aboriginal society. Titley (1993), for example, illustrates how lack of progress on the part of the female students at the Rupert's Land School was attributed by principal Burman to Aboriginal society itself. Burman rationalized the absence of advancement with the following:

It is not always easy to remember that a true estimate of the girls’ progress can only be made by remembering what they were when they came to us and the character of the surroundings amid which they have been reared. Giving these things due consideration, there is much to encourage the Department and ourselves in this important work (Burman, 1891 as cited in Titley, 1993: 383).

The above quote also supports the assertion made by Nock (1988) that missionaries and other school staff tended to believe that Aboriginal children did in fact have the intellectual capability necessary to learn Euro-Canadian ways.

Although the literature specifies little about school staff attitudes toward Aboriginal children, much can be inferred from how the children were treated.

**Treatment of Students**

The memories that former students have regarding their interactions with staff reveal much of the students residential school experiences and also further demonstrates the power staff members had to shape these experiences. They also convey much about the staff and the methods they used in caring for these children. Some staff were admired and revered, while others were feared and despised. Graham (1997) found that children who attended during the initial period of a principal’s tenure expressed more positive feelings towards the individual than those who attended at the end of one’s principalship, thus implying that principals could lose their initial enthusiasm. The tenure of E. F. Wilson supports this finding. Towards the end of his tenure, Wilson became disillusioned with the
residential school policy of assimilation and felt that it “was supported with insufficient
time the churches and by other whites as well.” In addition, he felt
“overworked and unappreciated” (Nock, 1988: 102). Graham (1997) also contends that
teachers were more popular than other staff; principals were often responsible for meting
out punishments and thus personal and amiable relationships were uncommon. Johnston
(1988), a former student, expressed animosity towards those staff responsible for
supervision and discipline. There were exceptions though, such as Principal Raley, who
was “respected and beloved” by his former students (Raibmon, 1996: 69). Staff and
students occasionally became involved emotionally and even romantically. Such bonds
could result in life-long relationships as in the case of a former student of Coqualeetza
school. She maintained a life-long relationship with the agricultural teacher, Peter Pirie
and even after he passed away, she continued to maintain ties with his family (Raibmon,
1996: 78, fn 40).

Many staff members had genuine interest in and concern for the children under their
charge and this was reflected in their treatment of the students. Johnston (1988) contends
that some staff members were somewhat caring, citing two young men who were in
charge of the younger boys, Fathers Mayhew and Schretlin. Father Mayhew is described
as “a man of tremendous compassion and understanding,” who was “like an indulgent
uncle” to the young boys (1988: 61). Father Schretlin was more of a disciplinarian, yet
based on the way the boys seemed to admire him, Johnston feels he “must have been
father, brother and uncle all rolled into one” (1988:61). Although positive memories were
not common in Bull’s study, two of her female participants recalled that a couple of the
nuns had been kind and that some of the staff at their respective schools were there "for the love of the people" (cited in Bull, 1991: 41). Similarly, at Knockwood's (1992) school, many of the staff members were feared. Yet the Sisters who taught sewing were liked because they were "gentle souls" who "allowed us to talk and laugh as long as we were reasonably quiet." Furthermore, "they never yelled or scolded, but taught sewing in calm and patient way" (Knockwood, 1992: 67).

Some former students are adamant that their overall residential school experience was positive, implying that they were well treated by staff. Graham (1997) admitted that some former students refused to be interviewed on account that they felt that her intention was to create a primarily negative representation of residential schooling. Some of those who view their residential school experience in a positive light may have been staff "pets." According to Knockwood (1992), it was common for staff to pick favourites towards whom preferential treatment was bestowed. The favourites often received the best clothing and arbitrary rewards. One former student recollected that older boys received exclusive privileges such as tobacco and cigarette papers given to them "in the strictest confidence by the priest" (cited in Bull, 1991: 50) Miller (1996a: 341) describes some of the circumstances that accommodated positive residential school experiences:

Sometimes students who were particularly small and vulnerable attracted solicitude and protection from other students from individual staff members. Children who had been orphaned or who were taken from an abusive home situation to a school in which at least one staff member took an interest in them and protected them have responded by viewing their treatment in residential schools in a very positive light.

The residential school experience was a heterogeneous one; many former students maintain their recollections are predominately positive.
While some enjoyed and were appreciative of the treatment they received, the memories of former residential school students are overwhelmingly negative, testifying to neglect and physical, sexual and psychological abuse. There are countless accounts of such abuse in the extant residential school literature. Knockwood (1992) discusses various forms of abuse experienced by her and other students. Sister Mary Leonard, a Sister of Charity at the Shubenacadie school was infamous for tormenting the students. She seemingly enjoyed administering arbitrary, unwarranted and often violent punishments on her students. The children were called derogatory names such as “savages,” “heathen,” “pagan,” and “wild Indian” (Knockwood, 1992: 50). One previous student shared a story of humiliation at the hands of a nun. The nun had drawn a picture of a donkey on the chalk board and proceeded to tell the girl that she “was as stupid as a donkey and a no-good-for nothing” who “would never amount to anything in life” (cited in Knockwood, 1992: 51).

Punishments received by students ranged from petty to outright cruel and humiliating. For example, the punishments of a male supervisor at the St. Philip’s school in Saskatchewan in the 1960’s varied from something as minor as the removal of boys’ marbles to a sadistic whipping using five (often studded) belts (Miller, 1996a: 327). There are numerous instances of excessive punishment. One former student, for example, recalled counting the number of times a boy had been strapped (128) for speaking Cree (Bull, 1991: 43). In the 1930’s eighteen boys who were students of a residential school in Nova Scotia had been caught stealing money and lying. They all had their backs strapped, their hair cropped and were given only bread and water for one day (Miller 1996a: 326).
Not only were punishments severe, but they were all too common and often arbitrarily meted out.

Another form of abuse was revealed publicly in 1990 by the chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Phil Fontaine. He shared his experiences of mistreatment while at the residential school in Fort Alexander, which included sexual violations. Many residential school survivors proceeded to come forward with their own stories of sexual abuse. Even prior to this, legal action was being taken against such sexual predators. In the late 1980's, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police launched an investigation at the Lytton reserve and uncovered an extensive degree of sexual abuse: “Derek Clark, a former dormitory supervisor at St. George’s School, was arrested and charged with nineteen sexual offences. Three months later, he pleaded guilty to eleven counts of buggery and six counts of indecent assault. The crimes involved seventeen boys, some of whom had been as young as nine years old when they were victimized” (York, 1990: 28). In 1989, a Roman Catholic priest who had been employed at the Williams Lake Residential School in the 1950's and 1960's pleaded guilty to the sexual assault of thirteen male students (York, 1990: 29). In 1995, a supervisor at the Alberni School was sentenced to eleven years imprisonment for the sexual assault of eighteen boys ranging from six to thirteen years of age, between 1948 and 1968 (Miller, 1996a: 329).

Officials were often aware of such abuses, yet failed to take proper action against perpetrators. Occasionally such revelations did result in dismissals. In 1898 the chief and council of the St. Peter’s Reserve presented the DIA with a petition charging Principal Fairlie of the Rupert’s Land Industrial School with “improper conduct towards the big
girls attending the school,” as well as “cruel treatment of pupils” (cited in Titley, 1993: 393). The charge of improper conduct referred to Fairlie’s practice of kissing some of the girls while they lay in their beds in the dormitory. David Laird, the Commissioner of the DIA, conducted an investigation which resulted in Fairlie being excused from his administrative position.

Residential school workers were required to work hard and often under adverse conditions. In fact, Milloy (1999: 135) found that complaints of morale-destroying working conditions of staff and instances of neglect and abuse of students were often interrelated in staff correspondence.

**Working Conditions**

Grant (1996) suggests that men and women left behind more comfortable lives in Europe or eastern Canadian towns and cities in order to work at residential schools. They came into contact with an unfamiliar climate and cultures and languages which were alien to them.

Milloy (1999) described the difficulties and frustrations faced by those employed at Aboriginal residential schools. Upon their initial arrival at a school, novice staff members were sometimes confronted by neglected children and dilapidated, unsanitary buildings. This is what Dr. J. P. Rice experienced when he arrived at the Red Deer school in 1903 in order to take over the school’s management. He described his shock at what he encountered: “the sight of the ragged ill-kempt and sickly children was sufficient to make me sick at heart” (cited in Milloy, 1999: 78). Similarly, J. D. Dagg replaced the previous principal of the Rupert’s Land school in 1899 and was astonished to find the farm had
been completely ignored; most of the livestock had perished. As well, the living quarters were unhygienic; “alive with bugs and vile vermin” (Titley, 1993: 394). Such detestable circumstances were in large part the result of chronic insufficient funding which forced school administrators to operate schools on very limited budgets.

Titley (1993) shows that toiling long hours was a reality for the staff of the Rupert’s Land Industrial School. Due to funding cut backs, Joseph Thompson, principal of the Rupert’s Land school in 1902, found the school to be severely understaffed. He worked a fourteen hour day, yet was unable to accomplish all that he felt was necessary (Titley, 1993: 397). Prescribed duties for various staff positions were frequently impossible to achieve. When Abbie J. Gordon accepted a teaching position at the Rupert’s Land school that same year, she was appalled to find that her job was not to be limited to classroom teaching. She expressed concern for her mental and physical health. Long hours and hard work were complemented with low remuneration.

Many staff were granted almost no respite from their work. As mentioned, the Department required that schools keep children’s holidays to a minimum in order to limit their contact with parents and communities. This, in turn, meant that staff had to forgo vacations. In 1891, an Anglican bishop representing the Rupert’s Land school realized that this “was causing strain on staff and students . . .” (Titley, 1993: 379) and requested that holidays be granted. The Department conceded. Children were allowed a break from their studies in the summer months and staff members were allowed to take holidays in shifts. A Presbyterian principal in 1889 likewise attested to the negative effect that continuous contact with fellow staff members in such close quarters could have on one’s
disposition: “It is hard when thus isolated and shut up in a little world of one’s own to
maintain that cheerfulness and good temper at all times which are necessary in order to
carry on work harmoniously. But I need not say more” (cited in Miller, 1996a: 236-237).
Grant (1996: 222) asserts that besides promoting interpersonal friction, such conditions
“must have affected the mental health of staff members.”

Milloy (1999) examines how the dynamics of school administration could be another
source of distress for some employees. The principal and matron had a great degree of
control over the operations of a school and this power was amplified when they were
husband and wife, as was common in Protestant schools. Titley (1993) exemplifies how
the authority of the principal and matron caused conflict at the Anglican-run Rupert’s
Land school in the early 1900’s. In 1901, six former employees of the Rupert’s Land
school sent a petition to the Department’s Commissioner complaining of Principal Dagg’s
mistreatment of them and of his inadequate administrative ability and cited as proof that
twenty-one officers had resigned from their positions in the preceding twenty months
(Titley, 1993: 395). In the following year, a teacher made a formal complaint regarding
various maladies at the school including an unsanitary school building and neglect of sick
children. The teacher also expressed her antagonism towards the matron, Miss Lang:
“She treats the officers especially the ladies in a supremely arrogant manner. It is so much
so, that a couple or three months is as long as they can tolerate her abuse” (cited in
Milloy, 1999: 135). The principal and matron at the Rupert’s Land school were not a
husband and wife team, yet they did wield and perhaps abused their power, displeasing
staff and resulting in opposition.
The working conditions at the four Presbyterian schools are examined in Chapter Six, and staff relations are the subject of Chapter Eight.

**Research Questions**

The review of literature helped to delineate needed areas of research. My research is a study of boarding schools in and near Manitoba. Much of the current research deals with the period of residential schooling after 1923. Also, I am adhering to Trevithick’s (1998) advice to limit research to a small group of schools in order to enable a more in-depth study and to avoid generalizations. Furthermore, little has been written on staff members of the schools; more is known about the students.

Although the literature review does reveal a small amount of knowledge regarding residential school staff members, what is known is really only scratching the surface. My research will contribute to this existing body of information. Various questions are addressed in regards to the staff members discussed in this study, including:

1. What are their backgrounds (social, educational, employment)?
2. What were their motivations for engaging in such employment?
3. What was their vision of Aboriginal education? What were their views on the purpose/goals of education? How did they feel these goals could be met? Do these perceptions support the continuance of the residential school system?
4. What were their representations/perceptions of Aboriginal children? How did they treat the children? What did they consider these children's place to be in society?
5. What did employment at a boarding school entail? What were the day-to-day struggles and challenges?
6. Who was likely to make a career of such work? Why did they leave the work?

The above questions did guide the data collection process, though, ultimately the data determined the parameters of the study and the topics which are discussed in the following chapters.

**Theoretical Framework**

Residential schools, to a degree, are representative of the larger pattern of relationships between Aboriginal peoples and Euro-Canadian colonizers. Various theoretical perspectives have been used to explain or describe these relationships.

One perspective views government policies as repressive tools or instruments of colonialism. I will refer to this as the instrumental perspective. In reviewing existing theoretical perspectives regarding the role of law and social control in colonization, Smidych and Lee (1995) found that studies done in the 1960's and 1970's typically viewed the imposition of European laws on Indigenous populations as being deceptive and coercive. Furthermore, these repressive laws were considered to be effective and powerful instruments for controlling the Indigenous peoples. In regards to residential schools, proponents of the instrumental perspective would consider school staff members to be agents of a repressive government policy of which its primary purpose was to ‘kill the Indian and save the man.’

The residential school system has also been viewed through a humanitarian perspective. The missionaries and churches involved in residential schooling have and to some extent, continue to contend that their motives were altruistic as they were genuinely concerned with the well-being of Aboriginal peoples. In 1993, the Permanent Council of
the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, for example, proclaimed the primarily humanitarian motives of those who worked in the residential school system:

Missionaries arrived with the armies and merchants of the fur trade. Most missionaries sincerely desired to share their most precious gift - their faith. They were generous, courageous, and often holy men and women. While some of their actions may be criticized today in light of new understandings, they tried to act with love and compassion ... Although not the sole instigators, missionary and educational activities contributed to the weakening of the spirit of the Aboriginal Peoples (cited in Chrisjohn and Young, 1997: 10-11).

The humanitarian perspective maintains that today residential schools are viewed in hindsight from the perspective of current sensibilities which perceive many of the practices and procedures common in residential schools as abusive, when in fact those in charge of the children were doing what they saw, based on their beliefs, to be in the best interests of the Aboriginal peoples.

The above theoretical perspectives have been criticized for their one-sided view of colonialism. They take the point of view of the colonizer and tend to imply that Aboriginal people have been passive recipients of colonial policies. The counter-perspective which argues for an interpretation of colonialism from the point of view of the colonized can be included under the rubric of postcolonial theory. Gandhi (1998: 4) summarizes postcolonialism as a theoretically diverse and interdisciplinary approach that is “devoted to the academic task of revisiting, remembering and, crucially, interrogating the colonial past.” Similarly, Loomba (1998: 12) defines postcolonialism as “the contestation of colonial domination and the legacies of colonialism.” Postcolonial writers acknowledge that, especially in the context of colonialism, there is not merely one history, but rather many histories.
Postcolonial analysis critically examines colonial discourses. Language itself is considered to be ideological rather than objective. Language can be seen as a means of colonial domination and of identity construction. Language has the power to construct its subject: “no human utterance could be seen as innocent. Any set of words could be analyzed to reveal not just an individual but a historical consciousness at work. Words and images thus become fundamental for an analysis of historical processes as colonialism” (Gandhi, 1998: 37). Thus postcolonialism questions the objectivity of existing dominant ideologies of history, culture and representation (Loomba, 1998: 40).

Postcolonial academics reveal how Eurocolonial representations are merely that, representations, or perhaps more appropriately misrepresentations:

The post-colonial investigation starts from the premise that the aboriginal person or band is not simply what the discourse of history tells us, but is rather a symbolic representation that has been fixed and articulated by colonial authors. The formation of colonial subjects takes place through power/knowledge relations in the form of textual practices and ideological representation that have assigned meaning to the indigenous other. (Santiago-Valles as cited in Hogeveen, 1998: 162).

The Indigenous peoples and their cultures that the Europeans encountered were interpreted through existing, ethnocentric ideologies. Eurocolonial representations of Indigenous peoples were also influenced by the need to justify their economic pursuits, and later their desire to appropriate lands and control Aboriginal peoples (Loomba, 1998: 106-107). Fisher (1977: 73) emphasizes the power of such representational ‘knowledge’ of colonized peoples: “Indigenous society and behaviour is viewed through a cultural filter that distorts ‘reality’ into an image that is more consistent with European preconceptions and purposes. The process is complete when the image becomes more real than ‘reality’
as the basis for policy and action.” The colonized ‘other,’ regardless of culture or geographical region, is commonly designated with similar characteristics, such as lazy, aggressive, sexual promiscuous, child-like and irrational. The colonizer is seen as normal, while the colonized is aberrant (Said, 1979: 47). Thus European representations of the colonized ‘other’, of inferior cultures and religions, become justification for the act of colonization.

Historical texts of Eurocolonials thus must be critically analyzed and images of Aboriginal peoples and cultures which often appear as objective truths and knowledge must be exposed as culturally subjective representations. The silence of the colonized peoples in the construction of history must be revealed. Furthermore, from the postcolonial perspective colonization is not seen merely as a one-way process of European takeover, but rather a degree of reciprocity and exchange of ideas is acknowledged. Postcolonial studies illustrate how the actions and reactions of Aboriginal people contributed to the shaping of colonial history.

Governmentality studies represent a fourth theoretical perspective which has been used to examine the general topic of colonialism. In such studies, Michel Foucault’s notion of governmentality and related concepts compose a framework used to analyze the colonial governance of Aboriginal peoples. Foucault’s notion of governmentality “refers to the ways in which the state’s dispersed administrative organization manages a free and active population through practices which seek to structure their choice of actions in relation to the desired end” (Hogeveen, 1998: 8). In his study on the governance of Aboriginal peoples of Western Canada from 1870 to 1890, Hogeveen (1998) argues that while the
ideology of the nineteenth century Canadian liberalism emphasized individual freedom and liberty, the same rationality displayed anti-liberal tendencies in its treatment of Aboriginal peoples; through spatial isolation and legal designation, Aboriginal people became a governable population on which various practices of government were disposed to structure their actions in the direction of amalgamation with the prescribed, Euro-Canadian mode of life. Peikoff (2000) analyzes the Anglican missionary governance of the Aboriginal peoples of the Red River region of Manitoba between 1820 and 1865 using a Foucauldian conceptual framework. Her study reveals that the missionaries attempted to destroy and reconstruct the traditional self identities of the Aboriginal peoples using various strategies in the domains of spirituality and kinship relations. Governmentality studies provide a framework within which to study Aboriginal agency and resistance as according to Foucault’s later work, individuals are viewed as free and active subjects.

Although these various theoretical perspectives have been used to interpret Aboriginal-Eurocolonial relations, this study was not be guided by them. Rather, I followed the advice of historical sociologists who make a case against applying a pre-existing theoretical model to historical data, arguing that arbitrarily chosen facts could be found to illustrate most any conceivable theoretical perspective whereas important information that does not fit could be omitted (Tilly, 1981; Skocpol, 1984). Skocpol (1984: 371), for example, suggests the use of the narrative method in order to “stress the portrayal of given times and places in much of their rich complexity and pay attention to the orientations of the actors as well as to the institutional and cultural contexts in which they operate.” Thus, rather than being constrained by a grand theory, the analysis was
inductive. This, in turn, facilitated an examination of the complexities of the situation under study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Population and Sampling

This study is limited to Presbyterian boarding schools located in and close to Manitoba between the late 1880's and early 1920's. Thus the study population consisted of all men and women employed at the four schools in the specified time period.

Initially, I planned to utilize data for all Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian-run residential schools in Manitoba. In regards to government records, an equal amount of data was available for each school. This was not the case for church records. A large collection of relevant data was available at the Archives of the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Conference of the United Church of Canada, but was limited to Presbyterian schools. The data located at the national United Church Archives was much richer for the Presbyterian schools than for the Methodist schools. As well, while in Toronto, I was unable to access the Anglican Church archives. Considering that the data were disproportionate, in favour of Presbyterian schools, I decided to examine only Presbyterian schools. I chose to include the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools, despite the fact that they were not located in Manitoba, because of the large amount of correspondence relating to them in the church archives. Following is a brief description of each of the four schools.

Opened as a day school in 1883, the Birtle Boarding School was upgraded to a boarding school five years later (Presbyterian Church in Canada Women's Missionary
Society. [1915]). It was located within the town limits of Birtle. The Birdtail Creek reservation was the closest to the school, situated twelve miles away. The number of students enrolled at the Birtle school in 1903 was forty-three (Canada Sessional Papers [CSP] 1905, Department of Indian Affairs [DIA] Annual Report [AR] for Year Ended 30 June 1904, p. 424). By 1915, the enrolment had increased to fifty-eight (CSP 1916, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1915).

The Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School was situated on the west side of Shoal Lake in Northwestern Ontario, near the Manitoba border and approximately 45 miles southwest of Kenora. The school opened in early 1902. The Ojibwa of Shoal Lake had negotiated with the Presbyterian missionary prior to the school’s opening. Before promising to send children to the new school, which they had requested, the Ojibwa people outlined a number of mandatory conditions. They did not, for example, want their young children to be given heavy work, nor to be baptized without parental consent. They also demanded that the larger children be in the classroom at least half of the day and that all children, although one at a time, could be removed from the school in order to participate in traditional ceremonies. These were a few of the safeguards designed to protect their children as students of the school (Freeman, 2000: 377-378). In 1907, this school had thirty-six students on its roll (CSP 1908, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1907, p. 293), and ten years later, the enrolment had increased to seventy-three (CSP 1918, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1917).

Located on the border of Coté’s Reserve, about 45 miles northeast of Yorkton, Saskatchewan, the Crowstand Boarding School accepted its first boarders in the late
1880's. In 1895, thirty-five children were enrolled here (CSP 1896, DIA AR for Year Ended 30 June 1895) and in 1911, the school boarded fifty students (CSP 1912, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1911). It was closed on December 1, 1915 and was soon replaced by the Coté Improved Day School.

The Portage la Prairie Boarding School was initially started as a day school by the women of the Knox Church in Portage. These women hoped to help the children of a group of Sioux who had camped nearby. In 1887, the local women agreed to allow the Women’s Foreign Missionary Society (henceforth WFMS) of the Presbyterian Church to take control of the school. Under the WFMS, a boarding department was added to the school. The original school building was located within the town’s limits, but later the school was re-located to a quarter mile east of Portage la Prairie (Presbyterian Church in Canada Women’s Missionary Society. [1915]). In 1893, nineteen children were enrolled (CSP 1894, DIA AR for Year Ended 30 June 1893, p. 249). The average attendance was twenty-four pupils in 1903 (CSP 1903, DIA AR for Year Ended 30 June 1902, p. 339). By 1916, the enrolment had increases substantially, to seventy students (CSP 1917, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1916, p. 213).

Originally, the intention was to find a large amount of data regarding a small number of former staff members (approximately five), and collect all data relevant to those particular staff members. However, I was unable to locate qualitatively and quantitatively adequate data for a small number of former residential school employees, and therefore I used no type of sampling: all relevant data regarding residential school staff members for the specified dates and geographical area was collected.
Data Sources

One of the sources of data used for this study was the annual reports of the Department of Indian Affairs, which provided data in the form of school reports. Some of these reports were authored by the principals and contained information such as student progress, curriculum, moral/religious training, and discipline and conduct. These reports were included in the DIA annual reports until 1914. The reports written by school inspectors were also used and these listed staff members, enrolment and the grading of students, as well as reviewed the general progress of students and the physical condition of the school. The DIA annual reports can be found in volumes of Canada Sessional Papers. The School Files of Record Group 10, Records of the Department of Indian Affairs, National Archives of Canada were used. The School Files consists of correspondence between various government agents that concerns operations of the Department of Indian Affairs. These also include some correspondence by and about various staff members. The School Files pertaining to Manitoba schools are kept at the Provincial Archives of Manitoba, and the complete set of microfilms is housed at the National Archives of Canada. I also used administrative documentation from the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Conference of the United Church Archives, housed at the University of Winnipeg. These included the Andrew Baird Papers and a variety of Presbyterian Church annual reports. As well, a relevant archival collection (Presbyterian Church in Canada, Board of Foreign Missions, Records Pertaining to Missions to the Aboriginal People in Western Canada, 189-1923) from the United Church of Canada Archives in Toronto was accessed. Information from a number of periodicals from the
Presbyterian Archives in Toronto was collected. This triangulation of data sources provides a more rounded presentation of staff members.

**Limitations of Data**

Historical documents used as data for social research must always be evaluated for inherent biases. Those documents which have been stored in archival libraries are often merely residues of the past. Researchers warn that questions must be asked of all sources of historical data, primary and secondary (Brown and Vibert, 1996: xvi-xvii; Aminzade and Laslett as cited in Babbie, 1992: 341). Necessary questions delineated by the various researchers include: Who authored the documents?; Why were they written?; Whose history do they speak of?; Who was the intended audience and thus what inclusions or omissions may have resulted? These limitations must be acknowledged in regards to my study.

The government and church records must be critically assessed for bias. The government documents were written by school staff members, church officials or DIA employees. The intended audience was high ranking Department officials. Considering this, it is plausible that some accounts may be inaccurately optimistic and undesirable incidents may have been intentionally omitted. For example, the school reports found in the Department annual reports were commonly written by principals. It was in each principal’s vested interest to portray their school as that which the Department would view appropriate and successful. Furthermore, principals were provided with a specific list of categories, such as student progress, health and curriculum, that were to be briefly discussed in each report. This restriction to particular categories coupled with the
required brevity of these reports resulted in reports which provide only minimal
description. Regarding documents in the School Files, there is no way of knowing who
decided what documents were relevant and important enough to preserve nor on what
criteria such decisions were based.

The United Church documents have similar limitations. School staff members were
usually employed by the Presbyterian Church. Therefore, correspondence written by staff
may be biased in an attempt to illustrate capability and achievement as an employee in
order to ensure continued employment. The subjectivity and possible biases of
correspondence authored by school staff members must be acknowledged.

Postcolonial critics often argue for the need to hear the voice of the colonized. The
government and church documents accessed will primarily have been written by Euro-
Canadians, and thus will reflect their history and not that of Aboriginal peoples. One
aspect of this study is to examine staff members’ perceptions of and attitudes towards
Aboriginal children. Yet, as Smandych and McGillivray (1999) warn, it is important to
acknowledge that views offered regarding Aboriginal children by Euro-Canadians should
not be taken as objective truths, but rather the researcher must recognize that such views
have been influenced by existing ideas about Aboriginal peoples as well as various
contemporary culturally-biased ideologies. Accounts may be tailored to suit the purposes
and beliefs of the author. However, it is not my intention to illustrate Aboriginal childhood
as it actually existed as it is to show the Euro-Canadian representations of these children.
The subjective experiences of Aboriginal children who attended residential schools is a
very important and necessary aspect of residential schooling that needs to be researched.
There are biases and limitations inherent in the data being relied on for this study. These sources are the most appropriate for acquiring the desired information. The biases cannot be avoided and I can only acknowledge my awareness of them.

The limitations outlined above highlight the subjectivity and the near impossibility of capturing an objective, truthful version of the past. Freeman echoes this problem that historical researchers are required to deal with, arguing that "Because the remains of the past are so fragmentary and flawed, and all events are placed into constructs of meaning or interpretations that are subjective and to various degrees unprovable, all history is to some extent conjectural" (2000: xxiii). Thus I will not claim to be portraying the definitive, true version of the lives of past residential school staff members.

Data Processing and Analysis

The processing and analysis of data depended on the type of data collected. Since all relevant data regarding staff at four Presbyterian schools between the 1880's and 1920's was collected, the data were coded, and general concepts and themes were developed. Generalizations regarding the data were formed via inductive analysis. In the initial pass through my data, I used open coding, as described by Berg (1995: 185-86). Open coding entailed little interpretation; all ideas are coded and they are primarily descriptive. In the second pass through the data, I used focused coding (Lofland and Lofland, 1995, 192-93). This entailed reviewing the open coding to differentiate between those more numerous and therefore more useful categories from those less productive. In this process, some codes were collapsed into themes, while others were eliminated from analysis. The final stage of analysis consisted of identifying examples which clearly illustrated the themes.
CHAPTER 4

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STAFF AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

With the exception of a small number of articles and books written about individual residential school employees, the representations of such people in the extant literature is limited. Yet, some general characteristics have been delineated regarding the men and women who found employment at these schools. Typically, the best qualified individuals were deterred from entering this line of work due to the remote locations of many schools and the low pay. It has been argued that the churches often staffed the schools with ministers and church-affiliated instructors who had failed in other areas of employment (Milloy, 1999: 178). Most staff fulfilled the requirement of missionary zeal, but often tended to be untrained or otherwise poorly qualified for their positions. At the same time, some staff members were indeed well-educated, competent and dedicated to their work.

Perhaps one reason for the lack of literature regarding residential school staff is the paucity of information in church records. When researching for her book about female Methodist missionaries stationed in Asia and Canada, Gagan (1992) found that much more information was available regarding missionaries posted in Asia and in the case of women missionaries engaged in work amongst Aboriginal people, many records were incomplete and some files contained only the location to which a woman was assigned. Similarly, in regards to this study, for some Presbyterian residential school staff members, the data were limited to the time period spent and position held at a certain school. For others, further biographical information was located, including educational background,
professional training, employment experience and reasons for being enticed into such work. Some biographical information was also obtained from secondary sources. A summary on the available background information on the staff members will be provided. (Additional background information, as well as work experiences for individual staff members is presented in the appendix.)

 Ideally, the employees' qualifications, that is, their education and previous employment, should facilitate their adaptability for the duties their positions encompass. The duties of each position will be examined in order to assess the degree to which the qualifications of the staff members coincide with their particular responsibilities.

General Background Information and Qualifications

Certain background information, such as geographical origin, motivation, Christian and missionary zeal and state of health, is not specific to a particular position and will be addressed first.

Geographical Background

In regards to geographical origin, close to half of the fifty-seven people for whom information was available had grown up in Ontario, or at least had resided in Ontario prior to being appointed. A dozen individuals came from the prairies. Two women, both teachers, had called Halifax home. A couple of the employees were Americans who were residing in Canada when hired: Mr. Martin, a Cecilia Jeffrey principal was originally from Williamsport, Indiana yet was living in Kenora and Mr. Snyder, who had been born and raised in New York State, was attending agricultural college in Manitoba when appointed
as farm instructor and assistant principal at the Birtle school. Of the six who were born
and raised in the British Isles, five had lived in Canada for at least a few years prior to their
employment at one of the four residential schools addressed in this study. Mr. Billson of
England, on the other hand, was hired as the boys’ instructor of the Cecilia Jeffrey school
soon after his arrival to Canada. Of the staff members, three were of Aboriginal descent.
For example, Susette Blackbird, a former student, who took charge of the kitchen and
taught at Birtle on a substitute basis, spent the first four years of her life with relatives of
the Keeseekoowensin band. A number of employees were already working in the
Aboriginal mission field. The Millars, for instance, had been stationed at the Ahousaht
mission in British Columbia when they received a transfer to Portage la Prairie.

Motivation

What prompted individuals to seek a position at an often remotely located, poorly
equipped Aboriginal residential school? The existing literature has paid minimal attention
to what motivated these individuals, with the exception of the contention that many were
unable to find work elsewhere and thus were only eager to secure employment. The
principal of the Crowstand school was disappointed with Miss Downing, a teacher who
remained at the school for only a few months. He felt that she was not driven by a
Christian spirit but rather simply wanted employment: “I think ... it will be necessary to
secure if possible one who is desirous of doing missionary work. I do not think Miss
Downing had anything more in view, than the securing of a situation” (United Church
Central Archives [UCA], Presbyterian Church in Canada [PCC], Board of Foreign
Missions [BFM], Records Pertaining to Missions to Aboriginal People in Manitoba and
the North West [MAPMNW], Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901).

In some cases, employees were not hesitant to quit when more agreeable or better remunerated work was offered, thus indicating that employment itself was the motivation to take up a position in a residential school. For example, Mr. Hilborn who worked as the farm instructor at Birtle for a number of months resigned when he was offered a higher paid position of contractor/builder (National Archives of Canada [NAC], Record Group 10 [RG 10], School Files [SF], Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Jul 1912). Likewise, a teacher at Portage, Miss Henderson, resigned when she found “more normal work” in Calgary (Second Annual Report of the Women’s Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in Canada [AR WMS PCC]. 1915, Report by Rev. Hendry, p. 90).

In the case of many of the principals, they had offered their services to the Presbyterian Church and, at the mercy of church officials, merely went where they were sent. Their motivation was to serve their church and God, and in some cases they had no particular interest in Aboriginal missionary work. Upon ordination, Rev. Walter McLaren was appointed principal of the Birtle Boarding School and missionary of the Bird Tail reserve. McLaren explained that until this appointment, he had never thought of entering into Aboriginal missionary work:

I did not go into Indian work from choice. I had never thought of it as a field of work. In fact with the vast majority of Knox men, I hardly knew we had such a work under our church. It was your own invitation on behalf of the FMC -awaiting me on my return from Scotland in the spring of 1905 - that first made me think of the work even for a time. At that time the call seemed to me providential. Health reasons made every other field of labor under our church impossible and I had made all my plans to go into mercantile life trusting that if health ever restored I might return to the ministry.
and if not that I might be able to do my part as a layman. I accepted the appointment in the spirit it was given. I remained in the work not one year but eight and proposed in my mind to give my life to it (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Mackay, 16 Apr 1913).

Thus, a lack of an initial desire should not necessarily be equated with indifference or a lack of dedication. Rev. McWhinney also began his career with the Presbyterian church missions as a residential school principal at Birtle. It appears to have been equally common for a missionary to be have spent some time in home missions prior to an appointment at a residential school. William Small of the Birtle school, Rev. Menzies of the Cecilia Jeffrey school and Rev. Whyte, principal at Crowstand, were each assigned to their respective positions as a direct result of their success as missionaries in home missions. According to this, it appears that a transfer from home missions to Aboriginal missions was considered a promotion. It is not known whether these men expressed a desire to work with Aboriginal people or if rather they reluctantly accepted their appointment out of a sense of commitment and duty to their church.

There were those men and women who openly expressed a personal aspiration to work with and help Aboriginal people. Upon her first introduction to Aboriginal children, Kate Gillespie, a teacher at Crowstand, was impressed with the needs of these people and maintained a lifelong interest in their welfare (Dobbins, 1961). For some, the personal interest was inspired by a divine summoning. In a letter of application, Rev. McKitrick, later principal and missionary of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, articulated his Christian motives:

I have for four years felt called to devote my life, for the extension of His kingdom amongst the heathen, and He has especially given me a strong desire to spend all the
rest of my years, amongst the heathen here in my own beloved native land. And, God helping me, I shall continue to work amongst them under whatever Church or Agency He may open up my way (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).

As he was initially overlooked by the Presbyterian church, he illustrated his commitment to the cause by settling for mission work with the Methodist church. When expressing her interest in a teaching position at the Portage school, Sara Laidlaw emphasized her relevant qualifications as well as stressed her genuine desire to contribute to this aspect of the church’s work: “I have made this matter one of prayer and sincerely hope you & your committee have not forgotten me; (I almost know you’ve not) that I may be used in Christ’s service even though it may be in a small measure” (Archives of the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Conference of the United Church of Canada [UCA-Wpg], Andrew Baird Papers [ABP], F 159-160, Sara Laidlaw to Mr. Baird, 28 Mar 1893). One can infer that of those who had a long term residential school career, most of them had a heartfelt interest in the work and not just a desire to be employed. Such dedicated employees include Annie McLaren who was matron of the Birtle school for twenty-five years, Jennie Gilmour who acted as Crowstand’s matron for fifteen years and Rev. Hendry, principal of Portage for over thirty years.

Principals’ wives were often assigned to the position of matron or assistant matron regardless of whether they were interested in the work or not. Mrs. Pitts, assistant matron at Birtle, matrons of the Cecilia Jeffrey School, Mrs. Dodds and Mrs. Menzies and Mrs. Whyte, Crowstand’s matron for a short time, are examples of this phenomena. For instance, Mrs. Whyte, wife of principal Rev. Whyte, was expected to act as matron of the
Crowstand school, at least until the school attendance increased (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. Wright, 19 Jul 1893). Being married to a principal also facilitated Mrs. Hendry's appointment as matron of the Portage school, yet she had expressed enthusiasm for work with Aboriginal people prior to being offered the position (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, W. A. Hendry to Dr. R. P. McKay, 26 Sep 1901). Some of these women were clearly not well suited for the positions to which they were automatically appointed. Mrs. Menzies, for example, had previous experience in institutional work, but the local Indian agent reported that she "apparently does not care for Indians and has very little sympathy with them, ..." (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, part 1, Frank Edwards to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 9 Feb 1924).

If the lack of a compassionate interest in the welfare of Aboriginal people could in some circumstances be overlooked, then what characteristics did the church require from potential applicants? When considering that the churches took such an active role in the residential school system in order to impart Christianity and to inculcate values into the children which were congruent with Christianity, it is not surprising that the Presbyterian Church deemed a Christian spirit and missionary zeal top priorities amongst the ranks of residential school employees.

**Importance of Religiosity**

Particularly in the early decades of residential schooling in western Canada, individuals working at the schools were expected to actively participate in missionary duties amongst the Aboriginal people in neighbouring reserves. Within the schools, religious training was
considered an integral aspect of the curriculum. Specific times of the day were designated for religious exercises and instructions, Bible reading and prayer. Even those staff who were not involved in missionary work with the adults or directly teaching the children about Christianity were expected to be of a "very decided moral character" in order to impress themselves "upon the Indian children and wield an influence in rightly directing their lives" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Baird to Mr. Crawford, 5 Oct 1889, p. 116). For example, when looking for a farm instructor, the missionary at the Lake of Woods preferred to find "one who will help to build up good christian [sic] character in those boys who are placed under him" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904).

It was not uncommon for the Foreign Missions Committee (henceforth FMC) to require an applicant to furnish a letter of reference from their church pastor, which was to be a testimony of their history, character, suitability for the work and any other relevant information (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 965-968, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Regulations for Mission Work Among Indians of Manitoba and the North West Territories [1896]). One such letter read: "This is to certify that Mr. W. A. Hendry for two years more or less under my pastoral charge, is a young man of good standing in the Church and great zeal for the upholding of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2001, T. Smith to Whom it may concern, 20 Oct 1897). Such letters were to attest to the faith of the applicant.

In the time period under examination, a lack in the necessary piety was grounds for the church to reject otherwise suitable applicants. The head of the FMC in Winnipeg was
disappointed in regards to the applications he had received for a boarding school principal:

“We have advertised in the daily papers here, and have a number of applications, but none very suitable, the failure being; in regard to the first qualification,” that being a “sterling character and missionary zeal” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 666-667, [Baird] to Dr. Fraser, 9 Oct 1890). The following excerpt of a letter to an applicant for a teaching position exemplifies the church’s intolerance for hiring non-Christians:

I supposed, however, that you would either take the first opportunity that presented itself of professing your faith in Christ or that you would at least tell me you intended to do so. Since you do not say anything to that effect I am left to infer that you have no definite intention of uniting yourself with the church in the near future and of course you will understand that it is impossible for us to appoint as one of our teachers a person of whom we have not reason to believe that she is an earnest and thorough Christian; since in our Indian Mission schools the teaching of christian [sic] truth by precept and example must form a very important part of the programme (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Baird to Miss Jennie Brown, 21 Sep 1889, pp. 101-102).

There were other reasons for desiring workers to have a Christian heart and a missionary motive. It was felt that such people would be more dedicated and thus would be more permanent.

A true Christian would be more likely to endure the nature of the work. This was stressed in regards to a position in a remote boarding school:

The position is one requiring great prudence and tact and is not likely to be enjoyed [unless] by one who enters upon it from a genuine desire to serve the Lord Christ [emphasis mine]. To anyone who is ready to enter upon the work self denyingly and to persevere amid discouragements of the monotony of routine work, there is a noble reward in seeing darkened lives made bright and brought into the radiance of the true light (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Baird to Miss May Armstrong, 5 Oct 1889, pp. 117-119).

One staff member emphasized that having faith in God could only benefit the residential school worker: “More than strength of body, is needed strong trust in God’s care of his
own work. There would be fewer worn-out bodies among us could we remember that we are but the tools in the hands of the Master, ... who is likely to keep His tools in good repair. We lose our opportunities for usefulness by fretting about results, as though we had the ordering of this work” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 27, A. M. Armstrong to Baird, 18 Jan 1893). Those without a religious intent were less likely to agree to work at a far off school. A Crowstand principal requested that a new staff member have the requisite “missionary spirit” so that he or she would be more likely to stay for an extended period (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H5, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 28 Oct 1897). Another apparent advantage of hiring men and women who felt a missionary duty was that they would not quibble over pay: “But we want workers who love the Master’s work more than the money and know how to deny themselves for His sake. There is a rich blessing in store for the faithful worker in this work, but not if they work for the sake of the blessing or the pay” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 2 Jun 1904). A Christian spirit was desirable for a number of factors.

**Health Requirements**

At least on paper there was an emphasis on the health of staff members. One of the questions each applicant was expected to address was regarding the state of their general health. In the 1890’s, the Presbyterian Church required a medical certificate from potential missionaries (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 965-968, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Regulations for Mission Work Among Indians of Manitoba and the North West Territories [1896]).

While some positions were more arduous than others, all staff experienced physical strain. A principal at Crowstand school underscored the importance of physical health:
I am glad that the first lady you mentioned did not come if there was anything the matter with her health. No one should come to work among the Indians unless they have first class health and a good reserve of vitality. We have had ample evidence of the truth of that statement during the past winter. Mrs. Lockhart was not well and the work told on her. ... Health and good health at that is one of the most necessary requisites in any office here (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 22 May 1896).

When a new staff member was to be sent to the Birtle school, the matron, Annie McLaren, demanded that the woman be physically fit: "I would like to know that she is strong and capable before the final arrangements are made. It would be simply foolish to bring a delicate person all the way here ..." (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 15-17, Annie McLaren to Rev. Baird, 10 Jan [1893]). A healthy, strong person would be more likely to withstand the taxing work and thus would remain for a longer period.

Rev. Walter McLaren, the church’s superintendent of Indian missions and schools in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and principal of the Birtle school, stressed medical health in general, but with particular concern with the mental health of the female employees:

The appointment of trained workers for every department, the enforcement of a medical examination for the lady workers in particular .... None but strong active sound hewed[?] women are suitable for this work. Many of the difficulties and misunderstandings that arise are due almost entirely to the neurotic condition of some of the workers (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 146, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Farquharson, 2 May 1912).

Ironically, McLaren was said to have bad nerves, and at one point, problems at the school were attributed to this malady: "I have not heard a single complaint that might not easily be explained by the state of Mr. McLaren’s health. A nervous man often does and says many things which if his nerves were in a better state he would never mention" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, James Farquharson to MacKay, 14 Dec 1911).
Clearly, at times the church was unable to refuse individuals on the basis of their inadequate health.

Teachers, Elizabeth McCurdy and Zena Brodie, were hired despite concerns about their medical conditions. Miss McCurdy’s former supervisor recommended her in all regards but warned about potential issues with her health: “The one doubt he has regarding her is as to whether she be sufficiently strong for our work. It seems she has been compelled to give up teaching two or three years ago because of her health, ....” On the other hand, Miss McCurdy herself maintained that she was “as strong as she ever was” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 142, Rev. Dr. Farquharson to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 12 Jan [1912]). Notwithstanding some trepidation, she was hired as hers was the only application received. Similarly, Miss Brodie was appointed teacher of the Cecilia Jeffrey school even though her health had precluded her from teaching at public schools for extended periods. This lack of strength meant that she was not able to take on duties outside of the classroom usually expected of teachers (NAC, RG10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Rev. Dr. Grant, 25 Aug 1916). Illness as a common reason for resignation will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Nine.

Qualifications and Duties by Position

Many of the required qualifications and responsibilities were position-specific. It is also true that duties were flexible and often overlapped between positions. Principals usually had some say in the allocation of tasks. Therefore the duties of matron, for example, may differ depending on the school and may even change within a school at
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different time periods or under a different principal. For instance, an employee designated at one school as matron may be given the responsibility of the kitchen work, and at another school the matron may be more suited to the sewing, and would thus be required to oversee the laundry and sewing. It would depend on the needs of the school and the abilities of each staff member. Also, the smaller schools had fewer staff and thus each staff member would have a greater number of and more diverse obligations. Generally speaking though, the qualifications and expectations of staff members were dependent on the position which they held. The positions of principal, matron/assistant matron, teacher, farm/trades instructor and nurse will therefore be considered individually.

Principals

Aboriginal mission work hopefuls were requested to supply pertinent information including age, education, professional training, employment experience and ability to acquire languages (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 965-968, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Regulations for Mission Work Among Indians of Manitoba and the North West Territories [1896]). Dr. Baird of the Presbyterian Church characterized the type of person wanted to manage an isolated boarding school:

The qualities which it is desirable that he should have besides a high Christian character and interest in missionary work, are such as adaptability to new conditions, some capacity for managing people and ability to live harmoniously with the members of his staff. It is important too that he should be in a sound condition of health and that there should be a good prospect of his mastering a new language (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 571-572, [Baird] to Rev. Dr. J. Munro Gibson, 6 Apr 1898).

Generally, there were no specific work experience or education requirements. As an introduction, the educational and employment profiles of three principals will be presented
in order to illustrate some common background characteristics of residential school principals. This will be followed by a discussion about preferred and actual qualifications.

In his early forties, married with four small children, Rev. David Iverach began his two and a half year career as the principal of the Birtle Boarding School (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, G. H. Wheatley to the Secretary DIA, 2 Oct 1913). Rev. Iverach had a practical knowledge of agriculture as he had grown up on farms in Scotland and Manitoba. He had attended university and completed a bachelor of arts. For ten years, he had been employed in Manitoban public schools as a teacher and a principal. In addition, he had been a minister in Springfield, Manitoba for a decade (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to Secretary DIA, 27 Sep 1913).

Mrs. Sara Marshall (nee Laidlaw) was responsible for the administration of the Birtle school from 1916 to 1921. When she initially sought missionary work in 1893, her credentials included a third class teaching certificate, experience teaching high school and six months of studies at Toronto College (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 159-160, Sara Laidlaw to Mr. Baird, 28 Mar 1893). Soon after applying, Mrs. Marshall (then Miss Laidlaw) was offered a teaching position at the Portage Boarding School. Her position there also entailed missionary work among the local Aboriginal women (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1262-1269, [Baird] to Mrs. Jeffrey, 12 Aug 1895). After seven years, she left Portage school in order to get married. It was sixteen years later when Marshall re-entered the Aboriginal missionary field as the administrator of the Birtle school. During her lengthy hiatus, Mrs. Marshall raised a family and, for a period of time, worked as the matron of the boys.
training school located in Portage la Prairie (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, part 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary, DIA, 4 April 1916).

As a young man, Mr. Small studied at the Manitoba College and graduated from university with an honours degree in arts. He also had normal school training as a teacher. He later became known by the Church for his excellent work as a missionary in the home missions field (The Minutes of the Thirteenth Synod of Manitoba + the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Held on Nov 12-15, 1895, p. 33). Based on these qualifications, Mr. Small was offered the principalship at the Birtle school in late 1895.

While a university degree was not a prerequisite for a position as principal, it was considered advantageous. In 1909, one British Columbian Indian agent lobbied for the introduction of stringent qualifications for residential school principals, particularly having obtained a college degree (Milloy, 1999: 130). Including the above mentioned Iverach and Small, no fewer than nine of the twenty-four principals for whom data was collected had completed a university degree. Considering that information for some staff was incomplete, this number may actually be higher. A few others had attended church-run colleges or institutions. Rev. McKitrick, for example, had attended the Moody Bible Training Institute. He did not, however take preparatory courses for missionary work, but rather attended lectures on theology and church history. Like Small, almost one-third of the principals held a teacher’s certificate and/or had received normal school training.

As discussed above, the church preferred individuals with a genuine Christian interest in missionary work. This goal is reflected in the number of principals who were already
involved in church-related work. At least fourteen of the twenty-four principals were ordained ministers. In the case of Rev. Gilmour and Rev. Hendry, they did not enter into the work as ministers, yet were required to perform marriages and baptisms, and thus were allowed to bypass the usual procedures, being granted their ordinations by the Presbyterian Church's General Assembly. As mentioned, a handful of the male principals proved themselves competent in the home missions work before being transferred to the field of Aboriginal missions. A brief description in the Woman's Foreign Mission Society's (henceforth WFMS) 1891-92 annual report regarding how Rev. Whyte earned his appointment at Crowstand Boarding School can be used to demonstrate this: "... by success in the Home Mission field has shown that he has the qualifications for the arduous work to which he has been called" (Sixteenth Annual Report [AR] of the WFMS, 1891-92, p. 32). Seven of the principals came to one of the four schools under study with previous experience in Aboriginal mission work. Although they were members of the Presbyterian Church, Rev. Hendry and Rev. McKitrick had been involved in missionary work with the Methodist Church. Rev. Hendry was teaching at the Red Deer Industrial School when his application was accepted by the Presbyterian Church and Rev. McKitrick had been stationed at various Methodist Aboriginal missions over a period of ten years prior to being appointed missionary of the Lake of the Woods area. Rev. Ross and Rev. Millar, on the other hand, each had dedicated a number of years to Presbyterian-run Aboriginal missions in British Columbia. Similarly, Rev. Dodds had evangelized amongst the Aboriginal people of the Moose Mountain mission for close to a decade before receiving a transfer to Cecilia Jeffrey school. Like Mrs. Marshall, Rev. Gilmour had
experience teaching at another Presbyterian Aboriginal boarding school. He had spent close to two years at the Regina Industrial School when he was promoted to principal of Birtle and later to Crowstand.

Practical, relevant work experience, such as employment in the public school system or a background in farming or trades-oriented skills, were not seen as necessary, yet were considered beneficial. Skills acquired from teaching and school administration in the public school system were considered to be transferable to boarding schools for Aboriginal children. Rev. McWhinney, Rev. Hendry and Mrs. Marshall had each gained teaching experience in the Ontario public school system. Mr. McGregor, principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, had twenty-five years experience as head master or assistant in public and high schools.

Many of the boarding schools had farms in connection with them, thus any practical agricultural experience or training was valuable to the residential school principal. Rev. Dodds had made his living by farming for ten years before taking an active role in mission work. Rev. Hendry grew up on a farm, which provided him with a background in agriculture. Beyond this introduction to farming, he had enhanced his knowledge and practical experience by attending the Guelph Agricultural College. Particularly in the more remotely located schools, the ability to do repairs was very useful. In applying, Rev. McKitrick highlighted his past work in industrial trades: “I spent about ten years in mechanical work as Machinist, Carpenter and Blacksmith, which experience I have found very helpful in an isolated Indian Mission” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).
In the case of Mr. Martin, the relationship between his profession and the administration of a boarding school was not apparent. This Cecilia Jeffrey principal was a lawyer. The Department inspector believed that Mr. Martin's professional skills would aid him as principal: "His training and experience as a lawyer will no doubt enable him to judge questions from all points of view so that his conclusions are likely to be well thought out and action based upon them to be definite and wise." Inspector Semmens went on to list Martin’s desirable personal characteristics, some of which may be attributed to his legal background: “He has a good deal of self possession, has a good temper, is firm and yet sauv[e] [sic]. He is a person of good address, pleasant in manners and disposed to be agreeable and conciliatory. He is a practical man, knows a good deal about machinery, is not afraid of work, is a good manager and looks toward profitable and permanent results” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, dated 8 Feb 1918). It is likely though that his experience as a Congregational Church minister was what most impressed church officials.

The ability to master a new language and experience with and knowledge about Aboriginal peoples and their cultures were given some consideration in the hiring practice. In the 1890's, for those interested in a livelihood in Aboriginal mission work, it was essential to mention their capacity to acquire a new language in their letter of application (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 965-968, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Regulations for Mission Work Among Indians of Manitoba and the North West Territories [1896]). Rev. McKitrick, missionary and principal at Cecilia Jeffrey, noted in his application that during
his high school studies he had learned some Latin, Greek and French. While such
languages would be of no use in an Aboriginal residential school, it does demonstrate an
aptitude for absorbing new languages. More importantly, during his previous postings at
various missions, he was also able to pick up some of the Cree and Stoney languages. He
maintained that he was able to conduct simple conversations in either language and was
able to read and write the Cree syllabic characters (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2,
File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891). Before his appointment to the Cecilia
Jeffrey School principalship, while stationed at the mission in Moose Mountain, Rev.
Dodds succeeded in acquiring enough of the Cree language to make himself well
understood when reading and preaching to the Aboriginal people (CSP 1899, AR DIA,
Report by H. R. Halpin, p. 152). In 1908, those in attendance at an Indian Worker’s
Conference recommended that workers should be required to complete one year of
language study as was compulsory for foreign missions (Minutes of the Foreign Missions
Committee [FMC], Western Division [WD], of the PCC, 1908-09, letter from W. W.
McLaren dated 1 Sep 1908, p. 31). This suggests that men and women commonly entered
into missionary work among Aboriginal people with an ignorance of the local language.
Yet, there is no evidence that any school principal was disciplined or dismissed because of
a failure to learn the language. On the other hand, there was one case in which a principal,
Rev. Gilmour of Crowstand, resigned at least in part due to his deficit in the local
Aboriginal language (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Neil Gilmour to Dr.
Mackay, 25 Sep 1902). In a much earlier letter, Gilmour offered to accept a posting
among the Sioux, as he had had more success with that language (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H
164-166, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 13 Dec 1897). An understanding of the local language was important for those undertaking missionary work, but could be overlooked in the schools as only English was to be spoken by the children.

In replying to an applicant for the position of principal of the Crowstand school, a representative of the FMC asserted that only those who had a background in work with Aboriginal people would be given consideration:

The position of Principal of the Indian Boarding School at the Crowstand was filled some time ago, and in any case, it is a position to which we could not allow anybody who had no previous experience among Indians. There is so much of detail and so much of knowledge of Indian character required in the management of a large boarding school that it would be quite unreasonable to expect anyone who was entering upon our work to become familiar with these duties at once (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1628, [Baird] to Mrs. A. Flindall, 3 Jul 1897).

The reality of the situation, however, undermines this claim. Other than those individuals already working in the field of Aboriginal missions, few had had any exposure to Aboriginal people or culture. Walter McLaren, for instance, was not even aware that the Presbyterian Church had members working in Aboriginal communities. Mr. McGregor entered into his appointment at the Cecilia Jeffrey school with many years experience working with Euro-Canadian children in the public school system, yet he had no previous experience with Aboriginal children. This parallels with Rev. McWhinney of Crowstand who was an experienced teacher but had never instructed Aboriginal children. Rev. McKittrick was well aware of the preference given to those with prior knowledge and experience with Aboriginal people as he emphasized his familiarity with Aboriginal culture when applying: “The knowledge of the Indians ways, customs habits, character, disposition, mode of life &c, I have of necessity [sic] learned, would be very useful” (UCA,
PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).

Assistant principal and later principal of Cecilia Jeffrey school, Mr. A. Matthews was the son of a missionary to the Aboriginal people of Rolling River. This background suggested a certain degree of understanding of Aboriginal life and was considered an asset (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1917).

It was acknowledged by the FMC and the staff members themselves that certain qualifications were considered desirable for those principals assigned to work at the more isolated schools. When writing to a potential candidate, Dr. Baird of the FMC recognized the practicality of a medical training: “The position which is vacant is in an outlying place in which white neighbors will be very few and the duties will be those of a preacher of the Gospel among heathens, where his medical knowledge will be of considerable value [emphasis mine] and where he will need also to act as Principal of a small boarding school for Indian children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 571-572, [Baird] to Rev. Dr. J. Munro Gibson, 6 Apr 1898). While managing the Crowstand Boarding School, Neil Gilmour, on more than one occasion, advised the FMC of the preferability of hiring a person with a medical background: “I remember remarking, when the offer of Crowstand was made me, that it would have been most desirable if a medical missionary could have been gotten. Since coming here I have frequently thought it and [illegible] when we have two children sick, one very sick and the Doctor is 45 miles distant, we feel our helplessness very much” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 164-166, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 13 Dec 1897). Yet, during the period studied, none of the principals were medical doctors. The increasing practice of
stationing nurses at the schools mitigated the calls to employ trained medical personnel as school administrators.

The Cecilia Jeffrey school was located on a peninsula of Shoal Lake in Northwest Ontario, and therefore travel by steam-boat was a necessity in the summer months. Thus in order to avoid the additional costs of employing a regular engineer, the church was required to hire as principal someone who understood the mechanics of a steam engine and who was able to manage the boat. According to one of his children, Rev. Dodds was offered the principalship at the Shoal Lake school in part due to his experience in navigation that he had acquired while growing up near the Georgian Bay. The Presbyterian Church’s FMC was more successful in securing missionaries with navigational abilities than those with an education in the medical field.

According to written policy, particular demographic attributes were regarded more acceptable than others. In regards to age, the Presbyterian Church’s regulations for mission work among Aboriginal people stated: “When a new language has to be acquired, applicants should, as a rule, be under thirty years of age” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 965-968, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Regulations for Mission Work Among Indians of Manitoba and the North West Territories [1896]). The ages for only eight of the principals were located in the data, and the average of these being thirty-five. Only three of these were under the age of thirty when they began to work at one of the four schools. Mr. Crawford, the youngest, was twenty-three years old at the outset of his career at Birtle school. The eldest, Rev. Dodds commenced his duties at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School at the age of fifty-seven. He began to work in the Aboriginal mission
field at Moose Mountain when he was forty-seven and yet even then would have been considered “too old” according to the above criteria.

For a man to be considered for the position of principal of a boarding school, often he was required to be married so that his wife could assume the duties of matron (see, for example: UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 666-667, [Baird] to Dr. Fraser, 9 Oct 1890). Based on the available information, of the twenty-one male principals, eleven were married, with or without children, when they arrived at their respective schools. And of these, the spouses of nine spent at least some amount of time as either matron or assistant matron. For a further four men, their weddings took place while employed at a boarding school, with two of their wives being employed: the spouse of Walter McLaren worked as a substitute teacher and Mr. Hendry’s partner took on the responsibilities of matron on a permanent basis. As for the female principals, Annie Fraser and Bessie Walker were single. Mrs. Marshall (nee Laidlaw) started out at the Portage School as a teacher and she resigned in order to be married. When she returned to the Aboriginal mission work as the principal of the Birtle school, she may have been a widow as there was no mention of her husband and she resided in the school. It was not common for a married woman to be employed at a residential school unless her husband was also on the staff.

According to the hiring practices of the church, generally speaking ministers and those with experience as teachers or principals in the public school system were deemed qualified to run an Aboriginal residential school. But were pastors and public education employees actually prepared for the duties and responsibilities which the position of principal entailed? In an attempt to address this question, the required duties will be
The position of principal was multifaceted and complex, with the various responsibilities demanding that the holder of the position have an adeptness for time management. The job description for principal included: “to manage, to secure children from the Indian Reserves as pupils, to overcome finally the fast vanishing objections of the Indians against such schools, to exercise watchful care over the Indian children when they are placed in the school, to give a healthy Christian tone to the whole institution, to oversee the work of the subordinate officers and to watch the expenditure of money ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 650-655, [Baird] to Mr. Bruce, 3 Oct 1890). In the early decades of residential schooling, the purpose of visitations to local Aboriginal communities was not only to abate parental opposition and to recruit children, but principals also had evangelistic duties, as the principal was also the local missionary. Regular visits to the neighbouring reserves often resulted in the principal’s absence for a number of days in a row. The matron at Birtle explained: “For instance, George [Mclaren] drove to the Riding Mountains last Monday came back Wednesday night, started for Lizard Point this morning, will be back tomorrow night or perhaps not till Sabbath if there is anything going on that will bring the Indians together” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 707-708, Annie McLaren to Baird, 3 Aug 1894). Essentially, the principal was expected to fulfill two positions at one time.

Balancing the obligations of principal with those of missionary was a constant struggle for some. It was a tall order for one person to take on the dual role of principal-missionary. A church official was quick to back-up Rev. Whyte, principal at Crowstand
when the Indian agent observed “that the Principal does not devote sufficient time and
attention to the advancement of the pupils under his charge” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F521,
Hayter Reed to Rev. Baird, 3 Feb 1894). In reply, Rev. Baird informed the Department
that the church was responsible for assigning Rev. Whyte his duties, and that his primary
role was as a missionary, and that as principal, he was merely the supervisor of the school
and in direction of its general policy (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 609-610, [Baird] to Deputy
Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, 6 Apr 1894). Rev. Laird, also an administrator
of Crowstand Boarding School, alluded to his frustration due to an inability to maintain
proper supervision of the students as a result of the travel demands of his role as
missionary: “... with the visits to distant parts of the field which must be made if the
people are to be kept interested in our work and many other duties in addition to the
above which I need not specify, it is utterly impossible for me to do a very large amount of
work in the school” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 339, George Laird to Dr. Baird, 10 Mar 1890).

Conversely, some principals were accused of shirking their missionary obligations. As
enrolment of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School increased, Rev. Dodds admitted that his
involvement in the missionary work had to be cut back: “The larger number of pupils, and,
consequently, the greater amount of work in connection with the school, has hindered to
some extent our mission work outside” (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, p. 89). For four
years, Rev. McKitrick’s position at Shoal Lake was that of missionary only. According to
a fellow staff member, when he was given the additional duty as principal of the Cecilia
Jeffrey school, he became negligent of his evangelistic duties (Minutes of the FMC, WD,
PCC, 1906, pp. 33-24). After 1912, the missionary obligations of residential school
principal were greatly reduced; at some schools principals were completely exempted from mission work, while at others the school administrators performed only occasional evangelistic duties (Bush, 2000: 117). For some principals, the duties extended beyond that of school administrator and missionary.

A principal’s duties depended on circumstances unique to each individual school. When Bessie Walker arrived at the Portage school, because the number of permanent boarders was small, she was the solely responsible for the school. For a number of months, in addition to principal and missionary, in essence, she was the matron, teacher, cook, nurse and housekeeper. Due to the extreme isolation of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Rev. Dodds was required to take on tasks that principals at other locations did not. Modes of travel in the summer were limited to water transportation. Dodds was the steamboat’s captain, and it was necessary for him to leave the school occasionally in order to pick up mail and transport supplies for the school. In extreme situations, due to the inability of a medical doctor to reach the school in a timely fashion, Rev. Dodds did his best to perform the functions of doctor and dentist. When the school was not fortunate enough to have a farm instructor on staff, Rev. Dodds’ position at Cecilia Jeffrey also included outside work, general repairs and farming obligations. Having to undertake the agricultural and other outside duties was not unique to Rev. Dodds.

When Mr. Gandier was principal of the same school, he had no missionary duties since there was a permanent missionary posted there, yet there had been no farmer on staff. He claimed that the land would have to be cleared before crops could be grown, but he aimed to do what he could in the way of gardening (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW,
In 1901, the farmer of Crowstand school resigned, leaving the principal Neil Gilmour with the duties of "fireman, stable man, farmer and all" until another man could be hired (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901). Upon his arrival at the Birtle school, Rev. McWhinney did not have to look hard to detect objects in need of repair: "Around the building and at the barn I found endless things that needed my attention. I have been fixing doors and windows, putting on storm sashes and I don’t know what all" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 34, W. McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 5 Feb 1902). Mr. Crawford of the Birtle school found that the greatest part of his time was taken up "doing or supervising the outdoor work in stable, garden and yard" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, A. Baird to Dr. Mackay, 28 Jan 1905).

Principals of schools which had few staff members and smaller student populations were often given the teaching duties as well. For example, both George McLaren of Birtle school and Mr. Gandier of Cecilia Jeffrey school were expected to take on the classroom instruction. During his brief tenure at the Birtle Boarding School, Neil Gilmour was responsible for all academic training and proved to be effective with Aboriginal children: "He is a kind and patient teacher and the discipline in the school room was well maintained without harshness" (CSP 1896, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30, 1895, Report of T. P. Wadsworth, p. 123). For a number of years, until student enrolment increased, necessitating the employment of a teacher, Rev. Hendry taught the children of the Portage school.

The head of a residential school was in control of the fiscal management of the school.
The DIA as well as the Presbyterian Church expected principals to keep the books balanced. However, reaching year end with the finances in the black was the exception rather than the norm in most schools. Keeping costs at a minimal was a constant struggle, and particularly difficult for those with no former institutional administrative training or experience. There is more information regarding the difficulties faced by principals and their subordinates due to the parsimonious policies of the DIA in the sixth chapter.

One of the mundane, yet time-consuming tasks was the administrative paperwork. Reports and letters regarding the day-to-day operations of the school were written for both the church and the DIA. George McLaren was hard pressed to find the time for all the paperwork that was expected of him, in particular a daily journal requested by the DIA:

I think you will agree with me, that no small amount of labor is involved in the keeping of this journal and in the making out of the monthly copies in duplicate. If one is to be made for each one here, that means writing six pages of foolscap each month. I do not object to their having the information if they want it, but I do object to the work. I spend five and a half hours of each day in the school room. I have to look after and help to do the work outside and do the greater part of the business of the school and keep the accts [sic]. I have to keep a conduct book and make monthly reports of punishments inflicted, and quarterly reports in triplicate, of attendance &c as well as attending to the general correspondence. I don’t mean to say that this is a great amount of work, but the trouble here is to get time. I cannot shut myself in a room to write and know that 20 or 25 children are outside or in the diningroom and there is no person to look after them. I have to stay out among them until the smaller ones go to bed, consequently I cannot begin writing till about 8 O clock, this leaves very little time for such work (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 168, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. prof. Baird, 13 Apr 1893).

The obligatory reports and correspondence added to the time constraints.

The most lofty responsibility was that of taking care of the children. The principals, and indeed all staff were expected to take the place of the children’s parents: “There is
nothing in the work of the public school teacher or of the Sabbath school teacher that can compare with it. At best, they are but co-educators with the parents in the training of their children. Here the officers of the school take the place of the parents and represent for them, everything that is good” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 800-805, [Baird] to Mr. Herdman, 12 Dec 1890). The principal was responsible for the general supervision and discipline of the children and at many schools, the principal was the sole person who could mete out corporal punishments. The supervision and general dealings with the students is discussed further in Chapter Five. Most of the principals were also in regular contact with the children’s parents and other Aboriginal adults. These relationships will also be examined in that chapter.

A wide range of duties and responsibilities were expected of the individuals who managed the residential schools. The diverse expertise necessary to have adequately fulfilled the post of principal would have been next to impossible to find in any applicant. Many of them were ministers. Graham (1997: 13) argued that “None of them were qualified for all the facets of the job, most of which were far removed from being a minister.” Those who had previously only worked with European immigrants in home missions were likely to have had no or little awareness of Aboriginal culture and customs. On the other hand, the individuals who had previously worked in Aboriginal missions would have acquired first hand knowledge of Aboriginal lifestyles. Neil Gilmour argued that such experience should be considered more relevant than being trained for the ministry: “My position was - and is - that if I had not taken the regular training for the ministry, I had spent five years in the Indian work, partly in schools, and partly on the
reserve, and that it was perhaps, a better training for the particular work expected of me than I could have gotten either at Toronto or Winnipeg ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 9 Apr 1901). A minister would have been versed in the evangelistic tasks called for, and those who had taught Sunday School would have experience with children, yet they had no experience with Aboriginal children and most lacked any knowledge regarding school administration.

The principals who had a public school background were also not sufficiently prepared. Running a residential school was much different from being a principal of a public school. In contrast to a public school, a residential school housed the students and most had small farms. Furthermore, the children were from an unfamiliar culture. Some of the public school employees had only taught and therefore had no background in school administration.

Due to the constraints of time, even the most qualified individuals had difficulty executing all duties effectively. In the case of Rev. Dodds at Cecilia Jeffreys, the church was well aware of this:

Your Committee readily admit that the duties of the Principal of the school are so varied and require his presence at one and the same time at the school and in the steamboat, whether freighting supplies for the school, or doing mission work along the shores of the lake, as to render it impossible for him to discharge them all satisfactorily; ... (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 111, Indian Mission Committee of the Synods of MB and Sask. Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to visit the Cecilia Jeffreys School by James Farquharson and William Prince, Jul 1908).

The principal of a boarding school had to negotiate how much time to spend on each responsibility and this often resulted in certain aspects of the work being neglected in favour of others. The necessity of effective time management, or rather of finding enough
time in a day to accomplish everything, continued to be a concern even after the 1910's when the missionary duties were greatly reduced.

*Matron and Assistant Matrons*

When a woman expressed interest in a position as matron or assistant matron, many of the usual particulars were requested: age, state of health, fondness for children, inclination for Christian missionary work, experience in such work and any other relevant information. Personal qualities of tact and patience were deemed essential (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 434-435, [Baird] to Miss Camp, 16 Jun 1896). Notably, education was not a consideration for this position. Principal Neil Gilmour emphasized “strength of body and knowledge of housekeeping” for these positions (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 20 Jun 1901). This same principal noted the more practical requirements: “The matron should be a robust person who thoroughly understands cooking, baking and butter making. A good manager, and able to control girls. If she has some knowledge of nursing, dressing wounds, administering simple medicines, etc. it would be very desirable” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 12 Jun 1901). He also stressed the ability to get along with the other staff members and for the matron to be able to supervise those under her without making it disagreeable for them (ABP, H 463-465, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 31 Mar 1898). When applying for an assistant matron position, Miss Currie addressed many of the desired attributes:

I might say at the outset that I am in my 31st year, and have been engage [sic] in housekeeping more or less ever since I have been able to do so. Though I have not had much experience in making children’s clothes, I served an apprenticeship of six
months with a first-class dressmaker and for some years made my own dresses, and I might say that I cut by System. There are no children in my immediate family. Yet I while at Birtle was in my cousin’s home where there were several small children and found we got on very nicely together.

With reference to music I sing and play fairly well, having sung in the Birtle Choir while there and have played for the last 15 years more or less.

As to working harmoniously with other members of the staff so far as I know myself and from past experience I certainly would anticipate no difficulty in that respect.

As regards the Sabbath School and Christian Endeavor work, I must say I have taken no very active part in either but have been in Bible Class and have taken part in other Church work such as Missionary Collecting, distributing Poor Fund etc. I might say in this connection that I have had considerable experience in drawing, and could aid, if necessary, by blackboard work in illustrating the Sabbath School lessons (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 646-647, Isobel Currie to Dr. Baird, 10 May 1898).

As mentioned, a background in running a household was considered more beneficial than extensive education. As assistant matron of the Crowstand school, Mrs. Lockhart was thought to be suitable due to her practical experience and the likelihood of her being a long term employee: “I think myself that the committee could not do better than to appoint Mrs. Lockhart for the sewing room. She is a widow without children and is very likely to be permanent. She has a good practical education of a farmer’s daughter and wife and she gets on well with the children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 641-644, C. W. Whyte to Baird, [] Jul 1894). Having grown up on a farm was among Florence McLean’s qualifications which resulted in her being offered the position of assistant matron at the Crowstand school: “She seems to be a young woman well fitted for the place, a farmer’s daughter who has resided for a number of years in this country; about 22/23 yrs old, strong and active with sufficient education to entitle her to teach school under a permit, fond of children, willing to work, and interested for a number of years in the subject of missions” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, p 153-154, B. to Mr. Laird, 24 Oct 1889).
Possessing a familiarity with the techniques of dressmaking, as did Isobel Currie and Miss Gilmour of Crowstand, was useful for those responsible for the sewing. Bessie Murchison of the Birtle school had graduated from a short course in domestic science course at the Guelph Agricultural College. Commonly, women in these positions came to the schools with general housekeeping skills.

Much of the work of the matrons and their assistants involved direct contact with the students, and thus any experience with children was considered valuable. Jessie Jamison of the Birtle school, for example, had worked at the Children’s Aid in Belleville, Ontario and at the Hampton Institute in Virginia. Some, such as Marjorie McIlwaine of the Crowstand school and Miss Hendry of the Portage school, had taught in public schools for a number of years. For many, their arrival at the school was their first introduction to Aboriginal children. However, some women had already performed missionary work among Indigenous populations. For instance, Alison Folliett had spent over ten years working at schools for Aboriginal children in the United States before coming to the Birtle school. Several women at the four schools had previously worked at other Presbyterian residential schools.

As mentioned above, some of the women were appointed as matrons or assistant matrons by virtue of their being married to the school principal. Out of the twenty-four women for whom some background information was available, eight were principals’ wives. However, many of these did have pertinent employment experience or training. Prior to being married, Mrs. Ross (later at Cecilia Jeffrey) and Mrs. Millar (later at Portage) were employed at Presbyterian-run Aboriginal boarding schools in British
Columbia as matron and teacher respectively. Mrs. Hendry's background as a graduate nurse proved invaluable at the Portage la Prairie Boarding School. The church was not reluctant to appoint Mrs. Menzies as the matron of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, as she had had previous institutional experience.

The matron, along with her assistants, were she fortunate enough to have them, were in charge of the school's entire household management. An excerpt from a letter to a prospective candidate illustrates how those interested were forewarned of the challenges such a position presented:

> The duties of Matron and Asst. Matrons in these schools are usually very arduous. The children have never been taught habits of tidiness, or even of ordinary cleanliness. They have at first little conception of any kind of regular habits, and it is the duty of the lady officers in our schools not only to keep the household affairs moving with regularity in the way of supplying meals, keeping the place tidy, and seeing that the interest of the children in such a way that when they leave the school, they will be able to manage homes for themselves (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 434-435, [Baird] to Miss Camp, 16 Jun 1896).

The actual tasks delegated to an assistant matron at the Crowstand Boarding School, Mrs. Lockhart, underscore the physically demanding nature of the work:

> Mrs. Lockhart's duties have been the making mending, washing and ironing of all the clothing and bedding; the care of the girl's dormitory and everything in it; the bathing of the girls and keeping of them clean in every respect; the care of the laundry; the charge of the girls when rising + retiring; the industrial training of the children in sewing, knitting, straw hat making, mat making &c in classes five hours each week; and the care of the girls while preparing for meals. This means having some care for nearly all the time from 6 a.m. till 8 p.m (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 180-184, C. W. Whyte to Rev Prof Baird, 26 Mar 1896).

While much of the physical labour was performed by the women themselves, they were also expected to teach and supervise the girls in domestic activities. In addition to household chores and the general discipline of the female students, matrons and assistant
matrons were often given missionary duties and were required to administer medical treatments.

There is no question that a background in domestic activities would have been beneficial, if not necessary. Even some amount of experience in cooking, baking, laundry, sewing and housecleaning would have prepared the matrons and assistants for the main aspects of their work. Yet, caring for a ‘family’ of fifteen or more was not the same as taking care of one’s immediate family. The majority of women lacked experience with children, and specifically children of Aboriginal descent. Thus, many may not have been able to efficiently manage the students and success in imparting domestic training would have been hampered. Most were without a medical or nursing training, and therefore much of the medical care received by the children would have been second-rate.

Teachers

When an opening came available for a teacher at one of the Presbyterian boarding schools, those in charge of mission work searched for someone with a Christian character, a missionary spirit, cheerful disposition, a liking for children and some teaching experience, with preference given to those with a normal school training (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 2, F 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 21 Jan 1893). Men and women who had attended a normal school would have received instruction in the methods of teaching and in the maintenance of classroom discipline. In addition, the ability to sing and teach instrumental music was often considered an asset (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 3, F 26, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 12 Jun 1901).

Many of the teachers who worked at the Birtle, Cecilia Jeffrey, Crowstand and
Portage la Prairie boarding schools did have a teaching certificate. The completion of a certain amount of high school was equivalent to a first, second or third class certificate. The most common certificate was a second class from the province of Ontario. Some did have normal training, however, according to the available data, the majority did not. Even more rare was a university education. Only two of the thirty teachers in this study had attended university. Miss W. Henderson, who taught at the Portage school for over two years, had completed one year of arts and Miss G. Reid, who also worked at Portage, had graduated from university with a bachelor of arts degree.

Frequently, the chosen applicants did have experience teaching non-Aboriginal children in the public school system. Some had only taught for a number of months, while others had extensive teaching experience. For instance, from the Birtle school, Florence Leslie had spent eight years in the Ontario public school system, three as a teacher and five as a principal and Eliza MacGregor had taught for about thirteen years prior to her appointment.

Experience with Aboriginal children was not a requirement, and few had such a background. One who did, a Cecilia Jeffrey school teacher, Miss Bennett, had previously taught at an Aboriginal school at Moose Factory which had been managed by the Indian Department. For those who were without a background working amongst Aboriginal children, their ability was assessed once employed. Miss MacGregor, for example, who first taught Aboriginal children at Birtle school, was considered to be “a born teacher of Indian children” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). This DIA employee implied that instructing Aboriginal children
was an inherent skill rather than one that could be taught.

Naturally, the primary role of the teacher was to impart academic instructions to the children. Teaching children with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds proved to be challenging, and required perseverance and patience. Being a teacher at a residential school also differed from working at a public school in that it entailed a degree of parenting responsibilities.

Some of the responsibility for the supervision of the children out of the classroom often fell upon the teacher. The principal at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School described the circumstances under which the teacher might be expected to watch over the students:

There is the parental care over them at all times, even in their play hours they cannot be left altogether to themselves without a wise oversight by someone, getting washed and dressed, coming orderly to worship and meals, keeping to their own playgrounds, doing the little chores appointed to each child regularly, seeing that the smaller ones keep out of the water holes and keeping track of their caps mitts shoes &c. Seeing that they all go to bed at their proper times and do so orderly, that they get their baths and change of clothes regularly &c &c. These are a few of the many details that must be looked after by someone. But they do not all nor always necessarily fall to the lot of the teacher though she should be prepared to take a fair share of this work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 5 F 62, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 2 Jun 1904).

Teacher, Kate Gillespie, drew comparisons between her duties at the Crowstand school with those of a public school teacher:

I have the same school hours as are allotted, or considered possible for the strength of any man or woman teacher in the Territories; and not only have I their hours; I have two different lines of work to follow up and try to teach intelligently — the ordinary school and the kindergarten — the latter alone would require constant preparation. But my duties do not begin at nine and end at four; they begin at eight and last until quarter past five and besides I have a gymnastic class two evenings in the week for the girls and one evening is taken up with the C. E. [Christian Endeavour] meeting. On Saturday forenoon I oversee the cleaning of the ground floor minus the sewing-room, in the stone building and in the afternoon have charge of the girls until three o’clock. After occupying part of the remaining time in attending to private matters you can
easily see I have but few moments to give to mind improvement and often when the leisure does come my mind is too wearied to do to other than just sit still and rest (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1169-1180, Kate Gillespie to Prof. Baird, 13 Jun 1895).

To have responsibilities aside from the classroom was common, yet some teachers, such as Zena Brodie of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, lacked the physical strength and thus were exempt from such duties (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Rev. Dr. Grant, 25 Apr 1916).

For numerous teachers, their work extended beyond the school and the school yard, as they were actively involved in the missionary work. For example, when circumstances allowed, May Armstrong of the Crowstand Boarding School, would contribute her time and energy to the adults of the nearby reserve by conducting religious meetings and sewing classes for the women. While teaching at Portage la Prairie, Sara Laidlaw’s duties included evangelistic work in the Aboriginal village three miles away. This required frequent visits in addition to a Thursday evening prayer meetings and the Sunday afternoon service (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 12, A. Jeffrey to Rev. McKay, 3 Aug 1897).

Too few residential school teachers had professional pedagogical training. Those who held certificates, in most cases, had an understanding of the subject material that was to be taught, but without having attended a normal school, would have lacked the ability to properly teach the material. A familiarity with the material was one matter, but effectively imparting it to the pupils was another. Even a normal school training would not ensure that a teacher was able to adapt their teaching styles to the unique needs of Aboriginal students; cross-cultural and linguistic training was not a part of the normal school
curriculum. The hiring of Aboriginal teachers would have aided in countering this problem. Susette Blackbird, a former pupil of Birtle school, often acted as a substitute teacher and John Black taught at the Crowstand Boarding School for close to a year, but this was not a common practice. Based on the data collected, it appears that none of the teachers at the four schools had attended a training institution in preparation for mission work. The non-Aboriginal teachers may have misinterpreted the behaviours and attitudes of the Aboriginal children as their interpretations would have been based on Eurocentric ideas which were incongruent with Aboriginal belief systems.

Farm Instructors

Having a background in a diverse range of agricultural pursuits was the basic requirement expected of those who worked as farm instructors at Presbyterian boarding schools. Despite the fact that the instructors worked directly with the students, past experience working with children was not insisted upon. However, certain personal qualities were considered desirable. A principal of the Crowstand school demanded that the new school farmer "must be steady, of good temper, not given to use of improper language" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 3, F 26, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 12 Jun 1901). Mr. McKitrick of the Cecilia Jeffrey school hoped that the next farm instructor would be able to exert a Christian influence on the schools' boys (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 5 F 57, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). Any mechanical or construction knowledge was also considered beneficial.

Most farm instructors had some degree of practical experience in farming. John Whyte of the Crowstand school had a minimal amount of practice of farming, as he had
grown up on a farm. On the other hand, there were men like Mr. Kilburn who had farmed at Neepawa, Manitoba for twenty-eight years and Garnet Hilborn who had fifteen years of agricultural experience, with a background in dairy and hog and poultry raising. William Perry arrived at the Birtle Boarding School with a great deal of practical experience, not only in agriculture. He had been raised on a farm, employed by farmers and also farmed on his own in Manitoba for a number of years. He also had construction experience with expertise in stone masonry. Some of his previous employment endeavours included supervision and management responsibilities. In addition, he had the preferred personal qualities: “Mr. Perry is a man of immense physical strength and strong personality, is good tempered and has good judgment and unblemished character” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 14 Dec 1914). 

Academic achievement was regarded as of little relevance to this position. For this reason, Mr. Snyder, who was employed at the Birtle school in 1910 may be considered overeducated for the position. He had graduated from Columbia University with degrees in arts and law. More relevant was the fact that he had been raised on a farm and he had completed two years at the Manitoba Agricultural College. Of those farm instructors for whom background information was found, only one, a Crowstand employee, Mr. McGregor, had acquired missionary training at the Moody Institute in Chicago.

Duties of the farm instructor depended on the school and changed over time at the same school. Some instructors were relegated to the duties of a manual labourer (see NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Extract from the Agent’s Report on the Birtle Boarding School for the Month of July 1913 by G. H. Wheatley).
Mr. Billson was hired as the farm instructor at the Cecilia Jeffrey school in 1904, however the principal found that he was more suited to other work: “He is useful to run the engine on the Daystar. He is the best engineer we have had yet on the str [steamer], is intelligent and better at that than farm work. He is busy now hauling wood and hay at the school and helping with the school work in many ways. ... But he is not quick at farm work nor accustomed to Canadian farm methods” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKittrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). It is clear that the position of farm instructor was flexible and varied in regard to the duties attached to it.

Rev. C. W. Whyte, administrator of the Crowstand school, was not instructed by the FMC as to what duties were to be assigned to the farm instructor. He described the responsibilities allocated to Mr. Hamilton:

The work I have given him to do in a general way is the care of the boys’ dormitory and everything in it; (of course he sends everything needing mending to the sewing room) the keeping of the boys clean in every respect; the superintendence of the boys at all their outside work + at the scrubbing of the dormitory; and the charge of the boys when rising + retiring and carpenter work. He has had nothing to do with the stables or cattle all winter. At the present time a number of things about the school are waiting for him e.g. roof of milk house, wainscotting [sic] stairway in stone building where plaster is badly broken, cupboard in laundry, pot cupboard in kitchen and painting of roofs (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 180-184, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 26 Nov 1896).

Mr. Hamilton’s job description illustrates the two main aspects of farm instructor position: instructing the male students in industrial and agricultural techniques and the general supervision of the children. With his background as the son of a farmer and as a machinist, John Whyte of Crowstand was deemed competent to teach the boys farming and to show them the proper use of tools. Also at Crowstand Boarding School, Mr.
Wright's work consisted of farm management, industrial training of the boys in carpentry and blacksmithing, as well as supervising the students while the principal was away visiting reserves or on church business (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Regarding Indian Schools in the North West, Baird to Mr. Wright, 14 Aug 1891, pp. 414-415). While farm instructor at the Birtle school, Mr. Perry also assisted the principal in discipline and management of the boys. Mr. Snyder of Birtle acted as the substitute principal when Walter McLaren was granted four months leave of absence (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 20 Apr 1910).

The majority of the men hired as farm instructors had the proper agricultural and industrial backgrounds, but none had had experience working with children. Considering that these instructors dealt directly with the students, teaching farming skills and in general supervision, it is surprising that a teaching or child care background was not recommended. The unfamiliarity with managing children was apparent in some of the instructors. Mr. Kilburn of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, for instance, was criticized for his inappropriate demeanour when working with the students (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Austin McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). On the other hand, a few, such as Mr. Billson, proved that their strength as farm instructor lay in their competence for relating to the pupils (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904).

Nurses

In 1914, the Indian Department began to place trained nurses in some of the residential schools. This served to reduce the work load and anxiety of the other staff who, without
the services of a nurse, were required to administer medical care in addition to all their other duties (Thirty-Eighth AR, WFMS, WD, PCC, 1913-14, p. 52).

Graduate nurses were preferred and many satisfied this qualification. Annie Tindale and Alberta Reid, for example, had both graduated from the Nursing-at-Home Mission Hospital in Toronto. The secretary of Indian Work for the Woman's Missionary Society opined that such graduates were well qualified for missionary work amongst Aboriginal people:

We have had graduates from this hospital in our Indian work and in our W. M. S. Hospitals in Western Canada and they have measured up to the requirements of the Institutions in an acceptable manner. We consider them especially fitted for our Indian work as they gain much of their nursing experience in daily visitations among all classes of people in our City. They are Social Service workers in every sense of the word (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Adelaide Clark to Dr. Edmison, 18 Apr 1923).

In addition to this training, both had extensive experience. Miss Tindale spent some time performing private nursing in Toronto. Next, she was the nurse at the Brandon Industrial School for four years. Before coming to Birtle school, she worked under the DIA as a field matron and nurse in Skidegate village, British Columbia. Miss Reid, who spent over five years at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, had nine years of previous practical experience. Thus, many of the schools' nurses were well trained and experienced.

However, boarding schools were not always able to attract graduate nurses. Mrs. Fraser, who worked as the nurse at the Cecilia Jeffrey school for two years, was not a professional nurse, yet she had had a degree of training. She had received some training from a Dr. Patrick of Glasgow, Scotland. She had also taken a course in surgical techniques at the Glasgow Royal Infirmary and had done some dispensary work in the
medical mission of Cowcaddens with the United Free Church (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Secretary DIA, 23 Aug 1916).

Mrs. Davis, a temporary nurse at the Birtle school, had no professional training and yet the principal felt she was adequately capable of taking on the nursing responsibilities of the school. She was willing to help out around the school in any way possible, thus implying her work was not limited to the children’s medical care. Often the medical treatment of the students was enough to occupy a nurse’s time.

With the exception of the most serious cases, in which a doctor would have to be called in, the nurse administered any necessary medical treatments. A nurse at the Portage school, Rosa Anna Bolton, described in her monthly report the work she had done:

Another case of Rubella developed during June but recovered speedily; we have had also one case of Influenza, one of Inflammatory Rheumatism one of Stomach Trouble one of Follicular Tonsilitis and one with a growth on his eye, he will be under the Doctors care for some time yet; the others are recovered having been treated with Sprays, Liniment, Tonics, Antitoxin and Ointment. There is always the administering of Laxatives and Tonics, dressing infected fingers and airing and disinfecting Lavatories (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt. 1, Nurse’s Report, Portage la Prairie Indian School, 30 June 1915 by Rosa Anna Bolton).

The nurse was often put in charge of the school’s pharmaceutical supply. Medical care was not always limited to the students of the school. Miss Reid at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, for instance, was responsible for the Aboriginal people of the nearest reserve, in addition to the seventy boys and girls residing at the school. Miss Reid was on duty at all times and she had experienced “many months of broken sleep” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Frank Edwards to Assistant Deputy and Secretary, 14 Jun 1922). In the case of serious outbreaks, the nurse would receive
assistance from another staff member or an assistant nurse may have been hired on a temporarily basis.

Many of the residential school nurses were professionally trained. As with all staff members, few had actual first hand experience with and knowledge of Aboriginal peoples.

**Summary**

In general, staff members were not well prepared for all facets of the work expected of them as residential school employees. Writing about female, Methodist missionaries, Gagan (1992: 190) highlighted the failure of previous employment to prepare the women who worked among Aboriginal people: “There were, in fact, few occupations that would have armed recruits for the vicissitudes of the remote Indian communities.” Most noteworthy of the staff members’ shortcomings was the lack of cross-cultural training and direct experience with Aboriginal people. All staff members were in daily contact with the children. Many also met with the local Aboriginal adults on a regular basis for evangelistic purposes. Nearly every aspect of the work done at residential schools entailed working with children and adults of Aboriginal descent. In the next chapter, the relationship between staff members and Aboriginal people will be explored. The duties which involved Aboriginal people directly, such as teaching, medical care, missionary work and student recruitment will be discussed in greater detail. Also, attitudes towards and perceptions of Aboriginal children and adults will be explored.
CHAPTER 5

RELATIONS WITH ABORIGINAL PEOPLE
“getting the good wishes of the Indians”

Parents and Other Adults

The success of a boarding school relied heavily on the ability of the staff to develop
and maintain positive relations with the people whose children were to be educated there.
The parents’ trust had to be gained and this trust had to be maintained by acceptable
treatment of their children. In the early decades of residential schooling, school staff were
also expected to evangelize to and ultimately convert the local Aboriginal people.
Regular visits to nearby Aboriginal communities were undertaken by principals and other
staff in order to impart the tenets and practices of Christianity.

Missionary Work

As representatives of the Presbyterian Church, employees acted as conveyers of the
Christian faith. An early principal of the Portage la Prairie Boarding School insisted that
Euro-Canadian Christians had an obligation to share their religious teachings with
Aboriginal peoples:

‘Is the Indian worth trying to reach?’ is a question often asked. In a very literal sense
he is our brother. Then is it necessary to ask, ‘Is it worth while trying to save a
brother?’ Not one of us would ever dream of giving up while one of our dear ones
was unsaved. Would we give up praying for him? Never! We owe the Gospel to the
Indians. We have taken from them their land, and have reduced them to a state of
semi-starvation by taking from them their means of earning their livelihood. The
responsibility is ours to teach them the means of living in a better state in this world,
and to tell them a life everlasting (Monthly Letter Leaflet [MLL], WFMS, WD, PCC,
Dec 1891, Vol. 8 No. 8, “Work Among the Indians of Portage la Prairie” by Miss
Indeed, many missionaries believed it was their altruistic, Christian duty to share the word of God with the Aboriginal peoples. Church workers disregarded Aboriginal spirituality and labeled traditional ceremonies as paganism and heathenism. The mission work and the work within the schools went hand in hand; staff wanted their students to return to a Christian community.

Those who held the double role of principal and missionary were required to conduct regular Sunday services. In the early 1890's, Bessie Walker, along with Annie Fraser, conducted services in the Aboriginal village a few miles away from the Portage school and had an attendance of over sixty adults (UCA-Wpg, ABP, School Report for Portage School, Bessie Walker, 30 Jun 1891). At some schools, missionary services were carried out at more than one location. Rev. Whyte, for example, held services at the Crowstand school three times a month, at the local chief's house also three times per month, as well as at four other locations, on either a monthly or bi-weekly basis (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 599, Presbyterian Church in Canada, Annual Report for Crowstand, Kamsack - Mar 31, 1894).

Throughout the week, staff members would conduct a variety of afternoon and evening classes with the Aboriginal adults. In 1894, Kate Gillespie had a Saturday afternoon class for adults on the Coté Reserve in order to teach them to read English. She briefly described the class and the progress of one participant after only two weeks:

The class consists of four women and two men, and I hope to have more after a while. One of the men has astonished me very much. He did not know the alphabet two weeks ago, and can now read the first nine verses in the first chapter of St. John. Of course he doesn't read it very fluently, and has to stop to spell several of the words, but still I think it is wonderful, considering the time he has been studying. His whole
ambition seems to be to learn to read. It is a very encouraging sign (MLL, WFMS, 
73).

Two years later, this woman was in charge of a women’s class at the same location. The 
women who attended agreed to learn a portion of the Bible in English and conversely,
Gillespie intended to learn it in their language. (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 969, Report of the 
School at Crowstand for the quarter ending Dec 31, 1896 by Miss Kate Gillespie). In 
order to facilitate visits to the peoples’ homes, Marjorie McIlwaine, also at Crowstand,
purchased a pony and buggy with her own funds. She planned a mother’s meeting one 
afternoon per week where she would travel house to house to teach sewing and knitting 
and, at the same time, have a prayer meeting (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1887-1888, Marjorie 
McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 23 Sep 1897).

Visiting the sick was another aspect of missionary responsibility. In addition to those 
trips made for planned weekly meetings and services, special visitations were undertaken 
for cases of illness. The missionary-educators provided whatever medical assistance was 
available to them. A teacher of the Crowstand school mentioned the increase in the 
frequency of the principal’s visits at times of medical need: “Of late Mr. Whyte has had 
to make more trips to the reserve than usual, as there has been considerable sickness on it. 
Within the last three weeks there have been three deaths” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 
1894, Vol. 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 73).

Preaching to Aboriginal people proved to be both rewarding and discouraging for 
those residential school personnel who partook in missionary duties. May Armstrong was 
pleased when some of the older people of the neighbouring reserve requested her to assist
them in reading the Bible in their homes (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 276, E. M. Armstrong to Baird, 20 Jan 1890). A couple of months later, Armstrong expressed her initial apprehension and subsequent relief in regards to conducting religious meetings with the adults of the Coté reserve: “I did not think I would be listened to. I expected to see every man stalk dignified out of the house. Instead they all listened respectfully and seemed very interested” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 361-364, E. M. Armstrong to Baird, 31 Mar 1890).

Annie Fraser, at Portage, reported that the “tipi work” would be made more efficient if a church were built, as the Aboriginal people she worked with were “very anxious” to have one (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 593, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Report of the Mission at Portage la Prairie for the quarter ending Mar 31, 1894 by Annie Fraser).

Aboriginal interest and participation in church services was often a source of gratification. Bessie Walker articulated this positive aspect of the work: “One cannot help feeling that the work is not in vain when we see ignorant and rough Indians and poor tired squaws coming so regularly to each service, and when we hear their voices so earnestly raised in singing ‘Jesus Loves even Me,’ we do feel repaid for any feeble effort” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1889, Vol. 6 No. 8, letter by Miss Walker, dated 16 Sep 1889, p. 16). Such examples of church workers having an influence over the Aboriginal people were welcomed news for missionary committees. Church officials particularly appreciated hearing of those who had fully converted to Christianity. Miss Fraser proudly described the conversion of their interpreter:

David Ross, our interpreter who was baptized by Mr. Wright last winter has been received into the church and is living a consistent Christian life. It was a sight well worth seeing at our last communion in Knox church to see this man sitting down to
the Lord’s table and so evidently enjoying the services. Only a few years ago, this man had no knowledge of the true God, but now he has boldly left all heathen practices and cast in his lot with the Lord’s people. We hope many more will follow (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1835-1836, Annie Fraser to Rev. Prof. Hart, 12 Jul 1892).

The rewards were often outweighed by challenges and frustration. Bessie Walker declared the disheartening nature of the mission work: “It is easy to feel cast down in the work among the Indians. Some days and even weeks, we feel as if we were doing a little; then again, we seem to lose what hold we thought we had, and often wonder if any others feel as down-hearted as we do about the little we do among the Indians” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, May 1889, Vol. 6 No. 1, letter by Miss Walker, dated 5 Mar 1889, p. 5).

Rev. McKirtrick of the Cecilia Jeffrey school cited the perseverance of the Ojibwa peoples to whom he preached to oppose such teachings as a drawback: “Often I feel the immense barrier and solid rock of paganism set in opposition to us here by these Ojibways and wonder why such a weakling as I should attempt such a task and so comparatively alone. ... There are times when we see how very determined these Indians are that they will not become Christians” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, A. G. McKirtrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 17 Dec 1901). Those who continued the practice of their traditional ceremonies were commonly cited as being inhibitory to missionary endeavours.

In his efforts to establish a religious service at Lizard Point, principal of the Birtle school, Neil Gilmour, noted that the performance of the sun dance impeded progress. While the chief had expressed his hope that Gilmour would maintain regular visits, the sun dance continued to be carried out on the reserve. The participation of the people of Lizard Point in these “hideous rites” made Gilmour “very sad.” Gilmour expressed
optimism that the sun dance would soon be a thing of the past: “I think this dance belongs to the class that has been, recently, by law, forbidden, so that we hope they have had their last sun-dance” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Sep 1895, Vol. 12 No. 5, letter by Mr. Gilmour, dated 27 Jul 1895, p. 131). Sara Laidlaw of the Portage school contended that a major obstacle to the religious work in the nearby Sioux village was the medicine men. The medicine men attributed deaths among their people to the missionary work being done and to Christian burials (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 689, Sara Laidlaw to Baird, 24 Sep 1896). Laidlaw also considered the “pow-wow” and Dakota worship to be hindrances: “These the medicine men like to have when we have our gatherings and anyone invited incurs the displeasure of the medicine men if they refuse; so you may see the courage needed to withstand. For a long time these gatherings were not held, but recently they have been holding them on Thursday evening when we have our prayer-meeting, and on Sabbath afternoon” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1071-1078, “Mission Work among the Sioux” by Sara Laidlaw, read to WFMS [1897]). Two years later, at the same location, a decline in attendance at religious services had been blamed on the actions of the medicine men: “... the influence of the medicine men who are putting forth their efforts, not perhaps as openly as formerly, but in a quiet way of their own, which is we believe more effective” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1223, Report of the Mission at Portage la Prairie for the year ending Mar 31, 1899 by Annie Fraser). While missionary-principal at Crowstand, Rev. Whyte had to deal with those attending his church services who continued to be involved in Aboriginal spirituality. He explained: “A large number of our members we found were addicted to heathen practices and kept instruments for conjuring in their possession. We
felt it best to remove their names from the roll. We did this after preaching on that subject several times and after private conference with the parties concerned” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1597, Report on the Mission at Crowstand, 1895 by C. W. Whyte).

Sometimes those who were not receptive of the Christian teachings did not aggressively oppose it either. May Armstrong, teacher at the Crowstand school, wrote of a “heathen” who had three wives. This man was generally friendly towards Christians and allowed Rev. Laird to hold a Sunday service at his house, yet he had “never expressed any desire to try the ‘New Way’ as they call it” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 275-278, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 1 Jan 1890).

Providing aid, most notably in the form of clothing, was another aspect of missionary work. It was common for school principals to receive clothing from the WFMS. This clothing was distributed amongst people on nearby reserves. Only the very poor, the sick and elderly did not have to work for the clothing they received. All others exchanged labour such as washing, scrubbing, sewing and getting wood, or goods, such as tanned hides, moccasins and quilts, for the donated clothing (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 469, Report of the Mission at CS, Cote’s reserve for yr ending Mar 31 1897).

In regards to Methodist women working among Aboriginal people of British Columbia and Alberta, Gagan (1992: 191) argued that weekly visits with the Aboriginal women for missionary purposes served to mitigate the monotony of life at a residential school. Annie McLaren’s experiences support this contention. She gives the impression that such trips were enjoyable and she found the Aboriginal way of life intriguing:

Hugh [interpreter] and I were up at the Reserve this week, ... I do enjoy a day or two
with the Indians, or longer if I could only take the time. They all appear so genuinely glad to see you, and after all there is a fascination about their way of living, in summer time their tents, and in winter time the open fire, and everybody sitting around apparently quite free from care or worry. ... We first called on the old chief and then took the houses as they came - our own Indians and Roman Catholics alike. All were delighted to see us (Foreign Missionary Tidings [FMT], WFMS, PCC, May 1898, Vol. 2 No. 1 by Miss McLaren, 21 Feb 1898, p. 22).

In resigning, employees often stated that they would miss their interactions with the Aboriginal adults. For example, Marjorie McIlwaine specified that she regretted to give up her weekly meetings on the reserve: “I am very much grieved to leave the work at Crowstand and especially to have to give up the women’s meetings, which I have enjoyed very much ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 144-145, Marjorie McIlwaine to Baird, 9 Dec 1897).

It appears that getting away from the school on missionary business was a welcome change for some staff members.

**School Recruitment**

Due to the method of government funding, the per capita grant, school principals were preoccupied with maintaining the maximum enrolment allowed. Principals visited the reserves not only for missionary duties, but also to sell their school to the Aboriginal clientele. These visits were essential to recruitment efforts. George McLaren of Birtle, for instance, requested a horse, as he argued that such visits should be made often, since “we need hardly expect the children to come if we do not go after them” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, File E139, Geo. G. McLaren to Baird, 4 July 1889). When on recruiting trips, Rev. Hendry of the Portage school did not only take note of the children of school age but also became acquainted with the younger children, potential future students and their parents: “Before the papooses could walk he would talk to the parents about the time when they
would begin school - and thus prepared their minds for the separation from their children”
(Murray, [1936]: 100). Recruitment, in most cases, had to be pro-active.

Boarding school staff repeatedly referred to the indifference or opposition of Aboriginal parents towards their children’s education as an impediment to their recruitment efforts. In writing about her frustration with the fact that many children on the nearby reserve had never been in school, Annie McLaren of the Birtle school explained: “Nothing can induce some parents to send their children. Sometimes they refuse because of their preference for the Indian way of training, and prejudice at, or fear of, English customs. Sometimes because of their deep love, which makes it hard to part with them” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Sep 1894, Vol. 11 No. 5, letter by Miss McLaren, dated 2 Jun 1894, p. 133). While working at Portage la Prairie, Annie Fraser was also discouraged by the number of children not receiving a Euro-Canadian style education and the difficulty in persuading the parents in allowing them to attend (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, March 1893, Vol. 9 No. 11, letter by Miss Fraser, dated 16 Jan 1893, p. 272). Grandparents were sometimes even harder to convince of the advantages offered by schooling. Portage school’s Bessie Walker claimed that grandparents resented “with no small hatred, every effort made to change their life. They think the little grandchildren should do nothing but play, and the school is looked upon as a place where the children are made to work by hard task-masters” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1891 Vol. 8 No. 8, by Miss Walker, a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Brandon Presbytery WFMS, p. 157).

Apprehensive parents sometimes agreed to send one child and if he or she were treated
well, they promised to send more (see, for example UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, A. G. McKitrick to Rev R. P. MacKay, 17 Dec 1901). Parents and the Aboriginal community in general had to be satisfied with the education provided and the general treatment of their children. Ill treatment of students was grounds for their removal. Such maltreatment included corporal punishment (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, John Semmens to Asst Depty and Secretary DIA, 10 Aug 1914), overwork (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, part 1, Copy - Report of Commission of Presbytery appointed to investigate conditions at “CJ BS” dated 26 Feb 1918 by Hugh J. Robertson and S. C. Murray), substandard accommodations (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1688, Presbyterian Church in Canada, quarterly report of the Birtle School, for quarter ending 31 Mar, 1892 by Geo. G. McLaren), the poor quality of English education received (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 146, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Farquharson, 2 May 1912) and the lack of supervision (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1467-1469, J. Ansdell Macrae to [Baird], 26 Dec 1891). Such conditions were also an additional deterrent for those who had not yet sent any of their children. Staff, on the other hand, often undermined such complaints. For instance, George McLaren alleged that parents removed their children from the Birtle school “for some petty reason, or perhaps no reason at all” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1030-1031, Geo. G. McLaren to Baird, [Jan-Mar 1891]).

Besides dissatisfaction with the general school conditions, an antagonistic relationship between the Aboriginal community and one particular staff member could also adversely affect the schools’ enrolment. From the outset, Maggie Nicoll’s relationship with the
Ojibwa people of Shoal Lake was on shaky ground. This was despite the fact that she had spent a couple of years as the teacher of the Regina Industrial School. Her colleague at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, the principal, Mr. Gandier, speculated that the trouble was caused by Miss Nicoll’s lack of appreciation for the intrinsic differences between an established school such as Regina and a new school, in addition to her refusal to follow recommendations by the missionary:

Her mistake I think was in expecting to deal with these Indians as one would with Indians of the prairie and in expecting to reduce an entirely new school immediately to a rigid system such as that of Regina. Any suggestions I have made to her have been willingly accepted but she might have had many valuable hints from Mr. McKitrick as to personal conduct toward Indians. Such advice was however distasteful to her because of a certain dislike to Mr. McKitrick and also a rather false idea of independence (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902).

For a time it seemed that her relationship with the Aboriginal people was improving, but once again the situation took a downward turn. The local missionary, Rev. McKitrick, blamed Nicoll for the decrease in school enrolment: “The trouble has broken out afresh lately and though I tried, as much as I dare, to get them to bear with her, and Mr. Gandier has tried to defend her to them, yet they are unanimous and more and more determined that there must be a change if the school is to go on teaching their children, or if other new scholars are to be gathered in” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). Furthermore, he opined that she had “little if any love” for the Aboriginal people and did not hide it. McKitrick had attended a meeting with two chiefs, two councillors and some of the parents at which he was told of their displeasure of Miss Nicoll’s treatment of the children and of the adults also. Miss Nicoll
had offered her resignation previous to this, but based on these complaints, decided to depart from the school at an earlier date than initially intended: "... upon further consideration I am convinced that the work itself will profit nothing by change being delayed" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). Staff members were at times pressured to leave if they were having a detrimental effect on the school’s enrolment and general progress.

Recruitment was not always stressful; in some cases, children were offered to the school with little effort on the part of the school administrator. In fact, some principals found themselves forced to refuse applications because their school was full to capacity. As principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Frank Dodds was distressed at the necessity of turning away children: “But I have been at great pains and trouble to create and foster the inclination in the Indians to send their children to school. I have had to refuse seven applications already this summer owing to lack of space and if I have to turn out some of those we have in it will certainly injure the school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Secretary DIA, 13 Aug 1909). This ease of attracting children to the school was indicative of parental confidence in the school. Parental confidence also had a positive influence at the Portage school. In 1898, Annie Fraser contended that parents entrusted the school with the care of their children, even when they were very ill. A few parents even provided clothing for the children (Twenty-third AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1898-99, p. 42). Rev. Hendry, in 1906, also found the support of the parents to be helpful. He explained: “Our duties in the school have been made easier and more effective by the co-operation and help received from the parents of
the children without which our work would be difficult, discouraging and of little permanent effect” (Thirtieth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1905-1906, p. 56).

By removing students and refusing to send children, Aboriginal parents were able to exert some pressure on schools when they felt their children were not being properly treated.

*Perceptions of Aboriginal People*

*Parenting*

Aboriginal parents were often recognized for the deep love they had for their children. Birtle principal, George McLaren, observed that when the children were returning to the school after summer or Christmas vacations, their parents would weep “as if their hearts would break” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Apr 1890, Vol. 6 No. 12, letter by G. G. McLaren, written 6 Jan 1890, pp. 10-11). After three children died accidently, Miss McLaren noted the deep sorrow of one parent: “Any person who has heard an Indian mother lament her dead will never forget the awful wail” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Feb 1894, Vol. 10 No. 10, letter by Miss McLaren, dated 8 Dec 1893, pp. 266-267).

Conversely, Aboriginal parents were sometimes characterized as being neglectful of their children. In order to dismiss accusations of her mistreatment of the Aboriginal students of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Miss Nicoll questioned the ability of Aboriginal parents to provide their children with proper care: “Do you think an Indian - whose children simply run wild - one day having a feast, and at another time having perhaps only one article of food, and not enough of that - with clothing half in rags, and even in the middle of winter, sometimes having neither shoes nor moccasins — is capable of judging what is proper
treatment for a child?” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 42, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 13 Oct 1902).

**Common Stereotypes**

Regardless of frequent exposure to Aboriginal peoples, residential school employees often shared stereotypical notions that were common amongst the larger Euro-Canadian society. Typically, a portion of the Aboriginal population was considered to be lazy. Rev. Whyte of the Crowstand school received clothing from the WFMS, which he in turn gave to the people of the Coté reserve in exchange for work. While he maintained that the majority of people were glad to earn the clothing in this way, others, “the lazy ones,” thought “they should get them for nothing” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Apr 1894, Vol. 10 No. 12, letter by Rev. C. W. Whyte, dated 9 Feb 1894, pp. 324-325). Ignoring relevant historical circumstances, George McLaren attributed Aboriginal dependency in general to an inherent character flaw: “We all know what notorious beggars they are, therefore we should do our best to discourage this degrading trait of their character and awaken a desire for self-support and manly independence” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Apr 1890, Vol. 6 No. 12, letter by G. G. McLaren dated 6 Jan 1890, p. 12). A teacher of the Crowstand school, Kate Gillespie, revealed the belief she held regarding the industriousness of Aboriginal people when mentioning her pleasure at the prospect of receiving assistance in building a church: “Mr. Whyte was quite encouraged by a meeting recently held by the Indians to discuss ways and means for finishing a church, the walls of which are already up. **Instead of trying to shirk the work, as is customary among them** [emphasis mine], they all expressed a willingness to do what they could by way of labour
on the building and drawing material to it” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Vol. 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 73).

Staff often characterized Aboriginal people as chronic complainers. Rev. Hendry of Portage dismissed the parental concern that children were not always receiving adequate time in classroom instruction at residential schools: “Regarding the children not being kept regularly in the class-room, I have never heard of this complaint except in connection with some of the very large Industrial School’s and I do not know if there is any truth in it.

*Indians will bring up anything on earth if they want to complain* [emphasis mine]” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol.6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of W. A. Hendry [1923]). According to Maggie Nicoll, matron at Cecilia Jeffrey school, if an Aboriginal person had someone who would listen, he or she would be inclined to tell a “story of trouble” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 45, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. MacKay, 5 Jan 1903). In another letter, she claimed that Aboriginal people are never satisfied: “They apparently must grumble about some one or something” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). The Cecilia Jeffrey school principal at this time also minimized grievances by charging that much was “imaginary,” yet “not altogether groundless” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902). As in this case, the stereotype of Aboriginal person as complainer was often utilized to undermine Aboriginal criticisms regarding the way their children were treated.

*Material Conditions and Economic Assimilation*

Miller (1996: 186) noted that due to their first hand experience with Aboriginal
people, teachers and principals tended to have a more complex understanding of Aboriginal culture and paid greater attention to non-material aspects of Aboriginal life than did government officials. Yet the continued interaction with Aboriginal people did not prevent them from judging Aboriginal society by Euro-Canadian standards. The homes of Aboriginal people were often referred to as being dirty and uncomfortable. New to such work, May Armstrong was pleased to see that the homes of the residents of the Coté reserve were quite tidy: “I was much surprised to find the houses so neat and comfortable. With few exceptions the floor was clean and neatly swept - the bed (when there was one) nicely spread up - the dishes arranged on a shelf which was usually decorated” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 275-278, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 1 Jan 1890).

Similarly, Rev. Gilmour was delighted to see the local Aboriginal men and women mirroring Euro-Canadian lifestyles: “It is nice to see them, driving to church in their wagons, in buggies, all nicely dressed, and looking just like white people” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 21 Sep 1902). He also mentioned their successful agricultural endeavours. When visiting the nearby Aboriginal village, Sara Laidlaw, teacher of the Portage school, would regularly compliment them on any material improvement in their homes or on their person (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1071-1078, “Mission Work among the Sioux” by Sara Laidlaw, read to WFMS [1897]).

Any sign of economic assimilation was also reported to the missionary boards and with those making progress being rewarded with praise. Annie Fraser, principal of the Portage school, recognized the economic progress of the local Aboriginal people:

You will be pleased to hear that many of the Indians have been doing so well this year.
They are anxious to purchase land for themselves, and have already a nice little sum of money in the savings' bank towards the amount needed. Several of them have gardens on the piece of land where they are allowed to camp. ... The seed was put in early and everything has grown beautifully. It is such a pleasure to us and to many others to see these Indians, who once spent all their time idling about, now becoming industrious and trying to make an honest living for themselves and families (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Oct 1892, Vol. 9 No. 6, letter by Miss Fraser, dated 2 Aug 1892, p. 150).

Four years later, Fraser described how some men were heedful in paying off their debts:

“It is a great satisfaction to us to see that the Indians themselves are beginning to realize that to cultivate honesty in their business transactions is the best way to success in life, and we do all in our power to instil the principle into them and their children” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1896, Vol 14 No. 8, letter by Annie Fraser, dated 22 Oct 1896, p. 219).

An ambition to work and self-reliance amongst Aboriginal people, congruent with that considered typical of Euro-Canadians, was noted as success.

Celebrations for Adults and Children

During the 1890's and early 1900's, the Birtle, Portage, Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand schools all hosted the students, their parents and other Aboriginal people during certain annual celebrations. In 1890, the staff of the Crowstand school put on a picnic to which approximately three hundred people attended. The afternoon was filled with sporting events such as races and a tug-of-war. The teacher, May Armstrong, believed that the successful event should be repeated: “It has altogether had such a happy influence over parents and children, that I think a picnic will be an annual occurrence at the Crowstand” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jan 1891, Vol. 7 No. 9, letter by E. M. Armstrong, dated 2 Aug 1890, pp. 5-6). The Portage school staff invited over fifty Aboriginal people to the school for a Christmas dinner. Sara Laidlaw divulged that she greatly enjoyed the event:
“The experience was new to me but I do not think I ever spent a happier Christmas - self was forgotten, by those of us who served, and to see the happy satisfied faces brought to our minds more fully than ever. ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive’” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 7 Sara Laidlaw to Mr. McKay, 27 Dec 1893). Three years later, a New Year’s Eve entertainment and dinner was put on for students, parents and other local Aboriginal people (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 973, Report of the School at Portage la Prairie for the quarter ending Dec 31, 1896 by Sara Laidlaw). Around the time of the Cecilia Jeffrey school’s first anniversary, the staff invited the children’s parents for tea on Christmas day, where the men enjoyed a football match and the women and students went for a sleigh ride (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 45, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. MacKay, 5 Jan 1903). At Birtle, in order “to keep the reserves in touch with the school,” all Aboriginal people with a connection to the school were invited to two annual festivals: a Victoria Day picnic with games and prizes and a Christmas supper and entertainment (CSP 1908, DIA AR Year Ended Mar 31 1907, W. W. McLaren, p. 293). According to reports, these events were enjoyed by all and likely served as a public relations tool for the schools.

**General Relations**

Healthy relations with the Aboriginal people was instrumental to the success of the residential schools. As illustrated by the case of Maggie Nicoll, some staff members failed to establish a favourable relations with the Aboriginal people from whom children were to be recruited. Many principals experienced an up and down relationship with the local Aboriginal population. For instance, throughout his tenure, Rev. Whyte received
complaints regarding the lack of mission work done and also a lack of supervision of the Crowstand school. Yet, when he announced his upcoming resignation, the local chief and headmen showed their approval of him by sending a letter to the church’s mission committee, requesting that a house be built for Whyte and his family, so that he would rescind his resignation (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1393-1394, [Baird] to Mr. Whyte, 14 Apr 1897). Others had little problem building and maintaining amicable ties with those from whom they recruited children and, in some cases, preached to. When permanently employed at Portage, Bessie Walker had been actively involved with the religious services of the Aboriginal adults in the area (see, for example ABP, E 1165, School Report of Portage School, 30 Jun 1891 by Bessie Walker), and when she returned after a year absence, she was inundated with requests for visitations from many of these people: "...my friends have showered me with invitations to spend a little time with them, and in trying to accept every invitation, there is not much time left for writing. It seems so good to be back with these friends again, and it is hard to bid them good-bye. Why it is, I cannot tell, but it is hard to leave the Indians here. I feel as if I belonged to them" (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, March 1893, Vol. 9 No. 11, letter by Miss Walker, dated 19 Dec 1892, p. 270).

**The Students**

*First Impressions*

For many of those who found employment in the residential school system, their first day of work was also their first introduction to children of Aboriginal descent. They usually arrived at the school with preconceived ideas of what these children would be like.
Most neophytes found themselves pleasantly surprised and impressed with the children they encountered.

Shortly after arriving at the Crowstand Boarding School, May Armstrong badly burned one of her hands. She explained how this mishap had allowed her to see the students’ considerate, caring side: “... I would never have believed that the children had such kind hearts, if I had not had the experience. The boys exhibited many gentlemanly acts as opening the door for me to leave the room, opening windows, lifting slates and moving things out of my way, and I can never forget the looks of silent sympathy of them all if I got an accidental bump” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 275-278, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 1 Jan 1890). Sara Laidlaw worried that she would have trouble controlling the students at the Portage school, but discovered her concern was in vain: “I have grown to be very fond of all the children. ...I was very much afraid I might not be able to get along with the children, but I have not had any trouble; they have obeyed from the first, both in and out of school” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Oct 1893, Vol. 10 No. 6, letter by Miss Laidlaw, dated 24 Aug 1893, p. 157). What Rev. McWithney experienced contrasted with what he had imagined of the Birtle scholars: “I must say I found them better than my expectations in appearance, aptitude to learn, and general behaviour” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 34, W. McWithney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 5 Feb 1902).

**Academics and Practical Training**

*The Debate over the Appropriate System: Day, Boarding or Industrial*

Of the staff members who expressed their opinion on what type of education was best for teaching Aboriginal children, most argued that the boarding schools were preferable to
both day and industrial schools. In 1889, in the heyday of industrial and boarding schooling, George Laird heralded the assets of the boarding system:

It secures regularity of attendance. The children are kept clean and properly clothed. They are taught order and cleanliness. They get a sufficient amount of wholesome food at regular intervals and in an orderly manner. Although allowed to visit their parents occasionally, they are in a large measure removed from the baneful influences of their homes. They learn to work, and gradually get removed from their minds the false idea, so common among the Indians, that work is degrading (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jun 1889, Vol. 6 No. 2, by Rev. G. A. Laird, Statement of Mission Work on Cote’s and Kese-Koos Reserves, 1888-9, p. 7).

In 1908, Kate Gillespie wrote the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs, warning him against carrying out their proposed plan to close industrial and boarding schools and establish day schools on all reserves. She contended that the Aboriginal peoples of the western provinces were not yet ‘civilized’ enough and that parents would not compel their children to attend regularly. She shared her experiences to illustrate: “I taught for three years in a day school on the Mistawasis Reserve and probably under as favorable circumstances as will be found on most reserves. The school did its work and had its influence over the children and the parents but the uplifting effects were very much less, comparatively speaking to what it has been here in the [File Hills] boarding school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol. 6040, File 160-4, pt 1. Kate Gillespie to Frank Pedley, 12 May 1908). A decade and a half later, according to Rev. Hendry of the Portage school, the day school system continued to be unsuitable for Aboriginal children “because of reserve conditions and the lack of responsibility among the Indian people” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol. 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of W. A. Hendry [1923]).

Mr. Pitts shared similar beliefs and stated that inspectors of Aboriginal schools and Indian
agents also agreed that day schools had been “an absolute failure” on most reserves in
Manitoba and Saskatchewan (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol. 6040, File 160-4, pt 1,
Extract - Report of F. E. Pitts [1923]).

Some were just as critical of the industrial schools. Neil Gilmour had worked at the
Regina Industrial School for approximately two years before being employed at the Birtle
and Crowstand boarding schools. While at the Crowstand school, Gilmour acknowledged
that he had formerly been a “firm believer” in the industrial school system. Then he
realized that industrial school graduates were not moving to non-Aboriginal communities
and finding employment in various trades, as had been the intention of the system. As a
result, he developed the opinion that Aboriginal children should be taught agricultural
pursuits. Also, he contended that ninety-five percent of all industrial school graduates
returned to their reserve, and that of the Regina graduates, “with one or two exceptions
they are all distinct disappointments.” He elaborated: “They come back, with heads
entirely too big for the reserve life. They are conceited and boastful, and they are
distinctly lazy. They are less industrious and less trustworthy than the older Indians who
never went to school” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 36, Neil Gilmour to Dr.
Mackay, 14 Apr 1902). The purpose of this letter was to oppose the transferring of
Crowstand students to the Regina school. Rev. McWhinney similarly argued that
industrial school graduates were not superior in post-graduate life to the boarding school
graduates, but often inferior:

When [industrial school students] return in a few years their ideas of life are so
different from what they must meet at home that they too often sit down in
despondency and do nothing. They come home inflated with such ideas of their own
importance that they are unwilling to come down to plain hard work. The first few years are spent usually in such idleness that the habits thus formed are hard to remove (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 53, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 16 Sep 1903).

McWhinney was also responding to the request made by the FMC for boarding schools to send some of their older students to the Regina Industrial School. In a comparable letter written one year later, McWhinney again questioned the practice of sending the best boarding school students to industrial schools, referring to the system as a proven failure and citing DIA opposition to industrial schools (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 65, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 7 Sep 1904).

In 1912, due to numerous incidents of immorality among students of the Crowstand school and the subsequent calls for a day school among parents, principal Rev. McWhinney advocated to have the boarding school replaced with what was called an improved day school. Only new students would be boarded for a year or two in order to obtain a strong knowledge of English. Unlike Gillespie, Hendry and Pitts, McWhinney was adamant that the conditions, at least on the Coté reserve, were appropriate to facilitate a successful day school. He maintained that the children would be well cared for by their parents and that agricultural and domestic training given at boarding schools could be achieved in the homes. He added that this system would not, as the boarding schools often did, destroy family ties: “We are respecting the natural ties of parent and child and acting in accordance with the Gospel we preach” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 142, McWhinney to Miss Craig, 11 Jan 1912). He also mentioned the inability of school staff to provide care equal to that of a parent:
The crux of the whole matter lies in the fact that no institution however good can take the place of a fairly good home. No member of any School staff can win the same love and confidence from a child that a mother can. The secret is the confidence of a mutual love. Anyone who knows Indians knows that the love between parents and children is very strong (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 142, McWhinney to Miss Craig, 11 Jan 1912).

In November 1915, the Crowstand Boarding School closed and an improved day school was opened (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, p. 93).

Those who opposed day schools implied that they believed that some time in the future, when conditions on the reserves had improved, that is, had become more 'civilized,' day schools would be an acceptable way of educating Aboriginal children.

Gilmour and McWhinney’s attacks on the industrial school system may have been, at least in part, an exercise in self-interest. It was in the interests of their respective schools to retain the larger students. The larger boys and girls performed much of the necessary work around the schools, and losing these students would result in a much heavier work load for staff. Also, without McWhinney’s support and request for a day school, he may have lost his job. Calls from the local Aboriginal people for McWhinney’s resignation had been growing, but most supported transforming the school into a day school. Opinions of appropriate education for Aboriginal children seem to have been self-serving, dependent on one’s own situation.

The Half-day School System

Aboriginal residential school students were educated by what was referred to as the half-day system. Students spent half of the day in the classroom, learning English and course material typically taught in the public school system. During the remaining time,
students were required to participate in practical activities. For girls, this usually meant household duties and for boys, farming and outside chores. Most employees were supportive of the half-day system.

The principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School for a couple of years in the early 1920's, W. J. Cookson, considered the practical training to be of equal value as the classroom work (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of W. J. Cookson [1923]). A long time principal of the Portage school and proponent of the half-day system, Rev. Hendry argued that practical training was of greater importance than academic training and a necessity if students were to be prepared for their future lives on the reservation:

After 25 years in Indian work, and seeing the problem on the reserve and in the schools, in B.C., Alberta, Sask., and Manitoba, it is my opinion that there is no education that the Indian children need so much as the training they will get on the farm, in the garden, laundry, bake-shop and kitchen. He may not work in some cases even when taught to work with his hands but he is more likely to do so since it gives one the confidence of accomplishment. A fair elementary education is necessary to transact business, to read the local newspaper, etc., I would say grade 6 to 8, but the higher education will not help much to solve the reserve problem, and the Indian must stand or fall on his ability to make a living on the reservation (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Volume 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of W. A. Hendry [1923]).

R. J. Ross, who had spent many years in Aboriginal mission work, contended that an Aboriginal child first required to “be taught industry before we can expect him to make a creditable showing in the classroom.” Furthermore, he claimed that, whereas a Euro-Canadian child is taught housework or farming at home, an Aboriginal child would go without such training if not offered at the boarding school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol. 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of R. J. Ross [1923]).
Academic Education and Ability

The academic training incorporated the basic subjects provided to non-Aboriginal children in the public school system. Yet, men and women who had experience teaching in the public school system were required to adapt their pedagogical means to the Aboriginal children. Crowstand principal, Neil Gilmour was critical of one teacher's ability to adjust her teaching technique even though she had been successful in public schools. He argued that due to her impatience, her students would fail to make progress, and may even regress (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901). A visitor to an Anglican-run school in 1908 delineated the difficulties unique to teaching Aboriginal children: “Most of the pupils entering the School are ignorant of the English language, their ideals and concepts find nothing in common with the school work, and psychological differences due to race and early training make difficult for either pupil or teacher to enter into the mental processes of the other. All must be patiently built up from the first principles” (cited in Miller, 1990).

Teachers and instructors were faced with cultural and linguistic barriers, which, in order to succeed, required a great deal of patience and a degree of creativity.

Particularly in the early decades of boarding schools, students did not get far in their academic studies. Yet, few staff doubted the innate intelligence of their students. Those teachers new to the work often relayed that the children’s intellectual ability surpassed their expectations. While employed at the Birtle school, Rev. McWhinney found that if he modified the material to be taught, the children readily digested it:

This, my first years experience in teaching Indian children, has been a revelation in
many ways. I expected to find them lacking in interest in school-work and generally dull. This expectation has proved altogether unfounded. When at all properly taught they are every bit as quick as a white child, and far more eager to receive instruction. Often I have had them beg for a lesson to continue rather than have recess (AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1902-1903: p. 49).

It was not uncommon for staff members to discuss the academic ability of the children in comparison to Euro-Canadian children. Bessie Walker of Portage argued that Aboriginal children were as smart as Euro-Canadian ones: “The children are found to be as bright and as capable of being taught as the children of white parents” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1891, Vol. 8 No. 8, by Miss Walker, a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Brandon Presbyterial WFMS, p. 156). Annie Fraser, of the same school, shared her view: “They are bright intelligent children and in ability compare favorably with the average white child” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1941-1944, Annie Fraser to Rev. Baird, 10 Nov 1892). Kate Gillespie of the Crowstand school was pleased with the new students the school had recently obtained: “The children seem to be very good material to work on — not at all listless but bright and full of life” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 971, Kate Gillespie to Prof Baird, 9 Jan 1895). Similarly, the first principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school maintained that the children were “very bright and interesting” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902).

Less frequently, teachers expressed a range in ability. George McLaren, Birtle principal and teacher, claimed “Some have done well with their studies others have done little or nothing” (ABP, E 1163, Geo. G. McLaren - School Report for Birtle, 30 Jun 1891). Crowstand teacher, Josephine Petch, commented that she needed to expend more energy on certain children: “Some of the children are quite apt, while others require more
Generally speaking, according to teachers, the Aboriginal students were able to make progress in all subjects. It appears that some children had difficulty with mathematics, but at least one teacher, George McLaren, discovered that the use of practical questions facilitated the children's ability to learn (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1030-1031, Geo. G. McLaren to Baird, [Jan-Mar 1891]). Teachers found the children to be particularly capable of memorization. Josephine Petch, a teacher at Crowstand, noted that this strength at times made it difficult for her to know whether the children could actually make sense of the material:

As a rule, they are very good at memorizing. They seem to do it with very little difficulty, even though they do not always understand the meaning. This fact, although very valuable in some respects, is the very opposite in others. Their memories are so retentive that often after an explanation, when they are being questioned on it, they will use in their answers the exact words that one has used in giving the explanation. This makes it very difficult to know whether they have grasped the idea, or simply memorized the words (FMT, WFMS, PCC, May 1899, Vol. 3 No. 1, letter by Miss J. Petch, dated 9 Mar 1899, pp. 28-29).

The lessons taught in the classroom were generally the same as those taught at public schools and authorized textbooks, also used in the public school system, were used in the Presbyterian boarding schools. Therefore, much of the material was of little relevance to an Aboriginal child. W. J. Small, a principal at the Birtle school, described the problem with such textbooks: "The great difficulty I find with the Canadian, Victorian and other primers is that many of the lessons are such that Indian children cannot possibly understand them until they reach the age of twelve or fourteen." In reviewing a
manuscript of a reader especially for Aboriginal students, Small was satisfied with it in that
“Nearly all of the lessons were such as could be related to the actual experience of the
children” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 23, W. J. Small to Mr. R. P.
McKay, 4 Mar 1901). There was no evidence that such a revised reader was widely used.
Inappropriate textbooks would have made the task of teaching English and reading to the
students more difficult.

Other than the reference above to Small’s critique of a manuscript for a more
appropriate textbook, the teachers made no complaints about the textbooks available to
them and did not mention modifying them for the children. In comparison, Pākehā
teachers appear to have been very active in altering their teaching materials for Māori
that used vocabulary and situations which were unfamiliar to their Māori students. In
response, many actually wrote their own texts which kept new words to a minimum and
dealt with experiences to which the children could actually relate.

Surprisingly, in official church correspondence, employees did not discuss the
challenges and difficulties of teaching children to whom English was their second
language. This may be because working with children who knew no English was taken for
granted in missionary work among Aboriginal peoples. Though, perhaps in letters to
family and friends, they wrote of the frustrations in communicating with the students due
to linguistic differences. Commonly, boarding school staff reported that the children were
able to learn the English language quickly. They were quick to boast about the Aboriginal
languages having been replaced by English. Rev. Whyte of Crowstand declared, “We are
glad to say that English is now the language of the School, and it is very seldom that an Indian word is heard” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 599, PCC. Annual Report for CS, Kamsack - Mar 31, 1894 by C. W. Whyte). Sara Laidlaw revealed the progress in English of the students at the Portage la Prairie Boarding School: “[The students’] English being remarkable, we scarcely ever hear them talk Sioux, the only time being when their parents are here” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 581, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Report of the School at Portage la Prairie for the quarter ending Mar 31, 1894).

One factor was often used to qualify a child’s ability to learn - age. Mr. Cookson, who was principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school for a time, argued that a child entering school at the age of thirteen or older could not be expected to make much progress in the line of academics (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of W. J. Cookson [1923]). Rev. Dodds, also of Cecilia Jeffrey agreed: “The younger children especially are quick to learn the lessons given them, while learning the English language at the same time. The benefit derived and the intelligence displayed are in inverse ratio to the age at which they are admitted, for the reason that those who come in young get a better grasp of the language” (Thirty-sixth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1911-1912, p. 46). In fact, those in their teen years were sometimes discouraged from entering the boarding schools (see, for example UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Sep 1902).

Vocational Training and Ability

A common perception among those employed at residential schools was that Aboriginal children, in comparison to their Euro-Canadian counterparts, lacked drive and
initiative. George McLaren’s view was widely held: “Indian children as a rule are bright and learn to read &c almost as rapidly as their white cousins, but they lack the industrious habits, the ambition and other qualities that aid so much in teaching white children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 578-579, Geo. G. McLaren to Hart, 29 Aug 1890). Rev. McWhinney argued that the lack of significant progress at school was not lack of ability but rather a “lack of ambition to excel” (Twenty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1903-1904, p. 52).

For this reason, many felt that industrial training was essential in order to instill habits of industry and economy. Female students were taught household work such as sewing, kitchen duties and laundry. Farming, gardening and rudimentary carpentry were among the work done by the male pupils. Rev. Hendry explained the benefits of such training:

“The farm is a help to the school financially but this is by no means its chief value. It is our finest training resort for boys, productive of good discipline, good ideals and good character. If the boys are to make a living on the reserve they must know how to till the soil successfully. The girls must be able to cook a good meal and keep a clean, tidy house” (Fourth AR, WMS, PCC, 1917, p. 71). The women who ran the Portage school in the 1890's often bragged of the advancement of their students in this regard. For example, Annie Fraser shared the success of some of their female students:

Our largest girls, Louisa, Katie and Topsy are becoming a great help to us. They help with the knitting and sewing as well as with the house-work. Louisa not only makes all her own clothes but cuts and fits for others. She has learned to cut by the “French tailors’ system” and does very well. During two of the summer months she was engaged as a domestic, with a family in Portage; they were well pleased with her work. Of course we do not mean to say that these girls are model ones. They often make mistakes and have a great deal to learn yet, but this is just to give you an idea of what they can do (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Feb 1894, Vol. 10 No. 10, letter by Miss Fraser, dated 23 Nov 1893, 263).
Annie McLaren also expressed pride in the progress the staff of Birtle had had with their students: “Nothing gives me so much pleasure or encouragement as the industrious habits the children have acquired, especially the girls. It seems as though they cannot idle away their time as they used to. It is ‘sew we please?’ or ‘Knit we please?’ the whole time” (Fifteenth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1890-91, p. 34).

It was generally believed among boarding school staff members that the half-day system was the most effective way to prepare Aboriginal children for their lives beyond their school years. In the early years of the residential school system, Department officials, church officials and staff members were optimistic that students would find employment opportunities in Euro-Canadian society. Crowstand principal, George Laird shared this view: “Our hope is that many of them will fill useful positions either as house or farm servants or tradesmen, and perhaps one or two of the more ambition ones may get positions as clerks in the Indian Department” (MLL, WFMS, PCC, WD, Mar 1892, Vol. 8 No. 11, dated 27 Nov 1891, p. 221). In 1906, Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian church officials announced that education for Aboriginal children would no longer focus on facilitating the students’ integration into non-Aboriginal society, but rather prepare them for life on the reservations (Pettit, 1997: 346). In 1910, Duncan Campbell Scott, the Superintendent of Indian Education, transformed the churches’ desire into policy. The new goal of education was “to fit the Indian for civilised life in his own environment. ... To this end the curriculum in residential schools has been simplified, and the practical instruction given is such as may be immediately of use to the pupil when he returns to the reserve after leaving the school” (cited in Armitage, 1995: 104). Thus girls were taught
household duties to prepare them for marriage and boys were taught farming, as that is how they were expected to make their livelihood on the reserve. In the early 1920's, the older female students at the Cecilia Jeffrey school were given weekly instruction in home nursing. The principal, Mr. Cookson, added that this was not done in order to train them to be qualified nurses, but rather to provide them with a basic knowledge of nursing and medicine to take care of their future families and also to combat the medicine dance (Ninth AR, WMS, PCC, 1922, p. 94). Some principals felt that the first couple of generations of Aboriginal children being educated in the boarding schools could not be expected to excel in academics. In 1903, Rev. McWhinney at the Crowstand school argued that too much should not expected:

... it seems to me no people can be hurried forward on the road of progress and civilization faster than a certain rate. All effort put forth to do anything more is only so much waste. I am afraid a great deal of the Indian education is of a nature intended to raise the Indian to a position he can not attain in this generation. They can be raised to a certain level but if you do by extra force lift them above it, when that force is removed backward they go to the natural level (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 53, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 16 Sep 1903).

Sara Marshall (nee Laidlaw), who had worked at the Portage and Birtle schools, contended that only a very small number of Aboriginal students could achieve the academic level necessary for a professional position: “However it is only the few in any nationality who climb to the heights in Literature, medicine, or law and it is, and will be, the same with the Indians” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Vol. 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of Mrs. Sara Marshall [1923]).

Religious and Moral Training

Religious and moral training were considered to be a very important part of the
education offered at the Presbyterian boarding schools. The religious training given to the students at the Crowstand school in 1904 was typical: “Morning and evening worship, study of Sunday school lessons, familiar illustrated talks and last, but not least, regular church services, are all employed to build up a knowledge of religious truth and form a basis of right character” (CSP 1905, AR DIA for year ended June 30th 1904, Principal’s report by Rev. McWhinney, p. 336). Memorization of Bible verses and the singing of hymns were also common exercises. It was the goal at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, under the management of Frank Dodds, to convey the everyday importance of Christianity:

... we endeavor to fit it [religion] - to dove-tail it as it were - into all branches of education; to implant the idea that Christianity is not something to be put on or off at will like a garment, not something for set times and seasons, consisting of forms and rules, but that it is a vital principle in the heart, at the centre of things, guiding, directing, controlling and coloring all the activities of life (Thirty-sixth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, p. 46).

Some staff members believed that Christian precepts would be inculcated by the children if staff endeavoured, through their day-to-day conduct, in word and actions, to show by example (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 971-973, E. May Armstrong to Mrs. Baird, 17 March 1891; Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, 1913-1914, Report by McWhinney, p. 59). Staff were particularly proud to be able to notify church officials of children who had professed to have accepted Jesus as their Saviour (for a few examples, see MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Vol. 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 74; UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1597, Report on the Mission at Crowstand, 1895, by C. W. Whyte; ABP, G 1303, Report of the School at Birtle for the quarter ending Mar 31, 1897 by W. J. Small).
Musical Training

At least some school administrators considered music to be an essential part of the boarding school curriculum. While principal of the Crowstand school, Neil Gilmour was adamant that the school’s teacher be able to sing and teach instrumental music. Much to his dismay, the teacher at the school at the time of his arrival was not able to teach music. So when that teacher, Josephine Petch, resigned, he strongly urged that a teacher with musical talent be hired: “It is most desirable that we should have here one who could play, not just a few tunes, but who could teach music to a number of the girls. Music has an educative influence, that is of value” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 24, N. Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 30 Apr 1901). This same principal was eager to form a brass band while at the Birtle school:

... if we had these [instruments] and boys trained to use them we would have, a band of our own which would add much to the attractiveness of our school, not only in the eyes of the children but to the old Indians too. I understand that on the occasion of the visit of the Elkhorn band boys to Birtle, the Lizard Point Indians turned out en-masse to hear them play, and felt very proud to hear such music from children of their own race (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 991, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 4 Feb 1895).

This was to benefit the children involved, but also had a public relations purpose.

Lifestyle Training

The education in boarding schools was not limited to English, academics and vocational training. It was also meant to impart a new way of life. Principal Pitts explained the all-encompassing goal of a boarding school education:

... the Boarding School not only teaches them to read, write, etc., but tries to teach them new conditions of living. Teaches them to eat different food, to sleep in beds, to dress, wash, bath, to bake their bread, cook their food, keep their houses and make a living on farms, etc. not like their parents have done but in a manner that shall enable
them to live in civilized conditions in which they find themselves, - tries to instill into them energy, perseverance, self-control, morals, and religion, and make these so much a part of their life, that they shall practice them as long as they live (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8153, Volume 6040, File 160-4, pt 1, Extract - Report of F. E. Pitts [1923]).

The schools were to prepare the students for a new way of living, the Euro-Canadian way.

**Care and Treatment of the Students**

**Manual Labour**

In many schools, at one period or another, vocational training was reduced to manual labour. In devising an agreement as to how the new Presbyterian boarding school should be run, the Ojibwa of the Shoal Lake region included a clause which stated that young children should not be required to perform heavy work and also that the larger children must attend school at least half the day (Freeman, 2000: 378). This indicates that the fact that residential school students were often required to perform strenuous work was common knowledge among Aboriginal peoples. Walter McLaren, principal of Birtle and Presbyterian Church’s Superintendent of Indian Missions and Schools, cited manual labour as the reason why Aboriginal parents were requesting day schools and also admitted that even at his school, the children were not getting a proper scholastic education:

The children are made a means to the end. The Indians perceive this and the demand for day schools is growing as a result. They see too often the interests of their children’s English education are sacrificed because the children are useful to relieve the situation about the school or farm. I know boys and girls who after ten years in our schools[,] Birtle included - cannot read beyond the second reader, cannot write a decent letter (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 146, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Farquharson, 2 May 1912).

Flora Henderson, who felt that too much work was expected of her as matron, also argued
that the female students of Crowstand were worked too hard: “I feel that the girls are made drudges of” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1110-1111, Flora Henderson to Baird, 16 May 1895). Sara Laidlaw did not hide the fact that the children of Portage did the majority of the household work: “... all the washing, ironing, mending, darning, cooking and baking is done by a few girls not over fifteen years of age. The baking of bread consists of about seventy loaves per week. Take out of the day four hours in which the children are taught a common school education and you will see what a busy life these children lead” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1071-1078, “Mission Work Among the Sioux” by Miss Laidlaw, [Jan 1896]). The Department’s Inspector of Indian Agencies remonstrated Birtle principal Crawford for his treatment of the boys: “There are only four boys in the school fit for heavy work (even these are small) they are certainly given too much heavy work and hardship” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). Yet, due to an inadequate number of staff, school management often found giving students manual labour responsibilities to be a necessity.

Medical Treatment

Caring for sick children was an all too familiar part of the boarding school experience for many staff members. Epidemics of contagious diseases, such as measles, whooping cough and influenza, ran their course through such schools, contributing to the physical and emotional strain already experienced by staff members. In the midst of a siege of whooping cough at the Birtle school, Annie McLaren was just thankful that before it appeared, the students had had enough time to recover from the measles (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 930-932, Annie McLaren to Prof Baird, 15 Dec 1896). Similarly, in 1899, the
Portage school was ravaged by whooping cough, and soon after, many children took sick with the measles. In fact the school had to be quarantined for over a month (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1433, Report of the Portage la Prairie School, for quarter ending Dec 31 1899 by Annie Fraser). Neil Gilmour’s distress was evident in a letter communicating an influenza outbreak at the Crowstand school: “We are having quite a serious time with our epidemic of La Grippe. Have had as many as 30 children in bed at once, and very sick. A dozen children crying at once with ear-ache. It will likely soon run its course now, but it does not, while it lasts, help in lightening the work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 26, N. Gilmour to McKay, 26 Jun 1901). In 1920, influenza struck the Birtle school: fifty-three students were in bed sick, as were two staff members (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, G. H. Wheatley to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 16 Feb 1920).

There were also tubercular symptoms and other ailments which required attention on a daily basis. Scrofula, the inflammation of the lymph glands, a symptom of tuberculosis, was common among boarding school children in the time period. In fact, Kate Gillespie noted that “Scrofula seems to be in every one of them” and stressed that it was “no small task to dress all their sores every day” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Vol 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 75). Likewise, Portage principal, Annie Fraser, was thankful for the rolls of soft cotton she received, as there were “always so many sores to dress.” She added that at that time, there were five students with sores who required “great attention” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1896, Vol. 14 No. 8, letter by Annie Fraser, dated 22 Oct 1896, 219).
Until nurses were hired, either temporarily during outbreaks or permanently, other staff were required to care for these sick children. At the Crowstand school, staff members took turns sitting up throughout the night with an ill boy for three weeks until he was sent to his uncle’s, presumably to die (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1390-1391, Miss M. McIlwaine to Professor Baird, 14 Apr 1897). In 1906, for at least two months, two women employed at the Crowstand school alternated twenty-four hour shifts caring for a dying girl. For each, the twenty-four hours off was not a rest but rather was occupied with other necessary work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 83, McWhinney to Dr. MacKay, 29 Mar 1906). After the parents of a sick boy, a student at the Crowstand school, removed their son from the school, Rev. Laird visited him frequently, often bringing with him a treat that had been prepared by the teacher. Laird expressed sympathy: “Poor boy, I think he realizes he is not to get better” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Aug 1891, Vol. 8 No. 4, letter by Rev George A Laird, dated 29 Jun 1891, p. 78).

Unfortunately there were situations in which sick children did not always receive the needed medical treatment. A medical doctor inspected the Crowstand school in 1894, and found that some children had been neglected in this regard. For instance, two children had ulcers which required dressings every day, whom according to the doctor, had not received their treatment for several days. Also, three students suffering from chronic nasal catarrh had not received treatment on the day of his visit and he warned that “very unsatisfactory results are the best that can be looked for in cases wherein the treatment prescribed is not regularly followed” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 922, A. E. Forget to Rev. A. B. Baird, 3 Dec 1894). Under staffing of such schools may have been, at least in part, to
blame for such neglect.

*Coping with the Death of a Student*

For some boarding school students, serious illnesses proved fatal. Dealing with the death of a student could be a heartrending and unnerving experience for staff members. Annie McLaren grieved the loss of a young male pupil at the Birtle school:

> We miss him sadly, the dear little fellow, but I trust he has indeed got a home now. It was amazing the strides he made the last few weeks of his life. He told me as soon as I returned from the East that I would have him but a short time. It is the very pleasantest [sic] recollection of my whole life the care and memory of this little boy. He had no pain, just got weaker and weaker day by day (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Feb 1890, Vol. 6 No. 10, letter by Miss McLaren, dated 29 Nov 1889, p. 7).

For Bessie Walker, the quickness at which the Portage school lost one of their students was a shocking ordeal: “One of our little girls died a few weeks ago. She was taken home to spend Christmas, and had not returned when she fell ill, her sickness only lasted a few hours; it was hard to believe that one of our number was taken from us, with so little warning” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jun 1890, Vol. 7 No. 2, by Miss Walker, 6 Mar 1890, p. 14). An assistant matron of the Birtle school, Tillie McLeod, mourned the loss of one of their younger students: “...one of our little boys, it was very sad to see him fade away before our eyes and not able to do any thing for him, he was so bright and patient to the end and died believing that he was going ‘home to Jesus’” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 674, Y. McLeod to Baird, 18 May 1898). This sense of relief due to the deceased child having expressed a belief and trust in Jesus Christ was articulated in other, similar letters by staff.

Accidental deaths also occurred at these schools. In November 1893, three boys, students at the Birtle school, died after falling through the ice on the nearby river. Losing
three children at once was particularly trying for the staff and the other students. The matron, Annie McLaren, explained how the boys were missed: "Now that the excitement and confusion is all past we miss the boys at every turn. Their places at the table happened to be side by side and it leaves a great blank there. When I call the boys in the morning and and [sic] when I put them to bed at night they are missing" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 481-484, Annie McLaren to Baird, 30 Nov 1893).

Conduct, Discipline and Punishment

Another challenging aspect of boarding school work was in maintaining discipline and obedience. An Aboriginal child attending school for the first time, to whom the classroom was a foreign place, would naturally find the confinement to a desk for an extended period a difficult task. Yet, it was believed that a strict regimen was necessary to keep order in the schools. The opinion of long time principal Rev. Hendry was common: "I believe in being extremely exact and methodical with the Indian children as their life and mode of living has been the very opposite. There should be a specified time set for every work the child does and I would insist upon it being done and properly done in that time" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 179-180, W. A. Hendry to Baird, 7 Dec 1897).

Rev. Laird of the Crowstand school contended that the systematic, regulated nature of the boarding school quickly resulted in improvements in the children's conduct: "It is surprising what an effect discipline of this kind produces in a short time. They soon learn respect both for themselves and their teachers. Obedience is secured not altogether through fear, but because it is felt a duty to obey, and becoming behaviour takes the place of rude impertinence" (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jun 1889, Vol. 6 No. 2, Statement of

However, the behaviour of the children at the Crowstand school was not perfect. When the children returned from a holiday at Christmas time, the teacher had some trouble controlling the children: “The children are very restless and inattentive and it takes a great deal of strength and patience to control them” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 275-278, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 1 Jan 1890). Laird also admitted that he had to exercise a degree of tolerance: “Of course they make a great deal of noise, and tax our patience at times pretty severely but this is expected.” Yet, he was pleased with their general behaviour: “Their deportment, on the whole, affords me much satisfaction. They always render a cheerful obedience, and do any work which is assigned them; they are for the most part diligent at their lessons, and their improvement in manners and general intelligence is very gratifying” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Oct 1890, Vol. 7 No. 6, letter by Rev. Geo Laird, dated 25 Feb 1890, p. 15). After having been at the school for close to two years, May Armstrong claimed that her students, both male and female, were as “orderly as the average white school children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1257-1259, E. M. Armstrong to Rev. Baird, 19 Aug 1891). Taken together, these various letters tend to indicate a general improvement in student conduct over time.

In his report to the WMS in 1914, Rev. Hendry wrote favourably, as he often had, about the general conduct of the Portage pupils: “The discipline of the school has been good and not once has it been necessary to resort to severe punishment. The children have cooperated with their teachers and have performed all their duties in a cheerful manner, always anxious to do their best” (First AR WMS PCC. 1914-1915, p. 63). The
following year was a somewhat different matter, yet the frequency of punishment did not increase. Hendry explained: "The discipline has not been so easy as formerly, owing to our large increase of new pupils, and an inexperienced staff. We have had to do no punishing of any account but a great deal of checking, and have been ever on the go. The next year will be very different, since they will come in after holidays knowing a few rules, and will take their places rapidly" (Second AR WMS PCC. 1915, p. 90). Such variations in the conduct of students over time were among the ups and downs of the boarding school employee.

The most common types of student insubordination at these four Presbyterian schools were truancy and immorality. Having students runaway was a problem in all such residential schools. Many students likely left because of homesickness, and others may have wanted to escape the confines of a highly structured system. Rev. Dodds of the Cecilia Jeffrey school found this to be the case. He wrote, "Threats to run away are quite common already among the younger pupils, if they are subjected to discipline or control [sic], or if any restraint is put upon them" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to R. S. McKenzie, 12 Mar 1917). One DIA official was of the opinion that students would only run away if they were not properly cared for: "As far as truancy is concerned this is a matter in which the school is primarily responsible. Where conditions are congenial it is found that truancy does not exist" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. D. Iverach, 24 Nov 1913).

Most principals experienced at least the occasional runaway. On the other hand, some principals experienced a relatively large number of runaways, sometimes in a short period
of time. In the first few months of 1917, the Cecilia Jeffrey school, under Rev. Dodds, had many students who left the school on their own volition. In January, several students ran away (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract of Report of Inspector Semmens on the CJ BS, dated 22 Jan 1917). Then, in February, four of the oldest boys ran, followed by four more boys and then four of the big girls also ran absconded (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, R. S. McKenzie to the Secretary DIA, 15 Mar 1917). When one or more children escaped from a school, upon detection, the principal would attempt to catch up with them before they reached home and return them to the school. In situations in which the runaways were allowed to reach home, sometimes they would be “shielded and retained” by the parents (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract of Report of Inspector Semmens on the CJ BS, dated 22 Jan 1917). Other times, the principal would be assisted by the parents, as they would return their child to the school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Duncan C Scott to the Schools Branch, 26 Mar 1917; UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1071-1078, “Mission Work Among the Sioux” by Miss Laidlaw). There were no reported cases of children being physically hurt as a result of running from these four Presbyterian schools, yet in other schools, some students did incur physical harm and even death in the course of attempting to escape from a residential school (see Milloy, 1999: 142-143) For principals, runaways were an additional worry as it gave the impression, true or not, that the students were ill-treated and therefore harmed recruitment efforts.

Another common impropriety was sexual immorality among students. Typically, this
entailed late night visits made by some male pupils to the girls’ dormitory. In general, male and female students were segregated in residential schools and such secret meetings between the sexes, in the dormitories or elsewhere, were definitely against the rules. One of the ladies on the staff of the Cecilia Jeffrey school had taken some of the female students for a walk and two of the girls asked to return to the school, but instead went some distance into the woods in order to meet with two boys. These girls were considered to have “broken the laws of the School in a very serious way” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, John Semmens to Duncan C. Scott, 10 Sep 1915). If the girls had not been orphans, they would have been expelled from the school.

Based on official correspondence, such cases appear to have been most prevalent at the Crowstand school. In 1891, scandalous conditions were revealed as older male students as well as young men from the reserve were visiting the girls’ dormitory. The inspector of Protestant Indian schools reported that he had knowledge of at least fourteen such incidents involving two males who did not attend the school and five male students and eight females. Situations of this nature served to reduce parental confidence in the school. The inspector wrote:

It is not to be wondered at that the Indians regard the school with the gravest disfavour when it is remembered that the pupils concerned in these immoral occurrences were entrusted to the guardianship of the school authorities when of most tender years, and as one of them said to me, “they have been allowed to grow up in wickedness which their mothers might have protected them from” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1467-1469, J. Ansdell Macrae to [Baird], 26 Dec 1891).

Years later, also at Crowstand, Rev. McWhinney was required to deal with cases of
immorality more often than any principal would have liked. In 1907, some students, male
and female, managed to visit the dorm of the opposite sex. McWhinney employed
unspecified punishment and individual talks in order to illustrate the wrong done by their
actions. As well, extra precautions, such as fixing the windows so that they could only
rise a short distance, were taken. Some boys, not all students, with the aid of a
screwdriver, were able to pry the windows open, allowing more nocturnal visits to occur.
McWhinney discovered the misconduct, punished the boys involved and again unspecified
“extra precautions” were taken (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 99, Wm
McWhinney to Dr. Farquarson, 8 Jul 1907).

In his book, *Shingwauk’s Vision*, Miller (1996a: 234) acknowledged the tendency on
the part of missionaries to assume that Aboriginal people in general, and particularly those
students in their teenage years, were more prone to sexual licentiousness than Euro-
Canadians. In an attempt to minimize their own responsibility, principals were inclined to
attribute such acts to the students’ lack of sexual restraint. McWhinney, undermining
accusations of inadequate supervision, contended that sexual impropriety occurred at
many residential schools but were not reported. As well, he pointed to the students’
supposed pronounced libidinous:

> Occurrences like this happen occasionally I believe in every Indian boarding School. In
our case these are always reported while in other schools the Agents there take the
view that no good can come of reporting them and they are kept quiet. Indian boys
and girls have strong sexual passions. They know of cases of loose conduct on the
part of their own fathers and mothers and they think lightly of these offences. In
boarding Schools where there are both sexes the temptation is strong because of their
seeing each other every day. The burden of this responsibility of keeping things right
has been a heavy one ... (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt.
1, W. McWhinney to Dr. Grant, 15 Aug 1914).
Furthermore, he suggested that the only sure method of preventing such acts from occurring, the boys and girls should attend separate schools. After two Birtle students became pregnant, principal David Iverach associated their pregnancies with a supposed weakness of theirs: “The problem of safeguarding the girls both in and out of school is always a difficult one in Indian schools, more especially as little or no dependence can be put in the girls themselves” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Copy - David Iverach to Rev. A. S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). In order to combat the problem at the school, a strong fence was constructed around the girls’ playground.

Occasionally, like Iverach, principals found themselves in the predicament of having to cope with a pregnant student. In the case of the two young women mentioned, Iverach consented to the marriage of one couple, but believed that the other girl had actually become pregnant during holidays on the reserve, and thus, a male student could not have been the father, as she had claimed. He maintained that based on the time of the child’s birth, that his suspicions had been correct and he did not consent to that marriage (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Copy - David Iverach to Rev. A. S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). Rev. Hendry discovered that one of his pupils, a fifteen year old, had become pregnant after she returned from holidays (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, W. A. Hendry to The Sec DIA, 3 Dec 1918). The man responsible was charged under the criminal code and according to Hendry, the authorities intended on making this man pay for the keep of the child. As advised by a DIA official, the girl was discharged from the school and sent home to her mother to be cared for. Yet, Hendry did not think the discharge should be permanent: “Regarding the discharge of the girl I beg to
ask the Dept if they think it wise to bring the girl back to school after the child is born and leave her here until she is nineteen or twenty yrs old. If she leaves sch now, not yet sixteen yrs old and in this condition, she will not have a fair chance to keep right” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Rev. W. A. Hendry to the Secretary, DIA, 6 Jan 1919). He wanted to do what was best for the girl and her future, although there is no evidence that she was ever consulted. In the early 1920's, some older students at the Cecilia Jeffrey school were in the practice of having sexual relations with fellow students for the purpose of claiming the female had become impregnated, resulting in the male and female being discharged from the school. Mr. Cookson, the principal, caught on when one student claimed to be pregnant, but Cookson later discovered she was not with child. He also found out that this same student had tried this twice prior. He also stated that this was common among the elder students, who simply wished to be discharged from the school. As a result, Cookson threatened the older boys at the school that for any such situations in the future would result in a prison term, since, he wrote, “such an action on their part is a criminal offence against the most sacred law of nature and we must teach our Indian boys and girls the value of that law as far as it effects the development of true womanhood” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol 6187, File 461-5, pt 2, W. J. Cookson to Captain Edwards, 2 Feb 1923).

Other transgressions with which staff had to deal included theft and attempted arson. It seems that minor stealing was a problem at Crowstand in the early 1890's. Principal Laird revealed his distrust: “The children show a tendency to unfaithfulness in little things[,] little thefts and lies. We cannot trust them” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1333-1334,
Geo. A. Laird to Mr. Baird, 11 Sep 1891). Rev. Dodds reported that some students of the Cecilia Jeffrey school had broken into locked rooms in the school building and stole certain items (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to R. S. McKenzie, 12 Mar 1917). Immorality was not the only type of misbehaviour McWhinney had wrestled with at Crowstand. On more than one occasion, students attempted to set the school on fire. Two of the boys confided that they wanted to burn down the school so that “they could all go home” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1 pt. 1, McWhinney to Mr. W. G. Blewett, 18 Mar 1913). McWhinney stated that he had tried reason, kindness and punishment, but all seemed to fail. He contemplated expelling the guilty boys, but decided against it, as this was exactly what they wanted.

One of the latent functions of residential schooling for Aboriginal children was to inculcate an obedience to authority. The saying “spare the rod and spoil the child” reflects Victorian sensibilities towards children and punishment. Therefore, it was believed that those who broke school regulations had to be disciplined. Existing literature has revealed countless accounts of excessive corporal punishment, despite the fact that this type of punishment was only to be used in exceptional circumstances. Birtle principal William Small admitted that it was “necessary occasionally to resort to severe corporal punishment” (CSP 1898, DIA AR Year Ended 30th Jun 1897, p. 248). George McLaren contended that severe punishments were not necessary at the Birtle school, yet conceded that some children had received “a few lashes with a strap” and had been flogged with “a small raw hide, when the guilty person was large and the offence serious such as persisting
in running away” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1955-1959, G. G. McLaren to Rev. Baird, 16 Nov 1892). Chief Red Sky of Shoal Lake accused principal Dodds of having cruelly beaten some of the students at the Cecilia Jeffrey school. Dodds confessed to having resorted to corporal punishment, yet maintained it was not severe. The secretary of the DIA pointed out that regardless whether the punishment was severe or not, it was having an adverse affect on the reputation of the school: “... it sets the Indians against the school and it would be better if the Principal would adopt some other means of maintaining discipline in the future” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. John Semmens, 31 Jul 1914).

Some principals stated that only very minimal punishment was required. In 1896, Annie Fraser revealed that circumstances called for punishment only “of the lightest form” (CSP 1897, AR DIA 1896 for Year Ended 30th June 1896, p. 320). When the Cecilia Jeffrey school had been open for less than one year, the matron disclosed that no corporal punishment had been necessary; disobedience was dealt with by a child being sent up to the dormitory (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 40, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 25 Aug 1902). In 1914, Rev. Hendry of the Portage school contended that the only type of punishment necessary was isolation for one to two hours (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914, p. 54).

Some principals sought innovative solutions to rule breaking. In order to curtail the larger boys from leaving the Crowstand school on the weekends without permission, George Laird planned to inflict penalties as well as organize special events so as to make Friday evenings and Saturdays more attractive to all students (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1331-
1332, Geo. A. Laird to Prof. Hart, 26 Oct 1891). When the DIA inspector criticized Birtle’s principal Crawford for taking the students out skating in the evening, Crawford defended the practice, arguing that it aided in reducing the need for corporal punishment: “I have always tried to lead the children rather than drive them and when a little thing as a skate one night a week, will help me to dispense with whipping I don’t want to give it up ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, E. H. Crawford to Dr. McKay, 10 Jun 1904).

In situations in which principals deemed it necessary to use corporal punishment, a principal found him or herself between a rock and a hard place. Corporal punishment was thought among Euro-Canadians to be an appropriate and effective way to discipline children. When faced with disobedience, particularly for serious infractions or repeat offenses, principals turned to the punishment they knew: corporal punishment. However, Aboriginal parents were staunchly opposed to the use physical punishment on their children. The decision to maintain discipline and order using such methods would often create dissatisfaction among the students’ parents. This in turn would cause problems in keeping up enrolment and for future recruitment endeavours.

Acknowledgment of Heroics

At least in some cases, those worthy of praise received it. A student of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Alec, was considered responsible for saving the life of another person. Alec and a Mr. Aitkin were crossing the lake on skates, when both broke through the ice. Alec succeeded in getting onto the ice and after catching his breath, he extended his hand and managed to pull Mr. Aitkin from the freezing water. Mr. Aitkin was sure that without
this assistance, he would not have been able to save himself from drowning. Principal Dodds explained this story to the Indian agent, wishing that the act of courage might be recognized by the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission. Dodds believed the boy deserved acknowledgment for his “extraordinary coolness, courage and determination” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt. 1, F. T. Dodds to R. S. McKenzie, 12 Dec 1913).

Children Given Classroom Responsibilities

When short staffed or when temporary help was needed, staff often relied on students to fill in. For a few months in 1897, the Crowstand school under Neil Gilmour was without a teacher. With Gilmour’s assistance, two of the larger pupils were put in charge of the classroom for a few weeks (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1824-1839, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 26 Aug 1897). Similarly, when Sara Laidlaw was feeling under the weather, a few of the larger girls were given the responsibility of running the classroom, and they “got along very nicely” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2024-2044, Sara Laidlaw to Baird, 29 Oct 1897). When Marjorie McIlwaine was planning her weekly afternoon visits to meet with the women on the Coté reserve, she decided to make arrangements for one of the female pupils to take charge of the sewing room in her absence, which she believed would “be no disadvantage” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1887-1888, Marjorie McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 23 Sep 1897). Many staff entrusted some children with taking on such responsible roles, yet few school graduates were employed on a permanent basis in the schools.

Holidays for Students

One of the reasons government and church officials favoured residential schools over
day schools was that day school education allowed the continuance of cultural
transmission from parents to their children and thus hindered the children’s assimilation
into Euro-Canadian society. It was also a point of contention among these same officials
whether the students of residential schools should even be allowed to go home for a
couple of weeks in the summer. For instance, in 1894, Annie McLaren of the Birtle
school disclosed that the government no longer approved of the children being sent home
for summer holidays; the classroom was closed, but the children were to remain at the
school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 664, Annie McLaren to Baird, 14 Jul 1894). In contrast to
the view of government and church officials, staff members, particularly in the first
decades of the Presbyterian boarding schools, argued that holidays were, in general,
beneficial for the students and for their conduct in school upon return. Maggie Nicoll
claimed that the Cecilia Jeffrey students returned to school in good spirits and ready to get
to work. The only problem was that for a time they were reluctant to speak English, but
this was short lived (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 40, Maggie Nicoll to Dr.
Mackay, 25 Aug 1902). Sara Laidlaw reported that “all the children being glad to return
to school after holidays and more interested than ever in their work” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G

George McLaren explained why he was supportive of allowing his students to go
home twice a year:

I have noticed that it often does considerable good to allow the children to go home, when they return to school they are more contented and during their visit home they often do good work for the school by giving a correct report of the work done there and of the treatment they receive. They are nearly always quite ready to return and that convinces others when nothing else will that the school is not as bad a place as
some would like to believe (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 423-424, Geo. G. McLaren to Baird, 5 May 1890).

Similarly, Bessie Walker contended that visits home tended to “help in gaining other members of the family to attend School.” Furthermore, Walker expressed a thankfulness that one girl’s trip home brought about in her an aversion towards her home life: “we feel thankful for it, as it cured her of her fondness for teepe [sic] life, she refuses now to go, even when coaxed by her parents and unless we accompany her, she will not go near the teepes” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 411-413, Bessie Walker to Baird, 1 May 1890). Neil Gilmour accompanied some Birtle students to their home reserve for two weeks and he was similarly pleased when a few students wished to return to the school early: “… it was rather gratifying to have some of the larger girls express a willingness and even a desire to return to the school before the two weeks were up. I took it as evidence that the unthrifty, comfortless homes on the reserve were becoming distasteful to them, and that they were beginning to know the advantages of civilization” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Sep 1895, Vol. 12 No. 5, letter by Mr. Gilmour, dated 27 Jul 1895, p. 129). This viewpoint was not unusual, but an alarming one. In essence, those with this opinion wanted the students to be repulsed by the life to which they would eventually be required to return. Unlike most staff members, Rev. McWhinney contended that student vacations home were essential for the very fact that most students did return to the reserve:

Many persons consider these vacations periods and the bringing the children under the adverse influences of the reserve life a mistake. I do not think so. Sooner or later these children will go home and remain permanently on the reserve. If kept altogether from home influence for a number of years their progress will be accelerated, but they will not be prepared for the struggle with its old life. The change is so great that despondency takes hold of the graduate and the downward movement sets in rapidly.
On the other hand if the pupils come in contact every year with what they must afterwards live amongst, the struggle is spread over the time when they have the upward forces to assist them. Their progress may be somewhat hindered, but they will be made stronger characters, while they carry with them the influences which work for higher and better things (Twenty-seventh AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1902-1903, p. 49).

His attitude also reflects the move away from preparing children to work as tradespeople and servants amongst Euro-Canadians, towards an acknowledgment that most graduates returned to their birth community.

**Emotional Bonds Between Staff and Students**

Most of the Presbyterian staff members included in this study expressed affection for their students. Negative comments such as the following by Rev. Laird were rare, at least in official correspondence: “we deplore many things about these children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1333-1334, Geo. A. Laird to Mr. Baird, 11 Sep 1891). After a short time teaching the students of the Portage school, Sara Laidlaw wrote that she had “grown to be very fond of all the children” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Oct 1893, Vol. 10 No. 6, letter by Miss Laidlaw, dated 24 Aug 1893, p. 157). Likewise, Rev. McWhinney shared that he quickly became attached to the students: “I have already found much that is pleasant in my dealings with the children and enjoy the work with them” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 36, W. McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 4 Apr 1902). In fact, when resigning, many female staff members asserted that it was the children they would miss the most. When Mary MacIntosh felt compelled to resign from Crowstand due to the physical demanding nature of the work, she requested a position at a day school. She cited the students as her reason for wanting to remain in the same line of work: “I do think a great deal of the Indian children and would feel badly to leave the Indian mission work” (UCA-
When an unpopular Crowstand principal was replaced, Florence McLean was happy to be able to withdraw her resignation because “it would be very hard for me to part with my dear little boys and girls” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1745-1746, Florence McLean to Rev. Baird, 28 Apr 1892). Leaving Crowstand school was difficult for Kate Gillespie: “Of course it will be a wrench to leave all the dear little friends ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1205-1206, Kate Gillespie to Baird, 9 Mar 1897). Flora Henderson put up a fight when her resignation was requested by the FMC: “I am strongly attached to the children and they are to me and I dearly love the work and do not want to leave” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1066-1068, Flora Henderson to Secretary of the Foreign Mission, Winnipeg, 18 Apr 1895). Maggie Nicoll departure from the Cecilia Jeffrey school was a difficult one: “it was one of the hardest things of my life to come away and leave [the students]” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 45, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. MacKay, 5 Jan 1903).

Favouritism

A favouritism for new and young students is evident in some letters written by staff members. In commenting about the newest member of the Portage school family, an eighteen month old boy, Sara Laidlaw described him as “the pet of the household” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Apr 1894, Vol. 10 No. 12, letter by Miss Laidlaw, dated 20 Feb 1894, p. 332). After Annie McLaren dedicated a whole paragraph on Birtle’s youngest pupil, a four year old girl, she justified this by writing, “she is the baby” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Aug 1895, Vol. 12 No. 4, letter by Miss McLaren, dated 16 May 1895, p. 103). In regards to newcomers, three little girls, Miss McLeod shared: “we all love them” (FMT,
WFMS, PCC, May 1898, Vol. 2 No. 1, letter by Miss McLeod, dated 3 Jan 1898, p. 18).

The extra love and attention bestowed on the new students would have mitigated the shock of transition for the young ones. On the other hand, preferential treatment of the young students may have resulted in a less hospitable environment for older students. For example, a Birtle principal charged that Annie McLaren had acted cool towards the older girls. Furthermore, he had observed that her favouritism resulted in neglect of others:

“She has three or four pets whom she hugs and cuddles and on whom she lavishes all her affection, and the rest are left out. She is altogether too [sic] partial and anything but fair.”

(UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Miss Craig, 28 Feb 1905).

Adoption and Marriage

In her study about female Methodist missionaries, Gagan (1992) found that while some of the women stationed in China had adopted orphan girls, those employed among Aboriginal nations in British Columbia and Alberta did not. Gagan explains this as an indication that the women working in Aboriginal missions rarely became attached to the children under their care. At least two Presbyterian workers in this study adopted an Aboriginal child. Miss E. C. Carson began at the Crowstand school in 1895 as the assistant matron. Shortly after, she was promoted to the position of matron. Three years later, Carson resigned on account of her upcoming marriage. The principal reported that one of the students, Rosy Brass, went with her and that Carson and her husband later adopted Rosy (FMT, WFMS, PCC, Sep 1898, Vol. 2 No. 5, letter by Neil Gilmour, dated June 30, 1898, p. 153). Neil Gilmour, possibly while teaching at the Regina Industrial
School, was granted guardianship of an Assiniboine girl named Wandah. While working at the Crowstand school, Gilmour asked for permission to go to Regina to pick the girl up, as she had been living with a Mr. and Mrs. McLeod there. He did not intend on keeping her at the school with him permanently, but rather wanted to find a home where she would be cared for and treated with respect:

It is my wish to find some nice family in some Ontario town, Christian people, with whom I could put her to live for a number of years, and be educated. I would of course pay for her. I would wish her to be treated not in any sense as an inferior, but just as the equal of the people with whom she lived. Perhaps you might learn of some one who would care to do a little missionary work of that sort, and if so I would be most thankful, to learn of it. In the meantime I wish to have her here with me (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1969-1971, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 14 Oct 1897).

There was no further information as to whether or not he later had this girl in his custody.

While the principal of the Birtle school, Walter McLaren married former student, Susette Blackbird. He was ostracized by staff and the mission board, but stood by his wife.

He pened a letter conveying his dismay regarding the discriminatory treatment him and his wife had received from the various Church committees:

I took a step further than many of my fellow Canadians and married a member of the Indian race. Some whose Christian profession should have taught them the essential equality of all peoples as followers of Christ have said and done things regarding this matter - that have hurt more than anything that has been done to me. It is a poor look out for the future of our church and of our Dominion - when the union of Christian peoples of different races is made a ground of offence. I am quite ready to bear any burden that may be laid at my door but I resent any attack made upon my wife as an indirect means of injuring me. There is no purer more unselfish Christian worker among the Indians than she and it has been her quiet endurance and her self-sacrificing devotion to the work of the school ... (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to R. P. MacKay, 16 Apr 1913).

*Maintaining Contact with Students*

Upon resignation, many boarding school employees severed their ties with the
communities in which they had worked. There were also those who maintained contact with former students. After leaving the Portage school, Annie Fraser returned to Portage la Prairie to spend most of her summer vacations with her sister. During Fraser’s stay, former students would visit her to reminisce about past times at the Portage school (Murray, [1936]: 88). After leaving the Crowstand school, Kate Gillespie taught at the Mistawasis day school and later was the head of the File Hills Boarding School for over six years. Gillespie resigned from this position when she got married. Gillespie’s wedding ceremony was performed at the File Hills school, and many of the guests were local Aboriginal people. Even while living in Regina and Ottawa, she kept in touch and continued friendships with her Aboriginal friends. The appreciation and gratitude of the File Hills people for all Mrs. Motherwell (nee Gillespie) had done for them over the years was evident at a celebration they planned for her on Mother’s Day, close to her eightieth birthday. She was invited to the newly constructed school building for a special ceremony (Dobbin, 1961). The continued close relationship between Mrs. Motherwell and the people of File Hills was a testament to her genuine interest in their spiritual and educational welfare.

Summary

Staff members may have despised aspects of the Aboriginal cultures and habits, but generally, they enjoyed their interactions with the students, their parents and others living in the surrounding Aboriginal communities.

The duties and responsibilities of boarding school staff involving Aboriginal adults and students reveals the diversity and demanding nature of the work. Work conditions,
particularly having an inadequate quantity of staff, sometimes prevented staff from providing adequate care of the students.
CHAPTER SIX

WORKING AND LIVING CONDITIONS

The residential school was a unique and challenging work environment. Many left family and friends and a more moderate climate, to a place where much, including the Aboriginal people and their culture, was foreign and new. The care of the students and indeed all the duties and responsibilities assigned to each staff member, seem all the more trying and stressful when considered within the context of the working conditions.

School Location

Due to the outlying location of some residential schools, men and women were often forced to forego the conveniences and social advantages of town or city life to which they were accustomed. They also left behind their circle of friends and family. Any loneliness or homesickness was compounded by the fact that interaction and communication with the outside, non-Aboriginal society was limited. Staff found themselves part of a small, closed community consisting only of coworkers and students. This was particularly true of the Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand schools.

The most remote school, Cecilia Jeffrey, was situated on the west side of Shoal Lake in Northwestern Ontario, near the Manitoba border and approximately forty-five miles southwest of the closest town, Kenora. The difficulty of mail retrieval for the school as described by a DIA inspector highlights the school’s outlying site: “At the present time a man with a pony and sleigh goes 20 miles [one way] to Ingolf station for the mails [sic] once a week” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract -
Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, dated 8 Feb 1919). Getting to or leaving this school was no easy matter regardless of season. When searching for a new farm instructor, the principal requested that the potential candidate be forewarned about the challenging modes of travel required: “You know of the difficulties of travel &c. I think it would be well if you could talk with Mr. Thomson about the trips with horse and dog train in severe weather, about the isolated situation and trips by water, by canoe, sail boat or [steamer]” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKitrick to Rev. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). In the case of medical emergencies, the school was hard to reach, and the nearest doctor was over forty miles away. The difficulty in recruiting qualified persons was attributed to the school’s location. The secretary of home missions, for example, blamed the school’s isolation when he experienced trouble in hiring a nurse: “We have tried in various directions to secure a graduate nurse, but so far have not succeeded. You understand nurses are very hard to get at the present time. Cecilia Jeffrey is a very isolated spot. This makes the position less attractive” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Secretary DIA, 23 Aug 1916). On the positive side, Rev. McKitrick contended that being in such an isolated location strengthened his faith in God: “My opinion regarding isolation is that if we have the right spirit it rather helps than hinders our nearness to our God and Saviour. Town and city life and civilization are not always helpful to spiritual life. One’s own want of harmony with God and His spirit should not be blamed on isolation or surroundings. I think nature helps us to draw near to God” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, McKitrick to MacKay, 14 Jul 1905).
The Crowstand Boarding School was located on the border of Coté's Reserve, about forty-five miles northeast of Yorkton, Saskatchewan. The closest non-Aboriginal community was the small town of Kamsack, close to four miles away. Staff rarely complained of the school's remoteness in official correspondence, perhaps because a distant posting was to be expected for those who offered themselves to mission work among Aboriginal people. One principal, Neil Gilmour, did, however, suggest that the problem in finding good workers, as at Cecilia Jeffrey school, lay in the locale of the school. He stated that this was particularly an issue in the case of farm instructors: “Our isolation, and great distance from town, make men dislike coming here” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 267-268, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 6 Jan 1898). In the case of an opening for an assistant matron, Gilmour emphasized that “Crowstand is a very out of the way place, and unless, one has some missionary spirit they will not be likely to remain very long” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H5-9, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 28 Oct 1897). Principal Gilmour associated a teacher's request to be transferred to the Regina Industrial School with a longing for the benefits of Euro-Canadian society: “I think Miss Petch would like to go to Regina and it would suit her. She is of a nature to need some variety. The sameness of the life away out here, so far from civilization, is wearing on her” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 24, Neil Gilmour to Rev. McKay, 30 Apr 1901). The difficulties in securing and keeping qualified staff reflects the unwillingness or inability of people to adapt to such isolation.

Employees in schools such as Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand were dependent on each other for company. Contact with other non-Aboriginal people was largely limited to the
occasional letter from a family member or friend. Gilmour asserted that it was particularly important for staff to get along in such a contained community:

Here at Crowstand, this harmony is particularly necessary. At Birtle or Portage La Prairie, where they are not cut off from the pleasure of society, it is not so bad, but with us, its almost as bad as being married. I mean we are so shut up with ourselves, that if a worker is out of harmony with the others, they are shut off from any social pleasure at all, and the position is unbearable, and the result, a resignation in a short time. The sacrifice a lady makes in coming to Crowstand, as compared with going to Birtle or P. La Prairie, is beyond comparison, ... (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Rev. McKay, 26 Jun 1901).

As Gilmour pointed out, the workers at the Birtle and Portage la Prairie schools had at least some degree of access to non-Aboriginal society.

The Birtle Boarding School was located less than one mile from the town its name bears. The preferable location of the Birtle school, relative to most other residential schools, did not eliminate feelings of loneliness. After a short time as principal of Birtle, Rev. McWhinney admitted feeling lonesome but also maintained that such emotions were minimized because his waking time was fully occupied: “I felt when I landed here as if I had entered something of a new world and for some time was quite lonely. But already I am getting quite fond of many of the children and have been so busy I have not had much chance of indulging my own feelings” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 34, W. McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 5 Feb 1902). Twelve years earlier, George McLaren echoed similar sentiments and expressed an appreciation for any mail received from friends: “Although the care of an Indian school is rather too busy a life to allow of a person getting lonesome, yet the patience is often sorely tried, and a letter from some of the friends at a distance helps greatly to cheer us up at times” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC,
Apr 1890, Vol. 6 No. 12, letter by G. G. McLaren, dated Jan 6, 1890: 10).

On the other hand, there is evidence that the staff members of Birtle school had access to some of the conveniences and amenities of town life. For instance, when a fire broke out in the basement of the school in March 1901, the staff were fortunate to receive assistance from the many town citizens who had hurried to the school in order to help extinguish the fire (NAC, RG10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, G. H. Wheatley to David Laird, 13 Mar 1901). Birtle’s principal from 1895 to 1901, Mr. Small, was able to participate with various sports teams in town (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Annie McLaren to Mrs. Shortreed, 24 Apr 1901). Mr. Small also implied in one of his letters that social engagements in nearby Birtle were quite common among staff (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 27, W. J. Small to Rev. McKay, 5 Jul 1901).

Personnel at the Portage school enjoyed similar advantages as those in Birtle. The original school building was located within the town’s limits, but later the school was relocated to a quarter of a mile east of Portage la Prairie. Occasionally in the correspondence by staff, there are indications which reveal a significant degree of community support, perhaps not from Portage residents in general, but from members of the local Presbyterian church. In 1893, a Mr. McKay accompanied and helped the ladies with their Sunday missionary duties. Sara Laidlaw, the school’s teacher, insisted that “the church owes to him their deepest gratitude” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Oct 1893, Vol. 10 No. 6, letter by Miss Laidlaw, dated 24 Aug 1893, p. 157). Similarly, for more than three years, a town merchant, Edward Brown, provided regular assistance on Sunday trips to
the Aboriginal village (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 12, A. Jeffrey to Rev. R. P. McKay, 3 Aug 1897). He also offered his home to Annie Fraser and Sara Laidlaw for brief opportunities of respite from their school responsibilities: "...he is very kind and good to us, his house is a refuge to us when tired and weary of the cares of a household of 21 children" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 9 Sara Laidlaw to Mr. McKay, 5 Feb 1895). During such breaks, the school could not have been left unsupervised and thus, one can assume that other local people also offered their support. Annie Fraser acknowledged and expressed appreciation for such local women who did help: "One of the greatest comforts we have in our work, is that we feel we have so many kind friends who are always ready to help us. We are indeed grateful to all the ladies who so kindly aid in the work. They can scarcely realize how valuable their assistance is" (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Dec 1896, Vol. 14 No. 8, letter by Miss Fraser, dated 22 Oct 1896, p. 220). When the school found itself in the predicament of being without a teacher temporarily, it was not uncommon for one of the public school teachers from Portage to come and act as a substitute (see, for example, UCA PCC BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 6, Andrew B. Baird to Mr. Cassels, 21 Jan 1893 and UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1745, Sara Laidlaw to Prof. Baird, 10 Aug 1897). Sometimes the school benefitted from the "considerable gifts of flour and beef" received from local farmers (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, pp 217-230, Baird to Mr. [illegible] 20 Jun 1897, pp. 217-230).

At the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey institutions, interactions of staff members were limited to their immediate colleagues and the Aboriginal children and adults. At the Birtle and Portage la Prairie schools, even occasional opportunities to get away from the school
and enjoy social intercourse with non-co-workers would have helped to ease the stresses that isolation could cause.

*Initiation into the Work*

Only a few of the staff members at the four schools had attended a training institute, where they would have been familiarized with their roles and the routines and difficulties of work among Aboriginal people. In preparation for her teaching position at Crowstand, Kate Gillespie turned to missionary publications of the Presbyterian church in order to gain a general knowledge of the work:

> Before coming here, I read a great many letters written by missionaries, and studied all their work until I thought I knew all about it, and can remember making the remark when I was leaving home, ‘that I wasn’t going into the work blindfold, anyway.’ I wasn’t either; but I have learned since the first of March that there are lots of things connected with it that I knew nothing about, and that I never would have known unless I had come into personal contact with it, and as yet I am only a beginner and have doubtless much more to learn (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Vol. 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 73).

Reading up on missionary work served as an introduction for Gillespie, but once in the field she discovered that much had to be learned via first hand experience. Naturally, rookies often turned to veteran missionaries for assistance and advice. Mr. Gandier of Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, for example, willingly availed himself to the advice of career missionary Rev. McKitrick (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902).

It was rare for a newcomer to receive much in the way of on-the-job training. In fact, often a resigned employee would have departed from the school prior to the arrival of his or her replacement. Upon returning to Crowstand school from a short summer vacation,
the principal, Rev. Whyte, was surprised and dismayed to discover that during his absence, the assistant matron had abandoned her post and left the school. Shortly after, the teacher also departed (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F319-326, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 25 Jul 1893). A similar situation arose a few years later, also at Crowstand, but under the administration of Neil Gilmour. The school was without a teacher for a few months, even though the previous one had given ample notice. When acknowledging that the sewing instructress’s request for a transfer to another school may have been approved, Gilmour appealed to Rev. Baird of the FMC that a replacement be sent before her departure: “In the event of her going I trust it will not be, that she will be removed until her successor is here. We have suffered quite enough in that way already” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 5-9, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 28 Oct 1897). Newcomers arriving under such circumstances would have had no one to show them the ropes. Many were forced to learn from their mistakes and thus the first few months would be particularly trying.

Some staff, who themselves had been compelled to learn much of their work by trial and error, were unwilling to put others through the same experience. When Bessie Walker resigned from the Portage school to accept a position at the Regina Industrial School, she was concerned about the new staff as the only other staff member, Annie Fraser, had proposed to leave the school at the same time. Walker was adamant that no one should be required to be initiated into the work as she had been:

... when Miss Fraser positively refused to remain if I left here at that time, that of course meant that the ones who came in, must without experience begin as I did, and I could not consciously accept the position for Regina and let another learn as I had to - the lessons were too hard, to be willing to let another learn them in the same way if it can be avoided (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1199-1201, Bessie Walker to Rev. Baird, 27 Jul
May Armstrong, formerly of Crowstand, was happy to be able to help introduce the new teacher to the work at the school in Alberni. She explained the challenges presented by a beginner in such a position:

I shall be pleased to assist Mr. Ross in whatever way I can to get acquainted with the work at Alberni. I very well understand the disadvantages under which he will begin his labor here — his ignorance of the children’s names, their attainments and disposition, his inexperience in class room management, his inability to speak or to understand the language of the people and the establishment of a new and better system of management in the department under his care, all makes his position, at the onset, a most trying one (UCA, PCC, BFM, Records Pertaining to Missions to the Aboriginal People in British Columbia, [MAPBC] Box 1 File 13, E. May Armstrong to MacKay, 23 Oct 1896).

Rev. McWhinney was not lucky enough to have someone introduce him to the work. He described some of his difficulties:

As soon as I reached the school I began getting the run of it and in a week had all the ordinary details of work pretty well in hand. ... It took me several days to get anything like the run of affairs in the school-room. There were three kinds of readers in use and the grading and work being all new I had to just begin and find out what they knew and what they did not know and from this I intend shortly to re-classify a part at least of the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 34, W. McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 5 Feb 1902).

Only seldom did neophytes receive on-the-job training, while others struggled, doing the best they were capable of.

The opening of a new school posed additional challenges and burdens, particularly on novice staff members. For instance, Mr. Gandier’s first experience with Aboriginal children was at the newly opened Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. The local missionary stressed the differences between new and established schools: “It is going to be no light task at first to break in the crude raw material we have for scholars and the staff should
not be short handed. In older schools where the larger scholars already have learned to keep house &c it is very different” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. R. P. MacKay, 30 Sep 1901). The Chief Inspector of Indian Agencies and Reserves for the Department described the added difficulties of starting a new school. He was discussing the Brandon Industrial School, yet many points are equally relevant in regards to any residential school:

Opening and successfully conducting a new Indian industrial school is a very much more difficult matter than to guide it along after it has been in operation several years. The pupils being all fresh from the reserves, and often from a nomadic life, do not know anything of civilized habits, and as all of them are ignorant alike, everything has to be taught by the teachers. The children cannot learn anything from each other of the nature required. Then a new staff, brought together from different walks in life, and placed in close and daily intimacy, some of them may for the first time be occupying such a position. All these different dispositions have to be harmonized by the principal (CSP 1897, DIA AR ending 30 Jun 1896, T. P. Wadsworth, pp. 368-369).

Too often a new staff member was given little or no introduction to the work. Rather, they were thrown into the position, expected to learn on their own. Their associates, otherwise occupied, could only help by periodically giving advice. New and longtime employees alike had to deal with the circumstances inherent in working in schools with very limited budgets.

**Financial Issues**

The chronic underfunding of the Aboriginal residential school system has been discussed in detail in existing literature, particularly by Miller (1996) and Milloy (1999). Financial support on behalf of the federal government for these schools was calculated on a system referred to as the per capita grant.

158
Per Capita Grant System

Although the financial responsibility for the schools was divided between the church and the government, the schools relied primarily on the per capita grants for their maintenance. Each school was given a yearly per pupil grant for up to an authorized number of students. The grant amount, as well as the maximum number of students allowed at each school, or "pupilage," was set by the Department. The total grant was calculated on the number of students enrolled (within the permitted number) on a quarterly basis. Each student below the allowed pupilage resulted in lost income, whereas any student above that number did not mean additional funds. This form of funding meant that principals were constantly concerned with recruiting new students and retaining those already enrolled.

Milloy (1999: 103) highlighted the insufficiency of the amounts allotted to Aboriginal schools by comparing them to those of other residential child-care institutions. In 1938, the average per capita grant for Aboriginal schools was $180, while the provincial government of Manitoba designated $642 per child yearly for the Manitoba School for the Deaf and $550 to the School for Boys. In the same year, the Community Chest sponsored the Knowles School for Boys in North Kildonan at $362 for each boy per annum. The differences are alarming. Needless to say, for most principals, keeping spending within the grant was a constant challenge and many simply could not do it.

The principals of the more remote schools experienced greater difficulty running their schools on the per capita grant because regional disparities were not taken into account when the DIA negotiated the per capita rates. As the administrator of the Crowstand
Boarding School, Neil Gilmour, argued that his school’s running costs were in excess of the Birtle school. He had managed the Birtle school for close to one year and thus had experienced the differences first hand. Gilmour contended that the fuel costs would be triple that of Birtle because of separate buildings to heat and the dilapidated state of the main building at Crowstand. He also stated that at Crowstand, there were only two treaty girls large enough to assist with any heavy work, compared to six at Birtle (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1754-1774, Neil Gilmour to Rev. Baird, 16 Aug 1897). About a year later, Gilmour suggested a number of factors that he felt should be considered if a re-arrangement of grants for maintenance of different schools were undertaken. These included the school’s distance from a market and railway, the number of Department grant earners allowed, the number of non-treaty children enrolled, the number of girls over fourteen years of age and the annual fuel bill. He added, that for the listed reasons, it would be unfair to compare the Crowstand school with the schools at Portage la Prairie, Birtle or Round Lake (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 758-763, Neil Gilmour to Rev. Baird, 1 Jun 1898). Two decades later, the continued failure to accommodate for local circumstances in the per capita grant system became a cause for concern for the principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, John Ross. He pointed out that his school was disadvantaged as compared to those located on land appropriate for agricultural use:

The grant per capita is not sufficient to meet our needs in buying food for the children. Considering also that we have very little land under cultivation to raise even roots and vegetables, we are not in a position to help out the extreme high cost of living very much. Almost all of our schools in the west are not so situated as most of their maintenance comes from produce of the land and also stock (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8152, Vol. 6039, File 160-1, pt 1, John T. Ross to Rev. C. Brouillet, 21 Jul 1920).
He further explained the school’s inferior position in a later letter:

The Mission property here comprising about 400 ac. is not agricultural land the greater part of it is rocky and the only land we have under cultivation is about 3 ac. simply sufficient for garden purposes. This coming winter I shall be obliged to buy all my feed for stock, ... In fact almost everything to support man and beast at the Mission must be bought and brought in from the outside (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8152, Vol. 6039, File 160-1, pt 1, Copy - John T. Ross to Board of Trade, Kenora 24 Aug 1920).

Most school principals struggled to stay within the budget imposed by the per capita grant system. Unique circumstances, such as distance from retail markets and the inability to grow crops, further disadvantaged some schools.

The modest amount of the grant was compounded with other problems. In some cases, the receipt of this funding was delayed by weeks or even months, making a difficult situation near impossible. For instance, it was the end of September and thus, the end of the third annual quarter, when Neil Gilmour complained that he had not yet even received the grant for the second quarter. In other words, he was waiting for six months worth of grant money. He conveyed his disappointment and frustration: “Surely it is not going too far when I say it is impossible to finance the school if this is to continue. I will have to adopt the method of borrowing money from the bank each quarter” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 21 Sep 1902). Even though Frank Dodds of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School had sent in his quarterly returns at the beginning of July, by the second week of August, he had not yet seen the grant funds. This lack of funds caused him “a good deal of inconvenience” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt. 1, F. T. Dodds to Secretary DIA, 10 Aug 1909).

Often principals were unfamiliar with the regulations, the ‘small print,’ pertaining to
the per capita grant. Principal Laird of the Crowstand school, for example, was surprised at the reduced amount when getting the grant for August to September:

I may state to the committee that the Indian Department has cut off the grant for board for the quarter ending 30th Sept only allowing for the time that the children were actually in school. The summer holidays occur in this quarter but I did not suppose that when the allowance of $60.00 per pupil per annum was made, that there would be any reduction because the children went to their homes during holidays allowed by the department. At any rate with this amount deducted it will be difficult to meet the expenses for board &c (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 257-258, Geo. A. Laird to Hart, 30 Dec 1889).

Likewise, Mr. Crawford of the Birtle school was dismayed to find that, for the same reason as above, an over payment of one hundred dollars had been made for the grant given in the September quarter. According to Crawford, having to repay the excess would not bode well for the school’s financial situation: “It has been such a hard winter that the loss of 100 dollars or more in our grant will be plainly evident in a deficit at the close of the year” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, E. H. Crawford to J. D. McLean, 13 Apr 1904).

The per capita grant was a method by which the Department limited government spending on residential schools. Inadequate staff at many schools was one of the many adverse byproducts of persistent under funding. School administrators were expected to make due with minimal staff.

*Understaffed and Overworked:* “There are about a hundred and one things waiting to be done and all at once; ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 527-529, May Armstrong to Baird, 26 July 1890)

Correspondence by staff members is replete with accounts of the stress and strain of overwork. As noted, it was not unheard of for a position to go unfilled for a matter of
weeks, or even months. Except in cases where a local Aboriginal man or woman could provide temporary assistance, one or more employees had to compensate by shouldering extra duties. When Crowstand endured several months without a teacher, principal Neil Gilmour, for a time, added the students’ academic training to his already demanding position (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1824-1839, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 26 Aug 1897).

Maintaining the full complement of workers was a continuing challenge for Neil Gilmour and the Crowstand school. In June of 1901, the school was without a matron even though the previous matron had made her intentions of resigning known in March. Rev. Gilmour also felt compelled to remind the head of the FMC that the teacher would soon be leaving. He stated his displeasure regarding the slow pace of hiring new staff:

... it would appear that on the 1st of June - the date of your letter, no steps at all had been taken, to secure a matron, and there must be a serious delay. A family of 46, and only one woman to take charge of everything is a serious matter. ... In the case of the teacher, I hope you realize that it is less than three weeks, now to the end of the quarter: the time set for Miss Petch to leave. Its almost four months since she sent in her resignation (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 26, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 12 Jun 1901).

Such delays resulted in extra work for the remaining employees.

Another circumstance under which staff found their work increased was when older pupils left the school either as the result of being transferred to an industrial school or reaching the age limit of eighteen. Students, particularly the larger ones, did much of the manual labour, indoors and outside. Mr. Small of Birtle school noted the additional duties given to the assistant matron due to the departure of two large girls: “Since Katie and Hattie, two of our ablest girls, went to Regina a great deal of extra work has fallen upon Miss McLeod who, it must be said, has borne it well and without complaint” (UCA-Wpg,
ABP, G 1385-1386, W. J. Small to Rev Prof Baird, 12 Apr 1897). When two of the oldest girls at Crowstand were transferred to an industrial school, Neil Gilmour questioned the ability of the present staff to keep up with the work without hiring an assistant seamstress:

As it is, they are taxed to the utmost to get the sewing done. ... Our two large treaty girls, Anna Bella Caldwell, and Charlotte Wilson, are to be discharged because of having reached the limit of age (18 years). We will have left then one big girl - Betsy Geuaille (16 years), one girl of 13 and another of 12 years neither of whom (the latter two) are strong (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 651-663, Neil Gilmour to Hart, 11 May 1898).

Having only one girl left to help the two women in charge of the domestic arrangements was considered a hardship at the Crowstand school again in 1901. Furthermore, this girl had only been at the school for three months and had only a rudimentary understanding of housework. Thus, Gilmour asked for a third woman to be employed for a couple of years, while the ten and eleven year old girls were trained and old enough to assist in the work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 9 Apr 1901).

There were situations in which the existing staff, considered to be a complete staff, was no longer able to run the school satisfactorily. In 1892, Miss Armstrong, teacher at Crowstand, requested an additional woman for the school’s staff, commenting that it was getting more difficult for her to maintain her current responsibilities: “But please do not leave us very long without help. I have not been so well lately as I was while in Winnipeg, and as my school is filling up again. I find that the work in the classroom taxes my strength to the utmost. I have not taken more of the sewing than caring for the girls clothes (20 girls) but even that part is not being done satisfactorily. ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP,

In 1901, a teacher who had spent four years at the Crowstand Boarding School and had recently left, attested to the need for an additional woman at that school:

The matron and assistant are very much over-worked. Too much of their time is occupied in the doing of work, and there is very little time left for teaching the children how to work. A certain amount of work has to be done each day, and each week, (the bread-baking, the washing, the ironing, the mending, &c) and if they took the time to teach the children how to do these things, the time would be gone, and the work not finished when it should be. Then you can imagine the confusion - Saturday night comes, and there are no mended garments for the little ones to put on, &c, &c. There is really too much work there for two women. Both of them are tired out at the end of each day. And when so much time and thought has to be given to the doing of work, which is only a means to an end, the chief object of the institution is crowded out, namely the spiritual training of the children (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, Josephine Petch to Dr. MacKay, 18 Dec 1901).

In this case, the women prioritized their responsibilities, which resulted in neglect of the girls' domestic training. An administrator of the Birtle Boarding School, Rev. McWhinney, in struggling to have the number of workers increased, pointed to the staffing situation of other schools:

Now from my six months experience I feel it is an impossibility to run this school as it should be run, with the present staff. I should have a man outside all the time and there should be another assistant inside. ... These changes would put us on a footing where we could do our work properly. ... We have, I think, the largest attendance and yet some of the others have a larger staff and Portage La Prairie with half the attendance has the same staff (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902).

In the fall of 1920, the teacher at Birtle was teaching a total of seventy children: twenty-six aged six to ten, thirty-eight from eleven to fifteen years old and six sixteen and seventeen years of age. Not surprisingly, in this case, the Department recommended that a second teacher be hired (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Asst
Deputy and Secretary, DIA to Rev. J. H. Edmison, 13 Sep 1920). Critical circumstances due to staff shortages often were necessary for the problem to be effectively remedied.

Due to chronic under staffing, toiling long hours was expected, if not an absolute necessity, at many residential schools. For instance, teaching at a boarding school did “not mean only five hours of teaching but more or less wear and tear from 7 o’clock in the morning until 9 ½ at night” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 257-258, Geo. A. Laird to Rev. Prof. Hart, 30 Dec 1889). When the hiring of an additional employee was proposed at the Crowstand school, the teacher, May Armstrong, hoped that the new person would be qualified to occasionally do some teaching: “There are days when I would be so thankful for even an hours relief from the school room and if the man were capable of taking charge there it would be a great comfort. ... It is too much for me to do successfully to have charge in the school room during school hours and from five to nine in the evening, and every day in the week” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1257-1259, E. M. Armstrong to Rev. Baird, 19 Aug 1891). Days were particularly long when sick children required around the clock attention. A Crowstand teacher, Mary MacIntosh, was often obligated to stay up all night to care for ill students, and was still expected to do the usual work the following day (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 152, Mary S. MacIntosh to Rev. Baird, 22 Mar 1893). Permanent nurses also experienced many sleepless nights. In 1922, the Cecilia Jeffreys school’s hospital had not been without patients for eight months, and Miss Reid endured “many months of broken sleep and [was] never off duty” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 part 1, Frank Edwards to Asst Deputy and Secretary DIA, 14 Jun 1922).
Working extended hours in an inadequately staffed school was complemented with infrequent respite. Sara Laidlaw requested some time off after having worked a full year with no holiday: "... I think possibly both teacher and scholars would do better winter work for a rest of ten days or two weeks" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 400, Sara Laidlaw to Baird, 9 Sep 1893). Principal Neil Gilmour suggested that Crowstand’s assistant matron be given a holiday while the children were at their homes, since she had "not had one day’s rest for a year and a half" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 27, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 4 Jul 1901). Similarly, Jeanie Gilmour worked for one and a half years without a day off. Due to construction workers being at the school over summer, for whom meals would have to be prepared, she asked for a break of only a few days so she could attend the agricultural exhibition in Winnipeg (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1326, Jeanie Gilmour to Baird, 17 Jun 1899). The most extreme example is that of Rev. McWhinney, who had worked for the FMC for over seven years without a furlough (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 131, Minutes of the Executive of the FMC of Synods of MB and NW, 20 Feb 1911). He initially wished to have three months off, but when he found it difficult to secure a substitute, he emphasized the need for even a brief holiday: "Perhaps the last five years have been as strenuous as any I shall ever see, and I think I shall do better work if I get away from it for even a short time" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 133, McWhinney to Dr. MacKay, 10 Apr 1911).

Even during the summer, when the children were allowed to visit their families for a few weeks, many staff remained at the school. George Laird of Crowstand noted the relative calmness at the school: "We are enjoying two weeks holidays at present. The
children have all gone home. The change is quite marked. Comparative quiet now reigns throughout the house” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Box E File 111-112, Geo. Laird to Hart, 11 May 1889). In 1893 at the Birtle school, George McLaren and his sister, Annie, remained at the school for most of the holidays. Time spent away from the school consisted of visits to reserves in order to recruit more children (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 381, Geo. G. McLaren to Hart, 29 Aug 1893). This was a break from the children, but often there was cleaning or handy work to be done around the school. During the summer holidays at the Birtle school, Rev. McWhinney commented, “... we are having a quieter time, but to me as yet it has brought only a change to outdoor work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902). After fulfilling school obligations, Mr. Gandier, principal of Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, actually found some spare time to enjoy fishing and canoeing while the children were away (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 40, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 15 Aug 1902). Holidays for some staff consisted of relief from the students, but did not allow for a chance to get away from the school.

In the time period examined, annual vacations were atypical for residential school employees. Yet, in exceptional cases, the missionary committees recognized the hard work of some women and actually encouraged them to take some time off. Matilda McLeod had laboured at the Birtle school for over a year without a break, when the head of the FMC in Winnipeg offered her some time off:

I have been sorry to hear from Mr. Frew that your strength has been somewhat severely taxed by your duties recently and that you are feeling rather worn out, and I write now without having said anything to the Committee about it, to ask you in a
quiet and confident way if there is anything we can do for you. If you would like a few weeks’ rest we will be happy to arrange it; or if as Mr. Frew suggested, you have thoughts of inviting your sister to come and spend a while at the school, we will be pleased to assist in defraying her expenses by paying at least the same sum as we would have given to the girls for extra work in the case of your absence. We recognize that your work is heavy and that your services have been willingly and ungrudgingly given, and both for your own sake and for the sake of our reputation, we do not want to allow you to go on until you break down on account of over exertion (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1941, [Baird] to Miss McLeod, 8 Oct 1897).

It was not until about five months later that she had an opportunity to get away from the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 674, Y. McLeod to Rev. Baird, 18 May 1898). It was the secretary of the WFMS who initiated this and other such offers. She had written Rev. Baird of the FMC in regards to Miss McLaren, the matron of Birtle: “It is a long time since she had a holiday and we are afraid she will brake [sic] down unless she has a change” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 902-910, C. M. Jeffrey to Baird, 22 Nov 1898). Less than a month later, Baird in turn suggested to Miss McLaren directly that she take a couple of months off: “It is a long time since you had a holiday and we would be entirely willing to have you take a good rest” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1038, [Baird] to Miss McLaren, 16 Dec 1898). Recommendations for a holiday were also made to Sara Laidlaw and Annie Fraser of the Portage school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1706-1711, C. M. Jeffrey to Baird, 5 Aug 1897; UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 505-506, Sara Laidlaw to Baird, 9 Apr 1898). It appears that such offers were limited to women in the late 1890's. Perhaps women were less likely to ask for time off themselves or the WFMS was concerned with keeping their best workers healthy. Missionary and later principal, Austin McKitrick, recognized the difficulty of the work expected of many of the female workers and their perseverance:

But perhaps what makes the difficulty is that more is laid on one person’s shoulder’s
[sic] than they are able to bear. I don’t know how it is in Crowstand, but I have seen good workers in other places leave the work because too much was expected of them, the human frame will only stand so much. ... But sometimes I think if we men were to put ourselves in the places of some overworked, tired-out women, we would perhaps not stand it so patiently as they often do (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. R. P. MacKay, 30 Sep 1901).

The high turnover rates among residential school employees was commonly blamed on the arduous work and long hours. A Department inspector cited “constant strain and overwork” as the cause of staff exodus from the school in northwest Ontario in 1916 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Assistant Deputy and Secretary to Rev. A. S. Grant, 11 Apr 1916). In 1925, the Department’s Superintendent of Education demanded a longer summer break for residential schools in order to allow each staff member a sufficient amount of time off:

At different times, representations have been made to the Dept that it would be advisable to increase the annual vacation at Indian residential schools to six weeks. Of late years, Mr. Inspector Cairns has urged a longer holiday and Rev. Father Guy, on behalf of R. C. principals, has made a similar request. ... A certain number of the staff have to be on duty at Indian residential schools at all times. If the vacation of the pupils is limited to one month, some of the officers do not receive any more than two weeks’ holiday (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8148, File 150-37, part 1, Memorandum, Russell T. Ferrier to Dr. Scott, 31 Mar 1925).

Adequate holidays facilitated an individual’s ability to endure the work for longer periods.

*Condition of Buildings and Lack of Equipment*

The lack of necessary funds sometimes resulted in minimal upkeep of buildings. Maintenance and repairs were too often set aside, resulting in unacceptable and sometimes deplorable conditions in which staff and students were required to work and live. Conditions which compromised the health and safety of the students’ included the lack of fire escapes connected with dormitories, the lack of isolation rooms for the sick and
overcrowding in dormitories, classrooms and dining rooms. Such circumstances also impaired the work of the staff members.

Poor sanitation and heating affected every one at the schools. Buildings in poor condition were unsuccessful in protecting inhabitants against the harsh winters. Bessie Walker warned that another winter in the Portage school building would be intolerable: “We must do something to improve the school building before another winter, we have suffered very much from the cold this winter” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 284, Bessie Walker to Rev. Baird, 25 Jan 1890). Neil Gilmour revealed the dire situation at the Crowstand school in the winter of 1897:

In the school room, already on a cold day, with the most fire we can crowd in the breath goes out in steam, and Miss Whyte has been wearing a fur coat in the classroom. In her bed room, water in a pitcher ... remains frozen all day. ... The building is unfit for habitation, nor do I think it can ever be made fit. Miss McLlwaine has had to move her sewing machine out of the sewing room, as it is impossible to get it warmed up enough, for the machinery to run, which means that it is quite unfit for a woman or girls to sit in at their work (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 157-160, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 2 Dec 1897).

Not only discomfort due to coldness, but also illness and death, were blamed upon deteriorating buildings. For Walter McLaren, principal of Birtle, there was no question about what was causing sickness, which in some cases proved fatal:

This school has an unenviable record for deaths from pneumonia and tuberculosis and I am convinced, the building as heated and laid out is to blame. The new plans provided a remedy for all these faults and would have prevented if carried out - what I feared all along would occur. ... You may not be aware that our Inspector Mr. S. J. Jackson reported most adversely upon the sanitary and heating appliances we now have and upon the draughty nature of our building (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, W. W. McLaren to Rev. MacKay, 26 Dec 1911).

Each of the four schools experienced serious problems with the degeneration of school
buildings. Neglect of buildings resulted in potentially dangerous conditions. In 1922, an Indian Agent disclosed the urgent need for major repairs at the Cecilia Jeffrey school: “Mr. W. J. Cookson, Principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey School has been in to see me, and informs me that the School is in a very bad state, owing to the foundations rotting away, heating not efficient, and sceptic tank not functioning properly” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6188, File 461-5, pt 2, Frank Edwards to Secretary, Dept of Indian Education, 17 Jan 1922). Even in 1908, when Cecilia Jeffrey was “comparatively a new school,” it was “badly in need of repairs for lack of attention” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. R. P. McKay, 4 Jun 1908).

Financial and time constraints resulted in the deterioration of buildings, which overtime required expeditious renovations in order to prevent foreseeable catastrophes. Some buildings were run down beyond repair and had to be replaced.

It is evident from letters written to their church superiors that staff regularly laboured without necessary or appropriate equipment and furnishings. Many of the items on their wish lists were for the care and protection of the children. Two of the ladies of the Crowstand school proposed to ask the FMC for some iron bed frames to replace the old ones, some of which were “home made and others held together by odd bits of lumber and so full of nail holes ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 527-528, May Armstrong to Mrs.Baird, 26 Jul 1890). Twelve new beds would have allowed them to dispose of the worst ones and provide beds for the children then sleeping on the floor. A few months earlier, May Armstrong also had asked to have a wringer washing machine purchased in order to lessen the work of the girls, as they were then doing all the washing by hand (UCA-Wpg, ABP,
Much of the clothing for the children was second hand clothing donated by the ladies of the WFMS, but too often the clothing was not suitable. Staff often emphasized the need for durable, warm clothing for the students (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E2s7-259, Geo. A. Laird to Prof Hart, 30 Dec 1889; UCA-Wpg, ABP, Geo. A. Laird to Rev. Baird, 23 Feb 1892).

Some of the requested equipment was to facilitate the work of the students as well as the staff. Kate Gillespie asked for a table, small chairs and some toys for her newly started kindergarten class at Crowstand (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F971-972, Kate Gillespie to Prof Baird, 9 Jan 1895). A sewing machine was requested by Principal Whyte, also of Crowstand, in order to reduce the work of the sewing instructress and the girls, who had been forced to do all the sewing by hand after the sewing machine broke down (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G1214-1218, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Baird, 12 Mar 1897). Walter McLaren, principal of the Birtle school, drew the Department's attention to the fact that the school's farm equipment was inadequate for the amount of land to be cultivated. Furthermore, he had contended that without proper equipment, little could be expected of the students and only a rudimentary knowledge could be imparted (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, part 1, G. H. Wheatley to Secretary DIA, 6 Apr 1911). The lack of appropriate equipment added to the stress of the work.

Nowhere was the struggle of dealing with inadequate implements, furnishings and buildings more pronounced than Neil Gilmour's first few months at the Crowstand school in July 1897. Much of the farming equipment, livestock and household items being used at the school prior to Gilmour's arrival were the personal possessions of his predecessor.
Thus, Gilmour started his administration of the school without some essential equipment. In the way of farm implements, the school was in need of a plow, harrows and a set of sleighs, "all implements which cannot be done without" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1670-1675, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 29 Jul 1897). A team of work animals and additional milk cows were also deemed mandatory by Gilmour. Miss Carson and Miss McIlwaine, Crowstand school staff, purchased dishes and laundry utensils from the former principal, so that their work could be carried on without interruption (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1931-1934, [Baird] to Mr. Gilmour, 6 Oct 1897). The school was also lacking the basic dining room furnishings of table, chairs and stove. Members of the FMC refused to furnish the livestock and implements, but later agreed to advance the funds for any items they considered necessary. The advanced funds were to be repaid over a number of months.

The main school building was not the haven of safety and comfort one would hope for in a home for Aboriginal children. On the contrary, the condition of the stone school building was deplorable. Gilmour provided a description:

It is not so much that the walls are setting, and cracking in every direction, but on one side at least it is gradually bulging out so that the wall and, inside [illegible] partitions have parted company. On the second floor, in three rooms all the plaster is off the ceiling, and in the others I suppose half is off on the walls, it is hanging here and there in bagging masses ready to fall off. I am told that last winter with the storm sash on, and everything as secure as possible, when there was a strong wind blowing, the draught in some of the rooms was such that lighted lamps were extinguished (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1688-1699, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 2 Aug 1897).

Representing the FMC, Rev. Baird proposed that the ceilings be mended using paper and cotton for a "cheap and satisfactory means of repair" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1931-1934, [Baird] to Mr. Gilmour, 6 Oct 1897). Gilmour opposed this proposition and stressed the
urgency of the situation:

Your proposal to put brown paper and cotton on, where plaster is off, I think is little good, so far as keeping out cold. The points of junction of plaster and paper cannot be so fixed as to keep out the wind that comes through the walls. But whatever is done should be done soon. I certainly think if you do not do more than you propose doing to secure the building, you will have cause for regret (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1824-1830, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 18 Aug 1897).

He later expressed a feeling of futility in regards to any improvements made to the building: “I cannot help feeling that the building is a wreck, and that however much is spent on repairs is almost the same as money thrown away” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 157-160, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 2 Dec 1897). In early February, the dead of winter, Gilmour reported that a furnace and ten stoves were in use in the stone building. Furthermore, he emphasized his belief that the building should simply be replaced, as it represented a threat to staff and students.

In numerous letters, Gilmour threatened to resign and begged and pleaded for the requisite equipment and for improvements to be made to the stone building. In addition, Gilmour inherited some unpaid bills and a negative bank account from the previous principal. The FMC added insult to injury by advising Gilmour to reduce costs, as the school’s finances had been excessive the previous few years: “We hope therefore that instead of increasing the expenditure now you will at an early date find some means by which, in various directions, it can be reduced... we will expect to find within a few months that you are able to recommend some alterations for the better” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1717-1719, Baird to Mr. Gilmour, 6 Aug 1897). Gilmour managed to persevere, continuing at Crowstand for over five years.
**Staff Accommodations**

Privacy was a rare commodity in residential schools. An individual’s private quarters were usually limited to a poorly furnished bedroom located in the main school building. In 1893, the Portage la Prairie “dwelling-house” contained two parlours and two bedrooms, one each for the principal and matron, as well as the livingroom, diningroom, children’s parlour, kitchen, bathrooms, the girls’ dormitories and a boys’ dormitory (CSP 1894, AR DIA For Year Ended June 30th 1893, p. 249).

In some cases, principals who had families were also relegated to reside in one of the main buildings. For example, in 1893, the bedrooms of Rev. Whyte, his wife and their children were located in a building which also housed the kitchen, laundry, pantries, students’ diningroom and bathrooms and the girls’ dormitory (CSP 1894, AR DIA For Year Ended June 30th 1893, p. 249). Over time, this arrangement became problematic for the Whyte family and Rev. Whyte requested to have their own house:

> We have not regretted having taken up our abode in the school but we feel that the time has come when we must consider our own family. And their health and proper training demands more separation from the Indian children and more privacy. We therefore ask the committee to consider the erection of a modest structure for our own use. We have not made any plans or estimates but would like a frame house of two flats with cellar, kitchen, dining room, study and four bedrooms (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 107-110, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 28 Feb 1896).

According to Whyte, they had been promised a house by the FMC as early as 1892 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1763-1766, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 2 May 1892). Their desire for a home of their own was never realized and this failure was cited as a partial reason for Whyte’s resignation (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1212-1218, C. W. Whyte to Prof Baird, 12 Mar 1897). Similarly, William Small, even after getting married and having a child, was
required to continue living in the school building. Small explained in his letter of resignation: “No married couple care to board for any length of time, but prefer to have their own home. I tried at the time of the erection of the new addition to have a kitchen and dining room but failed” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, W. J. Small to Dr. McKay, 8 May 1901).

Some staff were fortunate enough to have a separate residence, and therefore, some degree of privacy. In 1908, Frank Dodds and his family resided in their own house which was characterized as being “commodious and comfortable” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Indian Mission Committee of the Synod of MB and Sask. Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to visit the Cecilia Jeffrey School, July 21, 1908 by William Patrick and James Farquharson). The principal of the Birtle Boarding School in 1915, David Iverach, along with his wife and their four children, were able to rent a house a mile away from the school. Due to the size of his family, it was not considered practical for them to reside in the school building (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 19 Jun 1915). A farm instructor, Mr. Perry rented a house nearby the Birtle school after his marriage (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Superintendent of the Board of Home Missions PCC, 27 Jun 1916).

Living in the same building as the pupils and other staff members resulted in individuals, as well as couples and families, being deprived of any real level of solitude from the work environment.
Exposure to Illness and Disease

Residing and working among the students, in overcrowded conditions and lacking proper sanitation and ventilation, meant that staff were exposed to the same illnesses as the children. The illnesses and deaths of students in residential schools have been well documented (see, for example: Milloy, 1999: 83-100 and Miller, 1996a: 130-134; 301-307). Though illness was not limited to the students. In 1897, Kate Gillespie described the outbreak of the flu at the Crowstand school:

... la grippe has seized me in a rather unceremonious fashion and although I am not so disabled as some of the others have been still I am sufficiently so to impair my thinking powers somewhat — an impairment I cannot well afford either. La grippe reached the school a week ago today and all of both staff and children have had it with the exception of Mr. Carson and about half a dozen of the children. Miss Carson was the first to take it but was only real ill for one day. She recovered in time to attend to the rest and you may imagine her hands are full. Miss McIlwaine was real low last week but has resumed her duties today. Some of the children have had it pretty severely but are doing nicely now (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1089-1093, Kate Gillespie to Baird, 15 Feb 1897).

Five years later at the same school, la grippe swept through the school, again making students and staff alike ill. The matron, Miss Gilmour, was said to have had “a most violent cough” for several weeks (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 36, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 14 Apr 1902). A trades instructor, James Hamilton, showed symptoms of tuberculosis on more than one occasion while working at Crowstand school. The principal suggested that for the sake of Hamilton’s health, he should leave the school:

“... Mr. Hamilton who had scrofula before has broken out again. I think it is hardly wise of him to remain among all the scrofula germs that must be floating about here” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 22 May 1896).³ While employed as
principal at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, Mr. Matthews became ill with the Spanish influenza and after ten days, he perished (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. J. Semmens, 24 Oct 1918).

The unhealthy circumstances of many of the schools was particularly a concern for staff with family. The convener of the FMC in Winnipeg relayed Rev. Whyte’s anxiety regarding his wife’s well-being: “Mrs. Whyte’s health is likely to be seriously affected by continuing to live in the same house with unhealthy Indian children” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, Baird to Mrs. Jeffrey, 2 Apr 1897, pp. 196-199). Rev. McKitrick at the Cecilia Jeffrey school worried about the health of his own children: “It is not well anyway to put our little ones in there [school building] for many reasons, especially for the sake of their health as Indian children are sometimes not healthy enough for ours to be in such close contact with them. All doctors agree in this” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, McKitrick to MacKay, 23 Mar 1904).

**Summary**

The demanding duties expected of residential school employees were made more trying by the inhospitable work conditions which existed at many of the schools. Walter McLaren, the principal of the Birtle school and Superintendent of Indian Missions and Schools for the Presbyterian Church, associated staff stress and high turnover rates with the unfavourable environment of the schools:

...our residential school’s are so often undermanned, underequipped and that the margin of maintenance is so small, that the workers are completely occupied as Martha’s and have no time to be Mary’s. All are working at too high a nervous tension. The result is a succession of breakdowns and changes. ... Definite rest half days or days should be given to every worker. They are practically unknown in some
of our schools. ... I am confident that much friction, nervous strain that is undercurrent in nearly all our schools would disappear and changes would be less frequent in staff .... I often feel - that were our schools worked upon a uniform plan - temporary exchanges among those in the same department would do much to relieve workers from getting into grooves or from getting discontented, morose or irritable. I question three months furlough at the end of 5 yrs is sufficient to recuperate women 40 years of age and over. I feel that at the end of each successive 5 years of service the furlough would be lengthened a month. I know that the short term was not sufficient for all the three senior workers on our staff. The same was true with lady workers in other schools. When farms are attached to the school it means work the year round. There is need of a uniform system in granting short vacations to all during the summer (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 146, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Farquharson, 2 May 1912).

Workers were not rewarded financially for their perseverance and hard work: starting salaries were low compared to positions in public schools and raises were infrequent.

Isolation, lack of privacy and limited vacation time were the realities of residential school employees. In such an environment where people were working in close quarters for extended periods of time, friction between colleagues was prevalent.
CHAPTER SEVEN

STAFF DYNAMICS

The men and women employed at Aboriginal boarding schools toiled in close quarters with their colleagues. Individuals arrived at boarding schools, bringing with them their unique personalities, dispositions, values, likes, dislikes and their own perceptions of how to best accomplish their work responsibilities. Yet, they were all expected to be united in their goal to work towards the success of the school. Healthy relations among staff members were considered an essential facet of a successful school. For instance, when searching for a woman to become the new teacher of the Portage school, Rev. Baird of the FMC emphasized the importance of finding someone agreeable, as she would be working closely with the principal, Miss Fraser, and “the influence of both [would] be neutralized if they do not get on harmoniously together” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 21 Jan 1893). Baird reiterated this idea to a staff member of the Crowstand school who was unable to develop friendly relationships with her associates:

... we regard the harmony of the staff of such an institution as of so much importance that we cannot tolerate any other condition - It is not enough that they refrain from quarreling. They must co-operate with one another so closely that their differences will never become a matter of [illegible ] among Indians and outsiders and so do harm to the work which is carried on in the name of the Prince of Peace (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Henderson, 10 May 1895, pp. 542-543).

Conditions at the schools, such as the lack of privacy and overwork resulting in fatigue, often resulted in or heightened clashes between staff members. Another factor
which contributed to staff unrest was the high staff turnover rates common in most residential schools. The staff members remaining at a school were forced to accommodate and adapt to a variety of personalities. Some of these individuals had little experience and existing staff would be required to exercise a great deal of patience and understanding. A lack of tolerance and perseverance could lead to a conflict. A lack of harmony at a boarding school could also be attributed to considerations not involving the general working conditions, such as a struggle over authority.

The staff dynamics of each school will be examined. Not surprising, much of the correspondence in this vein deals with incompatibility and discord among staff rather than harmonious relationships.

**Birtle School**

As matron of the Birtle Boarding School, Annie McLaren appears to have been the cause of much strain between herself and the principals with whom she worked. Annie McLaren and her brother, George, were the only two people employed at the Birtle school when it was elevated from a day school to one that took in boarders in 1888. For the six years that George McLaren was principal and teacher, he did not mention any problems regarding his working relationship with his sister in official church correspondence. Yet, a number of years later, a couple of people associated with the school stated that they suspected he had not been altogether happy working with his sister. The local Presbyterian minister in 1901 alleged that friends of George McLaren's had hinted that George resigned because he could no longer endure Annie's exercising of her authority

(UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, H. T. Murray to R. P. Mackay, 6 May
1901). The man who succeeded George, Neil Gilmour, had talked to George in order to gain some information and advice about school management. Gilmour found that there was much that George knew little about, as his sister had looked after much of the details of the work. Even though George made no complaints to Gilmour, Gilmour got the impression that George had been "tired of holding an empty title" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to R. P. McKay, 18 May 1901).

During his administration of the Birtle school, Neil Gilmour also did not make it known to the FMC that he was having difficulties maintaining a harmonious working relationship with Annie McLaren. Yet he did not hesitate to give his opinion of the matron at Birtle when asked for it a few years later. He charged that he had endured "opposition, unfriendliness and lack of sympathy and of cooperation" from Annie McLaren (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 26, Neil Gilmour to R. P. McKay, 18 May 1901). He explained that he spent a number of weeks studying the situation and the characters at Birtle, and concluded that "the matron was determined in all but name she should be principal" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 26, Neil Gilmour to R. P. McKay, 18 May 1901). Thus, he felt compelled to tell her, in a friendly but direct way, that he had been appointed principal and therefore would assume the duties of principal. Gilmour believed that Annie McLaren never forgave him for taking such a stand. Furthermore, he opined that no man would be happy at the Birtle school as long as Annie was there: "... it will be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible to find a man who will take the place he should as head of the institution, and at the same time, get on with the Matron" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 26, Neil Gilmour to R. P. McKay, 18 May 1901).
McKay, 18 May 1901). After less than a year at Birtle, Gilmour was transferred to the Hurricane Hills mission.

William Small replaced Neil Gilmour in late 1895. For the first few years, the administration of the school ran quite smoothly. Small was married in 1900 and he and his wife had a child the following year. Soon after his marriage, friction between Mr. Small and Miss McLaren surfaced. Mr. Small’s brother provided his view on the source of this friction:

The fact is, and I wonder that the Committee has not seen it, that Miss McLaren has always been in reality the principal and the matron of that school. And I know that often my brother gave in to her rather than have trouble ... and she was thus the boss of the establishment. This went on for years .... But a wife went to Birtle to live who soon saw through things. Under her influence, my brother has asserted his rights as principal; hence the visit of Miss McLaren to Professor Harts' in February &c, &c (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 24, J. L. Small to Dr. Mackay, 18 Apr 1901).

The local Presbyterian minister agreed: “Mr. Small has been forced to resign by the underhand working of the matron Miss McLaren - not for any default of duty but because he declines to be now what he was when he first came here - a tool in her hands” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, H. T. Murray to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 6 May 1901). He also believed that the situation could have been remedied if the FMC had outlined the duties which were to fall exclusively upon the principal and those that were to be the responsibility of the matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, H. T. Murray to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 23 Apr 1901). Miss McLaren managed the domestic department of the school and was also in charge of the staffs’ meals and the collection of board fees. These duties, which were above and beyond what most matrons were
responsible for, resulted in a competing authority between the principal and the matron. William Small also thought that a change in this matter was necessary. To ensure a peaceful existence among staff, Small believed that after his departure, the newly appointed member, if a lady, should come as a teacher with the knowledge that she would be under McLaren’s orders and if a man, he should be granted responsibility for purchasing the provisions for both students and staff. Small and Gilmour had revealed another problem with the practice of paying board to the matron: they both felt they had been overcharged.

On the other side, Annie McLaren was not pleased with Small’s involvement in local sports and argued that his participation in athletics resulted in the neglect of school duties. She even went so far as to take personal shots at Small’s wife, writing that her parenting skills were inadequate (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Annie McLaren to Mrs. Shortreed, 24 Apr 1901). McLaren later retracted many of her accusations, claiming that she had written the defamatory letter after a fire at the school and she “was feeling the responsibility altogether too heavy” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Annie McLaren to Rev. R. P. McKay, 1 Jun 1901). Despite this, Small tendered his resignation and the Winnipeg division of the FMC promptly accepted it. He had worked along side with Miss McLaren for close to six years.

The vacancy left by Small was filled by William McWhinney. Upon receiving the appointment, Rev. MacKay of the FMC urged McWhinney to try to develop amicable relations with his staff. McWhinney realized that the problem in Small’s time at the school was due to a lack in “a proper feeling of confidence, friendship and freedom” between
Small and his staff. McWhinney insisted that through his patience and discretion, any noteworthy friction was avoided, and yet, an air of harmony did not exist: “But instead of the freedom and confidence that should exist between persons engaged in such work, the atmosphere has been decidedly chilly.” Had he not enjoyed his work, his time at Birtle would have been “rather a dreary existence” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, W. McWhinney to Mr. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902). Less than a year later, Mr. McWhinney was transferred to the Crowstand Boarding School.

When E. H. Crawford first arrived at the Birtle school, he found his colleagues to be pleasant and helpful; he had never imagined there could be hostility between them. Over time, he began to sense friction between the matron and the other women on staff. Once, while short one staff member, Crawford had expressed his wish to Annie McLaren that the assistant matron would return from her holidays shortly, to which McLaren retorted that years ago she had done better on her own than she did with others around. Soon after this, Crawford had failed to follow McLaren’s advice in a matter regarding a Sunday school picnic. McLaren failed to acknowledge Crawford for several weeks and she was never the same around him after this incident. According to Crawford, McLaren was moody and at times he found it difficult to “bear her faultfinding criticism” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, E. H. Crawford to Dr. McKay, 10 Jun 1904). He also found her to be inconsiderate of others feelings and prone to interfering in other people’s affairs (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Miss Craig, 28 Feb 1905).

In the beginning of 1905, Andrew Baird was requested by the FMC to visit the Birtle
school in order to ascertain the situation there. Baird was of the impression that the
women of the staff worked in a mutually accommodating fashion, but that Crawford was
somewhat excluded from this cohesiveness. He also got the feeling that McLaren had an
attitude that was “not entirely sympathetic to see whether the young Principal [would]
succeed or not” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, Andrew B. Baird to Dr.
Mackay, 28 Jan 1905). Baird concluded that since Crawford primarily performed outside
work, he could be replaced by a general labourer and Annie McLaren could take over the
principalship of the school. He argued that McLaren would be suitable because of her
extensive experience. Also, he shared that in the public estimation, she was the head of
the school anyway, and she was easily the strongest personality on the staff. A DIA
inspector, S. R. Marlatt, laid most of the blame for discord on Crawford. Marlatt was of
the opinion that Crawford did not like to take advice and that Crawford had not gained the
confidence and respect of the staff. Furthermore, he stressed that the three ladies on the
staff were old enough to be Crawford’s mother and they resented being managed by such
a young man. Marlatt also admitted that it would be a difficult task to find someone these
ladies would deem satisfactory. Thus, he concluded that either Miss McLaren or Miss
McGregor shall take over as principal. He suggested the idea of Miss McLaren becoming
principal to the other two ladies, but they stated they could not agree to such an
arrangement (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P.
McKay, 6 Feb 1905). A few times during her career, McLaren was in fact offered the
principalship, yet she declined (see Minutes of the FMC, 1902-03, p. 76 and Proceedings
of the FMC, 1904-05, p. 74). Even though her acceptance of such an offer would have
prevented the all too prevalent clashes between her and the school’s administrators, Annie McLaren maintained that she was content with her designation as matron. In reply to a comment made by a gentleman suggesting that she become principal, she remarked “I want neither the honor, the responsibility nor the salary” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 746, Annie McLaren to Rev. Baird, 18 Aug [1894]). Upon finding “more congenial work,” Crawford resigned after almost two years at Birtle (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Rev. R. P. McKay, 13 Feb 1905).

It seems that the DIA inspector was not totally correct in his assessment regarding the cooperation among the ladies of the staff. The departure of Crawford did not result in the disappearance of friction. In November 1905, the new principal, Walter McLaren sent a letter to the FMC, reporting that the school’s teacher, Eliza MacGregor, was “feeling the all but habitual treatment she is receiving at Miss McLaren’s hands so keenly” that she would resign if the matron were not removed. The assistant matron had also threatened to quit due to the same cause (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 80, Report on the Meeting of the Executive of the Indian Mission Committee, 13 Dec 1905). Implying that the trouble had stemmed from a disagreement over assigned responsibilities, the FMC suggested that the principal take greater accountability for the manner in which the staff performed their duties and that when any discrepancy over duties arose, the principal’s word must be final. After this, years passed without mention of any significant staff conflict in the correspondence.

In 1911, Walter McLaren married a former Birtle student, Susette Blackbird. Even though she was finished her schooling, she had continued to reside at the school and had
at times filled in for the teacher and assistant matron. The marriage created tension between Mr. and Mrs. McLaren and the ladies of the staff. The ladies felt that the McLarens should live in a building separate from the school because according to them, Susette McLaren had failed to “appreciate the delicacy of her situation” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 146, R. P. Mackay to Mr. Ogilvie, 29 May 1912). The church authorities agreed: “... the very fact that Mr. McLaren’s wife is an Indian makes it impossible that they can occupy any part of the school building. It looks at present as if Mrs. McLaren were getting a good deal of information from her husband and giving her old class mates the benefit of it” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, James Farquharson to R. P. MacKay, 14 Dec 1911). Due to this discord and allegations of mismanagement, Walter McLaren resigned. Six months before leaving the Birtle school in October 1913, Walter wrote to the head of the FMC. Even though he had managed to work with Annie McLaren over the years without any major conflict, he now admitted that his time at Birtle was not so harmonious:

Much of the difficulty here could have been avoided if a full and frank explanation of the situation here had been given me at the time of my appointment. ... No principal has ever been happy in this school. Mr. Crawford, my immediate predecessor said he was in purgatory while here. Mr. McWhinney said the two most unhappy years of his life were spent here. ... [Annie McLaren] has treated both my wife and myself in a way few would bear quietly ... (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to R. P. Mackay, 16 Apr 1913).

Annie McLaren retired from the work at the end of 1913. After this point, there was no more correspondence about staff hostilities. This could reflect the reality of the situation or the lack of such letters could be due to the fact that the church correspondence collected ends around 1915. Staff conflicts were much less likely to show
up in DIA correspondence.

*Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School*

The situation in the early years of the Cecilia Jeffrey school was complicated by the fact that the positions of missionary and principal were held by two individuals. Austin McKitrick, with about fourteen years experience in Aboriginal missionary work, had been appointed to open the Presbyterian mission among the Ojibwa in the Shoal Lake region of northwest Ontario. In addition to evangelistic responsibilities, McKitrick supervised the construction of the school buildings. He was responsible for opening the school, but he refused to teach at the school or manage it on a permanent basis (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 30 Sep 1901). Yet, he did keep informed of school affairs. To the annoyance of the school’s first two principals, McKitrick made the business of the school his own business.

The school’s first staff members consisted of the principal, J. C. Gandier, Maggie Nicoll as the matron and the assistant matron, Jennie Cameron. Gandier gladly welcomed any advice from McKitrick regarding dealings with the local Aboriginal people. Gandier reported that Nicoll was not so accepting of guidance offered by the local missionary: “Such advice was however distasteful to her because of a certain dislike to Mr. McKitrick and also a rather false idea of independence.” He added that McKitrick could be “somewhat aggravating to a lady sometimes” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902). Basically, Gandier implied that there was a degree of tension between Nicoll and McKitrick and appeared to have laid blame on both: Nicoll for her refusal to acknowledge that as missionary, McKitrick did
have some degree of authority, and McKitrick for his abrasive personality.

Gandier contended that he and Miss Nicoll had gotten along favourably. In a later letter, he noted that regardless of the fact that Nicoll was older than himself, she respected his authority: “Many ladies would think it rather too much to have so young a man put above them but Miss Nicoll although ready with suggestions never presumes in the least ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 40, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 15 Aug 1902).

After approximately ten months at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Maggie Nicoll wrote the FMC about her intention to resign. Among her reasons was the day-to-day reality of being a staff member at such a remotely located school: there being three single adults who, as circumstances dictated, found companionship only amongst themselves. She did, however, state that the staff members maintained amicable relations: “Our social relations, as a staff, have been and are most friendly, but even being such are attended with unavoidable strain” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). She believed that a married couple would have an easier time: “Our staff number three single people, three individuals, with no doubt three distinct aims in life, and no matter how united our work and effort may be[,] it lacks the unity of purpose and of interest, that undoubtedly would exist were a married man, the principal, and his wife matron of the school” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 42, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 13 Oct 1902).

Gandier also implied strained staff relations in his letter of resignation. He similarly argued that a married couple as principal and matron would be preferable to the current
situation, as “it would secure a unity of thought and work that would be impossible otherwise” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). By suggesting that he leave at the same time as the matron, he highlighted the difficulty one experienced when adjusting to the arrival of a new staff member: “...more time would be lost if I had to work in with a new matron and then in a short time the matron had to adjust herself to the ways of a new principal, than if both come at once ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). McKittrick’s partial authority in school matters also seemed to have been a point of contention. Gandier indicated that for his successor, there should be a clear distinction made between the duties and authority of the principal and that of the missionary. Furthermore, he admitted that since he was at the school for only a short period of time, he had abided by McKittrick’s recommendations even though he did not always agree. Although there does not appeared to have been any overt hostility, an underlying air of tension was alluded to in the principal’s and matron’s letters.

As Gandier and Nicoll had suggested, they were replaced by a married couple, J. O. and Sarah McGregor, who arrived at the school in May 1903. A few months into their term at the school, the FMC appointed an advisory council to attempt to restore harmony between Rev. McKittrick and the McGregor. One of the men appointed to look into the situation warned that both men “should subordinafe all personal considerations to the interests of the work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 54, John W. Little to Dr. Mackay, 8 Oct 1903). Yet, he was not confident that a satisfactory solution could be found, as both men were both at an age at which their ways and opinions were firmly
established. He attributed at least part of the problem to McGregor's temperament.

McKittrick, on the other hand, was criticized for interfering in the principal's work.

McKittrick was not impressed with the process of the investigation. He did not agree with the practice of asking one person, school staff member or missionary, if they have any complaints to make of the others. He believed that any charges should be made in the presence of those concerned so that errors could be corrected and those charged could defend themselves. This type of approach, he claimed, would have prevented many complaints from growing into anything larger (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin G. McKittrick to Dr. MacKay, 18 Nov 1903). The method used instead served to exacerbate the existing conflict.

Taking the only route provided by the FMC, McKittrick told his side of the story in a letter. He denied that his interference on his part in the principal's work was unjustified. He had remained at a distance as long as he could, but since he had so much related experience, he could no longer just stand by and observe the mistakes that Mr. McGregor was making. His interference was for the sake of the mission and school; he wanted both to be successful (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 54, Austin G. McKittrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 14 Nov 1903). He maintained that, while often good natured, Mr. McGregor from time to time displayed a bad temper. According to McKittrick, there had been no actual quarreling. He acknowledged that McGregor did a good job in the classroom, but overall McGregor was not capable of managing the school and often neglected essential duties.

The McGregors also wrote a couple of letters answering allegations made by Mr.
McKitrick and the assistant matron, Jennie Cameron. Miss Cameron had accused Mrs. McGregor of refusing to take her advice. The McGregors contradicted this, stating that Mrs. McGregor regularly consulted Miss Cameron on various issues. They had never argued, but Miss Cameron apparently had once announced that she would perform whatever duties she pleased. This was not the cause of any conflict since Cameron always did her fair share of the heavy work. There had been an allegation made by McKitrick that Mr. McGregor was not an easy person with which to work. In his defense, McGregor mentioned that throughout his extensive career in public schools, his relationships with coworkers were always cordial. Also, McGregor reported that on the rare occasion that he had made suggestions as to how the agricultural work might be done, McKitrick was always quick to oppose the proposal, "apparently with the intention of teaching me that he was here to superintend everything" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, J. O. and Sarah McGregor to R. P. McKay, 27 Nov 1903). The McGregors contended that they had always taken advice when given in a friendly way, but they had to cope with McKitrick’s perception that anything they did as being "wrong."

With a view to minimize tensions at the school, the FMC granted McKitrick authority over the school. McKitrick noted that Mr. McGregor had become less retaliatory than formerly, but he continued to be negligent in his responsibilities outside of the classroom. Sarah McGregor, on the other hand, continued to treat McKitrick and the assistant matron, Miss Cameron, in an unchristian way, resorting to "sarcastic and cutting words and actions" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). The McGregors attributed the continued disharmony with Miss
Cameron to Cameron’s temper and actions, which were, they claimed, due to her disappointment of not being promoted to matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, J. O. McGregor to Dr. Mackay, 12 Mar 1904). Considering the continued unrest, the Church representative responsible for investigating the situation became convinced that the only solution was for the McGregors to leave the school: “I would view with some alarm a continuance of Mr. and Mrs. McGregor at the school beyond the opening of navigation” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 5 F 59, John W. Little to Rev McKay, 21 Mar 1904). They departed from the school at the beginning of May 1904 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Mar 1904). To avoid future clashes between the missionary and principal, Rev. McKitrick was given the responsibility of school management in addition to his mission work.

It was only a matter of months until another letter regarding trouble between Cecilia Jeffrey staff members surfaced in the correspondence. From time to time, it had been necessary for Rev. McKitrick to speak to the teacher, Miss Wintersgill, about minor details of her classroom work. He was not always satisfied with how his own children were being educated, but also had some issues regarding the academic training of the Aboriginal children. Miss Wintersgill, on the other hand, did not appreciate this interference in her branch of work. McKitirick justified his actions: “When I am held accountable by both the Gov’t and the Church for everything in the working of the school, it is unavoidable that I must speak to the members of the staff about details of the work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). The same man involved in investigating earlier discord laid the blame on Mr.
Mr. McKitrick's propensity for "centralising all power, to minutest details, in himself," his lack of tact and the practice of interference were resented by the rest of the staff (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, John W. Little to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 25 Feb 1905). McKitrick made no apologies: keeping watch over all departments of the school was his duty.

McKitrick was not the cause of all staff hostility. There was a conflict between the matron, Miss Cameron and the teacher, Miss Wintersgill. McKitrick concluded that both women were to blame: Wintersgill for certain unwise conduct and Cameron for being "too strong in her dislikes and rather unrelenting when aroused" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 72, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 3 Apr 1905). The tension heightened, and McKitrick wrote the FMC, confiding that the assistant matron, teacher and farm instructor were threatening to resign if immediate action was not taken against the matron, Cameron (Minutes of the FMC 1904-1905, p. 124). Instead of the matron resigning, the teacher resigned. McKitrick warned that the trouble would continue unless Cameron assumed a different policy in her treatment towards her colleagues (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). Problems did persist, this time between Cameron on the one hand and Mr. McKitrick and the farm instructor, Mr. White on the other. Miss Cameron alleged that White had meddled in her work with the girls, while McKitrick had stood by and said nothing to White in regards to his inappropriate interference. Cameron contemplated resigning (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Jennie Cameron to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 14 Oct 1905). McKitrick believed it was a necessity to have Cameron replaced: she had, on
occasion, mistreated her fellow staff members, as well as Mrs. McKitrick (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 31 Oct 1905).

Miss Cameron's resignation was accepted.

Again, the school did not remain peaceful. The staff became dissatisfied with McKitrick and his handling of school affairs. The FMC considered hiring a principal and leaving McKitrick in charge of the missionary work, but they were afraid of the "consequences of having two men so closely connected with one kind of work on such equal terms" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 89, James Farquharson to Dr. McKay, 1 Sep 1906). Such an arrangement was tried in the cases of Gandier and McGregor, and both times proved a dismal failure. Subsequently, the Western Committee of the FMC notified Mr. McKitrick that his services would not be required after May 1907 (Minutes of the FMC, PCC, 1906, p. 44).

McKitrick's replacement, Frank Dodds acted as principal and missionary for over ten years. Assuming the correspondence is an accurate indicator of staff relations, the school was generally conflict free. Only once did the issue of staff unrest appear, and this was near the end of Dodds' term, when his wife had undertaken the duties of matron. An official from the DIA found that there was a want of harmony between Mrs. Dodds, and her subordinates:

'This raises the question as to whether it is best to have the Principal and his wife in command in the same institution. Sympathies may be so strong between them that a sort of family compact appears. In this case, others may for self protection criticize so freely as to awaken secret dislike which later manifests itself in opposition. So often this kind of thing grows from more to more until someone must leave to preserve the peace (quoted in NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Copy - Report of Commission of Presbytery appointed to investigate conditions at Cecilia
A church led investigation found that there was no support for the allegation of a family compact existing at the school. They argued that the staff members had expressed their loyalty towards Mrs. Dodds. They described the most likely source of any existing tension: "It seemed however clearly evident that there was a nervous anxiety on the part of the Matron for the success of the School, and a tendency to worry over the details of all departments that has led her to unnecessary interference with both pupils and members of the staff. This lack of tact in general management - understood and overlooked by some - is tacitly resented by others" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Copy - Report of Commission of Presbytery appointed to investigate conditions at Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School by Hugh J. Robertson and S. C. Murray, 26 Feb 1918). No steps were taken to remedy the situation: within a number of months the Dodds retired.

Crowstand School

The first two principals of the Crowstand Boarding School, George Laird and C. W. Whyte, had their share of disagreements and clashes with their staff members.

In the first two years of Laird's principalship, school correspondence focused on daily operations. Then, concerns of mismanagement and immorality among students began to surface. The teacher, May Armstrong wrote to the head of the Winnipeg FMC, to make him aware of the lack of order at the school, particularly with the training provided to the boys in outside work. She admitted that there had been disagreements between her and Laird (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1257-1258, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 19 Aug 1891). A man, W. J. Wright, was hired to act as the farm instructor and to assist in the supervision
of the boys.

Wright had been at the school for a matter of months, when he acknowledged that he and Laird were experiencing interpersonal problems, which for Wright, at least, were "very unpleasant" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1491, W. J. Wright to Mr. Beard [sic], 5 Jan 1892). He provided a couple of examples of inconsistent rules and of how the tasks he was responsible for were changed from day-to-day by Laird. Wright requested that the FMC give him specific duties, apart from Laird. He also had observed Laird clashing with other staff members, some who were "not so able to bear it" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1491, W. J. Wright to Mr. Beard [sic], 5 Jan 1892). Rev. Baird believed that this lack of harmony could largely be blamed on the huge responsibility which Laird shouldered: "Naturally I suppose any man harassed with the worries that beset Mr. Laird in the management of so large an institution is not always the master of his own temper" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1525-1526, [Baird] to Mr. Wright, 20 Jan 1892). Even though Wright’s proposition of a separation of duties may have enabled Wright to discharge his duties with minimal interference, the FMC did not consider it a wise move: "... if we did attempt any division which would confirm the estrangement between you, it would defeat the very object of your work at the Crowstand, namely, to teach the gospel of love and charity to the Indians" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1525-1526, [Baird] to Mr. Wright, 20 Jan 1892). Baird hinted that Laird may be leaving the school within a few months, and thus called for Wright to exercise patience.

The assistant matron, Florence McLean, was also experiencing difficulty with Laird. She insisted that Laird was quick to become angry and was inclined to use insulting
language towards her (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892). In order to avoid this persistent uneasiness, McLean considered her resignation as the only solution. When Laird announced his own resignation, McLean withdrew her own. The remaining staff looked forward to the prospect of working with a oneness that was not possible under George Laird.

The staff, along with the new principal, C. W. Whyte, avoided any real friction for about a year. Then, in May 1893, Wright put forth his concerns in a letter. The situation was no longer agreeable, but rather there was “a dead pull and hard feelings all the time” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 233, W. J. Wright to Prof. Baird, 22 May 1893). Wright found Whyte difficult to take orders from. Whyte would give inconsistent orders, devising plans one day and changing them the next. This was unacceptable to Wright and he admitted that he no longer took the interest in the work that he should.

Rev. Baird wrote to Wright, urging him to try to avoid further conflict:

... the members of the staff should work in harmony - I am aware it is difficult for all to do this when the head of the staff is not judicious but it is as unspeakably important for every interest of the mission that there should be genuine cooperation that we cannot excuse any member of the staff who does not pursue this policy. We hope therefore that you will do your utmost to keep upon cordial terms with Mr. Whyte despite his occasional unreasonable nesses (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. Wright, 14 Jun 1893, p. 198).

Baird also noted that he would be meeting with Mr. and Mrs. Whyte in order to discuss the conditions at the school.

Matters did not improve. Wright alleged that when talking to people on the reserve, Whyte was in the habit of blaming any problems at the school on his staff, and thus the staff had little confidence in Whyte. Harmony was not possible, Wright contended, when
he experienced interference six times a day (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 267-269, W. J. Wright to Prof. Baird, 20 Jun 1893). The FMC decided to grant Whyte a second chance with a new staff and thus, three staff members were transferred to other locations (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267).

Staff relations were restored with the arrival of the new employees. The new teacher expressed her pleasurable introduction to the Whytes:

At Crowstand I have found very warm and kind friends in Mr. and Mrs. Whyte. Mrs. Whyte keeps such a motherly eye on Miss Scott and me that it is never necessary for us to make her acquainted with the fact that we are feeling tired or sick, as she always sees it for herself. There are discouragements as well as encouragements connected with our labours here, but we share them with each other, and are all happy and hopeful (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Vol. 11 No. 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 73).

When on friendly terms, staff was able to encourage one another and provide a support network.

In February 1895, Mr. Whyte was having problems with the matron, Flora Henderson, and he asked the FMC to recall her: “I have come to the conclusion that it is hopeless to expect sympathetic and pleasant relations between Miss Henderson and the rest of the staff” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 22 Mar 1895). Henderson often complained about her duties, believing that she was given more than her share, and accused others of shirking their responsibilities. Whyte had asked Henderson to resign, but she refused to. Miss Henderson wrote Baird in order to share her side of the story. She maintained that she had never spoken crossly to any of the staff and that she felt that she got along amicably with the teacher and assistant matron. John Whyte, on the other hand, had spoken to her harshly a few times and C. W. Whyte was at times

Pressure for Henderson to resign continued, not only from the principal, but also from other staff and the FMC. The teacher, Kate Gillespie, for example, argued that while Henderson was not overly antagonistic, she had “never exerted herself in any way to be agreeable or to gain our goodwill” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1169-1180, Kate Gillespie to Prof. Baird, 13 Jun 1895). She added that Henderson's assertions of unevenly divided work contributed to the tension. The FMC convener was careful not to place all the blame on Miss Henderson: “We are far from believing that the fault is all upon one side - indeed I suppose it never is in such cases - but we regard the harmony of the staff of such an institution as of so much importance that we cannot tolerate any other condition” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Henderson, 10 May 1895, pp. 542-543).

The FMC sent a final request for her resignation, citing continued antagonistic relations with Whyte as a main consideration: “Even if Mr. Whyte had never made any complaint at all there is abundant evidence in your own letters to show that there is not a friendly feeling between yourself and him, and without such friendly feeling it is impossible for missionary work of the right kind to be carried out” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1132, [Baird] to Miss Flora Henderson, 3 Jun 1895). Miss Henderson gave in to the pressure and resigned (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1207, Flora Henderson to Prof. Baird, 20 Jun 1895).

In the summer of 1897, Neil Gilmour succeeded C. W. Whyte as the principal of the Crowstand school. On a number of occasions, Gilmour had to try to negotiate a peace between the ladies on staff. In his first year, Marjorie McIlwaine was employed as sewing
instructress and Miss E. C. Carson worked as the matron. There existed differences of opinion in regards to discipline and management between the two, but generally, they were able to maintain harmonious relations (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1997-1998, Baird to Mr. Mackay, 20 Oct 1897). As time passed, friendliness transformed into hostility.

Gilmour noted how their differences had deteriorated into conflict: "... it is most unsatisfactory having two women, working, one entirely independent of the other. There is too much stiffness as to make it very unpleasant" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 157-160, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 2 Dec 1897). Sometimes Carson and McIlwaine were not on speaking terms for two weeks at a time. Gilmour faulted Miss McIlwaine primarily, as she was at times very moody. At her own request, McIlwaine was transferred and Jeanie Gilmour, Neil’s cousin, replaced her. In order to eliminate discord caused by divided authority, the position formerly entitled sewing instructress was changed to assistant matron. Therefore, only one woman, the matron, would be the head of the housekeeping department (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 221-228, C. M. Jeffrey to Rev. Baird, 23 Jan 1898).

According to Gilmour, having one woman in charge could create a different kind of problem: “There are so many women who make it disagreeable for those who work with them, and especially for those who work under them, ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 463-465, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 31 Mar 1898). However, Miss Carson and Miss Gilmour’s working relationship was a very congenial one.

When Miss Carson resigned, Neil Gilmour was concerned about her replacement; he did not want someone coming to the school, as Miss McIlwaine did, believing that her duties were set in stone and that she would do only those duties and do them as she
pleased (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 651-663, Neil Gilmour to Hart, 11 May 1898). He hoped for someone who was more of a team player, who would help out where needed.

Jeanie Gilmour resigned temporarily in 1901. A Miss Wright was hired as the matron, but Neil Gilmour found that, in addition to her lack of suitability for the position, she had a bad temper. Once again, two women on the staff, Miss Wright and Miss Dunbar, were not communicating with one another. Neil Gilmour asked his cousin, Jeanie, if she would return to the school and was relieved when she agreed (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 11 Dec 1901). It was preferable to have employees like Miss Gilmour and Miss Dunbar, working with “no ‘cut and dried’ duties, no hard and fast lines by which they worked” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 19 Sep 1901). It even made little difference as to which was given the title of matron and which was given the title of assistant matron: “The difference is only in name, any way, because both seemed equally ready to do anything that needed to be done, and there was no question of who was in authority and who was not” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 11 Dec 1901).

In 1903, Neil Gilmour resigned. When the new principal, Rev. W. McWhinney arrived at the school, he was pleased with the existing staff dynamics: “In [Gilmour’s] staff I have found much more cordiality than at Birtle ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 48, W. McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 8 Apr 1903). There was no further correspondence regarding staff problems. This might be attributable to the fact that Miss Gilmour and Miss Dunbar both remained at the school for over ten years. They were both familiar with
the work and worked well together. Such cooperation would have gone a long way to preserving peace at the school.

**Portage la Prairie School**

Throughout the decades examined, there was no mention of any agitation or conflict among staff members in the church or DIA correspondence. In the early years of the Portage school, when the total staff numbered two, those in charge of missionary work were particularly cautious when hiring a new staff member. While not a common practice for most boarding schools, the existing staff member was consulted before someone was hired. When Bessie Walker was transferred to the Regina Industrial School, Annie Fraser was asked if she had any opinion as to who should be hired: “Since you and she must live on very intimate terms we are anxious to consult you on the subject. We have several names on our list but other things being equal we would give preference to some one you know and would like to have with you” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Fraser, 5 Nov 1892, p. 76).

Rev. Hendry was appointed Portage’s principal in 1901. For the majority of his term, his wife, Jean, worked along side him as the matron. As well, for over ten years, Hendry’s sister, Mary, held the position of assistant matron. In a history of the Portage school, Murray ([1936]: 98) described the situation as “an agreeable ‘family compact.’” He elaborated:

... not only were the members of staff united, but from the beginning of his encumbency [sic] emphasized the unity of the school as a whole. Internal difficulties must not be aired in the public. They must be sympathetic and loyal to each other. If one of the family erred, the error must not be proclaimed - much less magnified. Dirty linen, in short, must be washed at home, not in the community laundry. This principle
was adhered to throughout the entire Hendry regime and was an important factor in the development of the institution (Murray, [1936]: 98).

Therefore, while friction may have been present, such problems were resolved without the need for outside investigations or assistance. At one point, Hendry was responsible for hiring his own staff: "The staff were not sent haphazard. In later years especially members were selected by himself after personal interviews – His officers were loyal and efficient, cooperating with himself and with each other" (Murray, [1936]: 99). This would also contribute to the maintenance of positive staff dynamics.

**Hiring Practices and Staff Relations**

Rev. Hendry was able to strengthen the cohesion of his staff by doing the school’s hiring himself. While the principal of the Crowstand school, Neil Gilmour expressed his desire to have greater control over staff appointments. At times when the school was in need of a new member, Neil Gilmour would write to R. P. Mackay, stating his opinions, the merits and disadvantages, of certain church workers with whom he was familiar, in order to have some influence over the hiring process. Gilmour briefly described the hiring procedure used and what he thought about it: "... the principal knows nothing of the one appointed to his staff until after the appointment is made. I believe that at least, when an appointment is being made, the principal should be consulted" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 20 Jun 1901). Gilmour argued that greater authority in hiring practices and an ability to dismiss incapable staff would ultimately improve the relationship among staff members:

But I have seen a good deal of the inner working of most of our Indian Institutions, and I know this, at Regina where the principal appoints his own staff, while a member
may hold an opinion at variance with his, they do not think of withstanding, his
decision in any matter, while in Boarding Schools where the appointment in no way
depends upon the principal, and he cannot if he would ask a member of his staff, to
resign, the tone is quite different. Perfect harmony among workers is always most
desirable, and nothing more conduces to this than having one recognized head (UCA,

Rev. McWhinney echoed this opinion while he was the principal of the Birtle school:

“Now I understand that in Regina and Portage La Prairie the custom is in force for the
Principal to make such [staff] appointments subject to the approval of the F. M.
Committee. This I think is but right in order that harmony may be preserved on the staff
and I would therefore like to have something to say about the filling of any vacancies that
may occur here” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, Wm McWhinney to Rev.
R. P. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902).

**Nepotism**

Often an individual was hired for a position at a boarding school mainly because of
their association with an existing staff member. There are numerous examples of this
practice. As mentioned above, when the principal was a married man, his wife was often
appointed as matron. A teacher at the Crowstand school, May Armstrong, suggested that
her sister come to the school to act as a substitute, in order to allow her to go on holidays
(UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 308, E. May Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 20 Feb 1890). According to
May, her sister had had some teaching experience and was interested in mission work.
Mattie Armstrong was approved to come and her appointment became permanent. Rev.
C. W. Whyte hired his brother as the Crowstand school’s farm instructor when the
previous one was transferred to another mission (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 521, Hayter Reed to
Baird, 3 Feb 1894). While teaching at the Crowstand school, Kate Gillespie recommended an acquaintance of hers, Miss E. C. Carson, to replace the matron (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 22 Mar 1895). Miss Carson, in turn, named a family friend, who came to work at the school to help with the outside work (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1750-1753, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 13 Aug 1897). Sara Laidlaw of the Portage school requested that her brother be hired to assist with the teaching (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2024-2044, Sara Laidlaw to Rev. Baird, 29 Oct 1897). He worked there for approximately one year.

Harmony amongst staff members was considered to be very important in order that the school be successful. As illustrated above, conflicts were common at the boarding schools. One of the reasons why the FMC willingly hired family and friends of existing staff, even sometimes when they were not properly qualified, may have been the probability of healthier staff relations. Rev. Baird was somewhat apprehensive about hiring Sara Laidlaw's brother, but in the end the likelihood of staff compatibility outweighed Harry's lack of experience:

So far as character, earnestness and prospective congeniality to you and Miss Laidlaw is concerned, the proposal seems an admirable one ... But as regards his qualifications as a teacher, we have no further whatever, and in view of his youth and probable inexperience, we have some misgivings on the subject. If, however, Miss Laidlaw could in a measure take oversight of the school-work, it seems to us that the presence of her Brother might relieve the situation greatly, and we are quite willing to appoint him with that subject in mind (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2013-2014, [Baird] to Miss Fraser, 27 Oct 1897).

Similarly, Neil Gilmour was anxious to hire Miss Carson's friend, Charles Bradbrook:

On account of the isolation of this place, it is not an easy matter to get a white man who is willing to stay. Bradbrook is a friend to the Carsons, and on account of
knowing Miss Carson well, was willing to come. ... I thought that on account of his friendship to the Carsons, he would be more willing to be helpful about chores etc. than a stranger might, ... (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1750-1753, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 13 Aug 1897).

When already familiar with a co-worker’s disposition, work habits and idiosyncrasies, the work would go more smoothly. Also, a friend or family member would be more accepting of advice and constructive criticism, and more willing to provide assistance above and beyond their job description.

Summary

Maintaining positive work relations appears to have been difficult in the Birtle, Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand schools. Correspondence from the Portage school is free from any mention of staff disputes.

Conflicts fall into a number of categories. Antagonism was sometimes caused by power struggles. Annie McLaren was the matron at the Birtle school for twenty-five years, and all the principals, with the exception of her brother George, admitted that she had been difficult to work with due to her controlling nature. One of the principals contended that she had a “weakness for usurping authority” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 18 May 1901). The principals felt she went too far in interfering with their duties. A degree of frustration and impatience with novice staff from one who had so much experience in the work at Birtle may be understandable. Annie McLaren was familiar with all aspects of the school, had known most of the students for a number of years and was well acquainted with the Aboriginal parents and other adults. Perhaps, a greater degree of tactfulness on her part may have
reduced tensions.

Austin McKitrick probably could have empathized with Annie McLaren. When he arrived in northwestern Ontario to open a mission and school, he had built up over ten years of experience in the field of Aboriginal missionary work. He had rejected the proposition that he take control of the mission work as well as the school, but after having to deal with two inexperienced principals, he acknowledged that he had made a mistake. Seeing an amateur principal making errors was very discouraging for McKitrick, and he felt compelled to advise and make suggestions. He tried to justify such intrusions in the second principal’s work:

But why the school should be again left to run on the rocks and break up, because a green pilot is at the wheel, who don’t know the course and won’t learn it, while one of fourteen years experience in the channel of Indian work is forced to stand by on the same vessel with his hands tied and forced to suffer and go down with the same vessel whose course he is not allowed to help direct, I can’t understand (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 14 Nov 1903).

It is understandable that a seasoned veteran like McKitrick wanted to teach the new principals how to effectively deal with the Aboriginal children and adults. Yet, had he been more diplomatic when giving advice, perhaps the principals would have been more accepting of it.

Discrepancies over duties and an unwillingness to assist coworkers was another catalyst for staff friction. Tensions flared at the Crowstand school due to Flora Henderson’s impression that she shouldered more than her share of the responsibilities. She characterized her position at the school as that of “a beast of burden” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1110-1111, Flora Henderson to Baird, 16 May 1895). The teacher admitted that
she had not offered any assistance to Henderson in the kitchen work, since she had the
hours of a public school teacher plus was involved in school duties three evenings per
week and Saturday afternoons. All the staff members, except Miss Henderson, considered
the division of duties to be fair. Neil Gilmour, who had acted as principal at the Birtle and
Crowstand schools, wished for staff members who worked in a cooperative manner,
willing to perform duties that may not be included in their job description. He was not
impressed with Marjorie McIlwaine’s attitude. She had come to the school with an
understanding of what duties were expected of her, and those are the only ones she would
perform (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 651-663, Neil Gilmour to Hart, 11 May 1898). Flexibility
and a willingness to help out where needed was most desirable in the work ethic of a
boarding school employee.

Just one abrasive personality on a staff roster made work difficult for the others.
Laird’s subordinates reported that they had experienced his temper and anger. Crowstand
sewing instructress, Marjorie McIlwaine, was said to have been moody, corresponding to
her physical condition. Similarly, Cecilia Jeffrey principal was characterized as being
temperamental and Miss Wright, the matron of Crowstand for a brief period, was
portrayed as having a bad temper. Such individuals received some, but not all the blame
for existing conflicts. Others were guilty of impatience and intolerance.
CHAPTER EIGHT

COMPETENCE: SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

In much of the existing literature, the majority of employees of Aboriginal residential schools were considered to be incompetent and had accepted positions in this line of work because they were unable to find employment elsewhere. There were some very dedicated, talented individuals working at the schools, but, based on existing studies, they appear to have been the minority. In this chapter, the ability of staff members in their respective positions will be examined. It is important to keep in mind that this study relied on data from official church and DIA correspondence. Therefore, the representations of staff capability may be generously positive, the church and government both desirous of portraying the schools in a positive light.

Teachers

Boarding school teachers had varying degrees of success in teaching Aboriginal children academic subjects. Occasionally, a teacher was acknowledged for having a natural talent for educating Aboriginal youth. This was the case for Eliza MacGregor, teacher at the Birtle school for eight years (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, 6 Feb 1905, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). An educator at the Birtle school for four years, Florence Leslie was considered talented and able by members of the church and the DIA. The local Indian Agent wrote: “The teacher, Miss Leslie, also the staff deserves credit, for the good work now being done at this Institution, ...” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and
Secretary of the DIA, 22 Jan 1918). Adelaide Clark, a secretary of the WMS, also referred specifically to this teacher when speaking of the progress achieved at the Birtle school: “The work in all departments has been satisfactory, but the class room under Miss Leslie’s care deserves special mention” (Third AR, WMS, PCC, 1916, p. 70). A Miss McLaren imparted academic instruction at the Crowstand school for ten years. During her first year at the school, she was described by Professor Hart as “an earnest and efficient teacher” (PCC, Minutes of the 22nd Synod of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, 1904, p. 29). More than midway through her career at the Crowstand school, the principal described her pedagogical achievement: “Classroom work has been giving improved results on account largely of Miss McLaren’s long experience in the work here and consequent knowledge of the individual peculiarities of each child” (Thirty-sixth AR WFMS PCC, 1911-1912, report by McWhinney, p. 51). When Josephine Petch resigned after close to four years at the Crowstand school, Neil Gilmour, who was most frank when writing about staff members, noted that he would miss her, since she was “an excellent school teacher, very thorough, and very well up in the work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, B 2 F 24, N. Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 30 Apr 1901). The students at the Portage school made progress under Miss R. Harvard, despite the challenge of an overcrowded classroom: “The provincial school inspector gave an excellent report, although the work is being done under almost impossible conditions, as we have 35 pupils in a room suitable for 14 at most” (Ninth AR WMS PCC, 1922, p. 93). Miss W. Henderson, also of the Portage school, was characterized as an efficient teacher: “She keeps excellent order in the school and has good control over the pupils” (CSP 1917, AR
DIA for Yr Ended March 31\textsuperscript{st} 1916, Report of S. J. Jackson, p. 213). Portage principal, Rev. Hendry characterized Mary Lytle as a strong teacher: “Miss Lytle has done work in music and in the kindergarten room, of a character which has passed my expectations. In three months she had 22 small children speaking English” (Second AR WMS PCC, 1915, p. 90).

Many of the teachers had some experience in the public school system, and some found it difficult to adapt to the new environment of an Aboriginal boarding school. Cecilia Jeffrey school’s principal, Austin McKitrick criticized Miss Wintersgill for using the same teaching methods on the school’s Aboriginal students as she had used in public schools (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). The principal of the Crowstand school stated that while Miss Downing may have been a successful public school teacher, he was skeptical of her ability to succeed with Indian children, since she lacked the patience required (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901). She left the school after only three months.

A teacher was sometimes commended for one aspect of the work, but criticized for another aspect. Birtle’s Elizabeth McCurdy’s success with the lower grades was regularly recognized, yet her inability to discipline the older grades was also noted: “[She] is not competent to handle the class-room at the School if it is proposed to continue the system of all the grades in one class room. Miss McCurdy has a good way with the younger pupils but has no control over the larger scholars and a change of teacher should be made at once if the one class room is kept at this school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 214
6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Extract - Report of Inspector S. J. Jackson on the Birtle Boarding School, dated 27 May 1915). The school’s principal reiterated this attitude: “I have never been satisfied with the results of her teaching larger pupils and do not think results from her teaching ever will be satisfactory” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Copy - David Iverach to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). Despite this concern, McCurdy taught for four years. During Zena Brodie’s teaching career at Cecilia Jeffrey, the Board of Home Missions received a complaint from the Department: there were twenty-seven students still in the first standard who had been in the school for two or more years (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Assistant Deputy and Secretary, DIA to Rev. Dr. Grant, 11 April 1916). Miss Brodie’s philosophy, according to principal Dodds, was that any child who did not have a good grasp of the requisite subjects would not be passed: “... she refuses to promote pupils from one standard to another until they are prepared for it by a thorough knowledge of all that is included in the standard they are leaving” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Rev. Dr. Grant, 25 Aug 1916). Furthermore, she had argued that white children often required two or three years to pass standard one even though they did not have the handicap of the ignorance of English. Dodds also pointed out that the DIA Inspector had only positive comments to make of Miss Brodie’s teaching ability. This was evident in Semmens’ report of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, in which he wrote that Miss Brodie “is enthusiastic and is very successful at her work” (CSP 1916, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1915, p. 222). Brodie was not dismissed because of this complaint: she was still employed at the school almost ten years later (Eleventh AR WMS PCC,
The Presbyterian schools appear to have had at least some capable teachers. Those teachers who had difficulty accommodating their teaching techniques to Aboriginal children tended not to stay in the work for any great length of time. There were also some teachers, like McCurdy, who were lacking in one regard, but stayed for a number of years. The church experienced difficulty finding skilled teaching staff, and thus were reluctant to replace even merely adequate teacher.

Nurses

In general, all concerned parties were pleased with the work performed by the schools’ nurses. The DIA inspector of Aboriginal schools was displeased at the prospect of Lyla Stratton, “the very efficient nurse,” leaving the Cecilia Jeffrey school: “Should she finally decide to retire a very great loss will be sustained for she has been very helpful and successful in her work” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract, Report of Inspector J. Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Bdg, dated 22 Aug 1916). Mrs. Katherine Fraser succeeded her, and was employed at the school for two years. The same inspector considered Mrs. Fraser a dedicated, competent employee:

I have come to regard Mrs. Fraser as a superior type of woman, as a capable and conscientious nurse, as a faithful and devoted member of the school staff and as an exemplary christian [sic] lady. Her work was well done, the infirmaries were very clean and orderly and she appeared to have a knack of ministering to the sick, and of nursing them back to health which marked her as a person of special worth (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, date of inspection 21 Jun 1918).

Rev. Hendry of the Portage la Prairie Boarding School was for the most part satisfied with Jean Derby’s nursing skills, but there was one omission: she failed to realize the
importance of keeping the students’ clean and free from vermin, on themselves and their
clothing (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, W. A. Hendry to
Secretary DIA, 4 Feb 1919). The Department considered the principal also to be
somewhat responsible for this oversight, and instructed him to advise Derby to use insect
powder when necessary (NAC, G 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, J. D.
McLean to Rev. W. A. Hendry, 11 Feb 1919). The staff at the schools were happy to
have this medical support, and in most cases, had little reason to complain.

Farm Instructors

Most of the men who found employment at the four Presbyterian boarding schools as
farm instructors had years of agricultural experience. As would be expected, most
received positive feedback on their work. The Indian agent praised Birtle farm
instructor, William Perry and his assistant for their achievements: “Both ... are good
practical and experienced men, and take an interest in the pupils and their work, and the
result is that the boys are interested in farm work and are making efforts to master all the
details of running a farm ...” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1,
G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 22 Jan 1918). W. W.
McLaren, the principal of the Birtle school, was greatly impressed with farm instructor
and assistant principal, J. H. Snyder:

He desires to devote himself to industrial mission work. ... and is rapidly
accommodating his knowledge and theory to the practical needs of Indian work. I
think he will become an instructor hard to excel - being able and willing to teach the
boys farming from a reasonable scientific standpoint and yet enable them to do so with
the limited resources usually at their disposal when setting up for themselves. He is
taking splendidly with the boys and seems to know how to get the best out of them.
He also takes a personal interest in everything that tends to the welfare of the pupils
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and of the school as that if the salary necessary to retain him is forthcoming, he will probably become a permanent member of our staff (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Apr 1910).

Mr. Billson was hired as the farm instructor of the Cecilia Jeffrey school. Even though his lack of knowledge of Canadian agricultural methods made him inadequate as a farm instructor, he was most useful as a handyman and at running the school's steamboat, and was highly competent in relating to the students: "Mr. Billson is a good example to the boys and a great help too because of his dignified and proper conduct in mingling with all the scholars and especially the large girls" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). Mr. B. Murkin, also hired as farm instructor at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, brought some admirable qualities to the job: "[He] is a good faithful worker, alert, wide awake, handy, mechanical and a real help about the school and farm work. I think he will make a good engineer for the Daystar" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to MacKay, 7 Feb 1905).

Unfortunately, there were a few farm instructors who, for one reason or another, were dismal failures. Mr. B. Kilburn came to the Cecilia Jeffrey school with twenty-eight years of farming experience. However, the principal deemed his work to be inadequate. He failed to work the required ten hours per day and furthermore, "he appear[ed] to think he [was] there to have an easy time and to put off the bulk of the work on to the large boys." As well, McKitrick was disappointed in his inappropriate demeanor: "He has been very rough in his language and manner especially with the large boys. Using such abusive language as could not be tolerated in an Indian Bd’g School, by a representative of our Church" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Austin McKitrick to Rev. R. P.
MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). When McKittrick attempted to discuss these issues with Mr. Kilburn, he was defensive and offered his resignation (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Mr. B. Kilburn to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 5 Jul 1905). In 1914, Mr. H. Everett taught farming at the Crowstand school. He openly admitted to having had sexual intercourse with some of the teenage girls at the school, sometimes in his room and a couple of times, he had entered their dormitory at night for the same purpose (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, W. G. Blewett to the Secretary of DIA, 21 Jul 1914). Upon hearing this confession, the school’s principal ordered Everett to leave on the train that night (NAC, RG10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, W. McWhinney to Dr. Grant, 15 Aug 1914). The Indian agent later had McWhinney lay an information and have a warrant issued, but there was no evidence that he was ever brought to justice.

**Matrons and Assistant Matrons**

The women who filled positions as matrons and assistant matrons varied in their adeptness for the work. Some were commended for their proficiency and commitment. Long time matron, Annie McLaren, was appreciated for her care of the students and her success at winning the confidence of the Aboriginal adults (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 21 Oct 1913). Many considered her to be the head of the Birtle school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, Andrew B. Baird to Dr. Mackay, 28 Jan 1905). The DIA inspector articulated her success: “Miss McLaren as matron continues to do first class work, as the mother of the institution she is worthy of every consideration, her particular branch of the work is in the
sewing room as well as a general oversight over all, her influence over the girls is of the best” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev’d R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). An assistant matron at Birtle in 1915, Christina Kidd, was characterized as “a faithful and efficient worker” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 16 Nov 1915). Matilda McLeod, also an assistant matron at Birtle, had a number of desirable qualities: “[She] is in her own quiet way very fond of the work, very conscientious and successful in doing it and very ready to work in the utmost harmony...” (ABP, Letterbook 2, [Baird] to Mr. [illegible], Report on Indian Mission Schools under care of the Presbyterian Church, 20 Jun 1897, pp.217-230). The DIA inspector also noted some of Miss McLeod’s assets: “She is an amiable sweet dispositioned woman, beloved by the pupils. She attends to the kitchen and dining room work, there is no waste in her department” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5, File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). The inspector of Indian Agencies described Cecilia Jeffrey matron, Mrs. C. C. Kay, as a capable worker: “The matron is a marvel of activity and devotion, and enjoys the affection of the pupils” (CSP 1915, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1914, Report of John Semmens, p. 207). After only a few weeks as the assistant matron of the Crowstand school, Miss E. C. Carson had proved herself, and the principal proposed to promote her to matron: “She has shown her ability to govern, is winning the affection of the children and has won the confidence of all of us. I have no hesitation now in recommending that she be at once appointed as matron. I am sure you would have great difficulty in finding a better one” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1184-1191, C. W. Whyte to Rev Prof. Baird, 14 Jun 1895). The next principal of Crowstand
also viewed Miss Carson in a favourable light: “She is physically strong, even tempered, and has herself well in hand” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1754-1774, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 16 Aug 1897).

Some women proved strong in some aspects, but weak in others. Maggie Nicoll, who had been considered a skillful teacher at the Regina Industrial School, was not so successful at the Cecilia Jeffrey school. The principal faulted her for exacting too much discipline on the students of what was a newly opened school. She also was not able to establish a good relationship with the local Aboriginal people (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902). Jennie Cameron, who started out as an assistant matron at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, was considered to be tactful and cautious in her dealings with the Aboriginal people (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, Mr. J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 6 March 1902), however, according to the principal, she was deficient in controlling the students (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Sep 1902). The next principal of the school was more positive about Cameron’s ability to maintain the discipline of the female students and she was later elevated to matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 2 June 1904).

Miss Bremner was employed at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School as an assistant matron. The principal she worked under was somewhat critical of her work, yet commended her Christian spirit: “Miss Bremner hasn’t learned yet how to get the girls to work instead of doing it herself. But she will learn I think, and she has a beautiful christian
[sic] character and is a valuable worker from a missionary standpoint” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, McKitrick to MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). The principal established that, due to her physical deficiency, she would be better suited as matron: “Miss B, though perhaps unsurpassed as a mission worker and Christian bible worker is not very strong physically and needs a strong woman to help her and also one who could help her to control the children with firmness and wisdom, and with perhaps a little more firmness and discipline then she herself alone would, with the right kind of assistant, ... I think be able for the work of Matron ... ” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Austin McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 21 Oct 1905). Shortly thereafter, she was appointed matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 79, Report of the Meeting of the Indian Mission Committee of the Synod of MB + NW, 16 Nov 1905). In evaluating Miss Bremner’s capability as matron, principal McKitrick conveyed that she was lacking in numerous ways. Yet he was willing to overlook her shortcomings as she was making an honest effort and above all she had a “kindly, forgiving Christ like spirit” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Austin McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 15 Feb 1906).

Marjorie McIlwaine had completed several months at the Crowstand school as the sewing instructress when the principal conveyed his satisfaction with her: “I am very pleased to report that Miss McIlwain [sic] is showing herself to be in every way one of the most efficient officers we have ever had at the Crowstand. Everyday we are finding out new qualities of value in her. She is experienced, practical, earnest and of a most happy disposition” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 514-516, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 10 Jul 1896).

However, when the position of matron became available, the new principal was disinclined
to recommend Miss McIlwaine for the position. He argued that she was not very physically strong, and thus tended to be irritable at times. He maintained that as the position of matron required an even temper and sufficient vitality to undertake the work, she would not be suitable (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1754-1774, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 16 Aug 1897). She was thus passed over for a promotion.

A number of the women hired were simply not suitable for the position. Miss H. Stewart, for example, was deemed incapable to fill the position of assistant matron at Birtle. The Indian agent reported that a more competent person was needed: “... I would advise her retiring altogether, as she is not in my opinion qualified to teach anyone, as she has very little knowledge of housework, and no control over her temper, and is in this way a bad example to the children” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Extract- Report of Mr. Agent Wheatley on the Birtle Boarding School dated October 29, 1913). Based on this agent’s assessment, the secretary of the DIA strongly encouraged the principal to dispense with her services (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev David Iverach, 7 Nov 1913). Following this correspondence, Miss Stewart offered her resignation (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Rev David Iverach to Secretary of the DIA, 17 Nov 1913).

Based on first impressions, the principal of the Crowstand Boarding School believed Miss Wright to have a number of shortcomings. She was hired as matron and started in July 1901. The principal regarded Miss Wright to be “lacking in energy, and decision and not the person one would select to be the mother to some 20 girls.” He also conveyed apprehension about her physical strength as she was previously required to give up nursing
because she was not strong enough. Added to these weaknesses, it was the principal’s opinion that she was “already appalled with the work, ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 27, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 11 Jul 1901). As well, Miss Wright was said to have been quite temperamental and she complained about the amount of work that was required of her (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 29, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 4 Sep 1901). Miss Wright resigned after only three months at the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to MacKay, 19 Sep 1901).

Based on the data, it appears that a good proportion of boarding school staff were quite successful at discharging their respective duties. Considering the sources of data used, one must be cautious in their interpretation. Those who quickly learned that they were not cut out for such work likely did not remain long, and therefore it is possible that they were never mentioned in correspondence. In other words, capable staff would be more likely to be discussed in letters simply because of the greater length of their stay at a school. An amount of skepticism must be exercised in regards to reports by DIA and church inspectors. Particularly in official reports, both parties wanted to portray the schools in a positive light. Also, inspections were scheduled in advance and there is evidence that school conditions were contrived in order to depict a positive school environment for such inspections. Crowstand farm instructor expressed his concerns that announced visits resulted in an artificially favourable impression: “A person can have very little idea by just visiting the school, for things are made very different for a visitor” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 267-270, W. J. Wright to Prof Baird, 20 Jun 1893). Principals, unless writing for annual reports, tended to be more forthcoming when discussing the
merits and demerits of their staff members. It is obvious that certain weaknesses were excused in the case of some workers. The church’s expectations may have been lowered due to a lack of suitable applicants. If an adequate employee was dismissed, there was no guarantee a better one could be found. Despite this apprehension about the validity of the data, some staff members were clearly competent and the church and DIA had reasons to be proud of them.

**Principals**

Ultimately, the school administrator was held responsible for the success of a boarding school. The DIA and, to a lesser extent, the Presbyterian church officials were more critical of the ability of the principal than those individuals filling other positions. Many problems common to residential schools, such as frequent runaways and poor fiscal management, were often blamed directly on the principal. The principal was under the most pressure to be successful, as he or she was expected to take responsibility for all aspects of running the boarding school. DIA officials, church officials, as well as fellow staff members and the Aboriginal people concerned with the affairs of a particular school all commented on the ability of the principal.

Birtle’s first principal, George McLaren, encountered hardships which were commonly experienced by residential school administrators. These included the occasional truancy of students, impediments to recruiting students and time constraints (see, for example: UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 108, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Prof Hart, 8 May 1889; UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 168, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Professor Baird, 13 Apr 1893 and UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 266, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Baird, 13 May 1893). Despite such drawbacks, the FMC
did not question McLaren’s ability. Also, there was an accident, in which three children drowned while playing on the ice (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. Cassels, 12 Dec 1893, pp. 288-291). None of the staff members were accused of failing to properly supervise the students. On notification of George McLaren’s resignation, Rev. Baird declared the FMC’s confidence in him: “We have not only been well pleased with the fidelity with which you have discharged your duties but we bear willing testimony to the fact that we have had undeniably little trouble with the internal management of the institution and that we have had to differ from your own judgment so little in matters that concerned the Indians” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. McLaren, 30 Apr 1894, pp. 392-393).

Not all principals at Birtle received so little criticism. When E. H. Crawford began his two-year administration of the Birtle Boarding School, he was depicted as an enthusiastic principal, “a young man, full of energy and zeal” (CSP 1905, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1904, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 424). Crawford had been employed at the school for over one year when he began to receive criticism from Church and DIA officials. The regional inspector of Indian agencies indicated that while Mr. Crawford had some admirable personal qualities, he felt that Mr. Crawford was not the appropriate person for the position of principal:

I still consider him a young man of high moral character, and one who would like to do the right thing, but I find he has the unfortunate habit of procrastination, starting a work and not finishing it, etc, he is also very absent minded. In addition to this he does not care to be advised. He is a young man (only 25) perhaps I expect too much of him, but I have certainly come to the conclusion that he is not in his right sphere (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905).
Furthermore, Marlatt contended that Crawford had failed to gain the confidence of his employees and faulted Crawford for giving the larger boys too much heavy work. Another complaint advanced was that many of Crawford’s responsibilities were more appropriate for a general labourer than for a principal. Since the greatest part of Crawford’s time was spent doing or supervising the outside work in the stable, garden and yard, it was argued that if one of the women currently on staff was promoted to principal, then much of Mr. Crawford’s duties could be just as efficiently discharged by an intelligent labourer (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, Andrew B. Baird to Dr. Mackay, 28 Jan 1905). Crawford resigned shortly after these concerns had been raised.

David Iverach managed the Birtle school from October 1913 to March 1916. During Rev. Iverach’s tenure of office, truancy and immorality among students were concerns at the Birtle school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. D. Iverach, 24 Nov 1913; NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 19 June 1915). The DIA inspector attributed such behaviour to the lack of proper supervision. Rev. Iverach did not sleep in the school building, as he and his family lived in a rented house a mile away from the school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 19 June 1915). It was also noted that Rev. Iverach was often away from the school on church business and for recruitment purposes, and therefore the school was often left inadequately supervised (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Extract - Agent G. H. Wheatley’s Monthly Report on the Birtle Boarding School, dated 20 Apr 1915). The Church attempted to rectify this problem by relieving
Principal Iverach from all responsibilities for missionary work on the surrounding reserves. Furthermore, church official Andrew Grant argued that the responsibility of recruitment should fall on the DIA, and not the principal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 29 Apr 1915). In response to complaints, Rev. Iverach contended that he was present at the school from the time the pupils got up in the morning until the time they went to bed at night, and that the farmer slept in the school building. Moreover he opined that the situation had been remedied: “So far as I can see the discipline of the school has been steadily improving and the supervision of the children has been as close as at any period in the history of the school. Truancy has now almost disappeared” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Copy, David Iverach to Rev. A. S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). The DIA never requested Iverach to step down, but only asked that an addition be made to the staff: a “good general purpose man” to supervise in the summer months as the farmer was three miles away at the farm much of the time (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol 6251, File 575-1, part 1, Extract - Report of Inspector S. J. Jackson on the Birtle Bdg. School, dated 27 May 1915).

Sara Marshall’s ability was initially questioned because of her gender. Prior to getting married and raising a family, Mrs. Marshall (nee Laidlaw) had worked at the Portage school for seven years. In the spring of 1916, she was appointed the principal of the Birtle school, initially on probationary terms. During her previous experience, she had “shown great ability in this line of work” and thus church officials were confident in her potential to perform the job (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, Andrew S.
Grant to D. C. Scott, 31 Mar 1916). The DIA inspector, on the other hand, was uneasy about having a woman in charge of the school without the constant assistance from a man. "Mrs. Marshall seems to be a very capable woman, but I am doubtful of her being able to run this school without a male member of the staff living in the school and being on hand at all times" (as quoted in NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 27 Jun 1916). The Superintendent of Home Missions continued to advocate on Mrs. Marshall’s behalf, as he pointed out that the farm instructor, Mr. Perry, was in charge of the boys and he opined that "with Mrs. Marshall in residence, and because of her ability and long experience in this class of work, that she is quite capable of handling the situation, with Mr. Perry assisting her" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 29 Jun 1916).

According to the District Superintendent for Manitoba, there was little reason for concern, as the discipline of the school had improved under Mrs. Marshall and she was handling the boys with "remarkable skill" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 5 Aug 1916).

Over time, Marshall ably proved herself even to previously skeptical DIA employees. The local Indian agent commented that "under the supervision of the energetic Principal, Mrs. Marshall, strict discipline is maintained, with kindness, and the good progress being made is the result." Agent Wheatley also stressed Mrs. Marshall’s superior financial management: "Strict economy in all the departments, is adhered to, both in purchases for the school and consumption of same. This is carried on without stinting the pupils, either in provisions or the necessary clothing requirements" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 29 Jun 1916).
Mrs. Marshall’s flair for financial affairs was exemplified after her first year at Birtle, as she was able to eliminate a $408 deficit and ended up with a surplus of over $200. In addition to strong school management, she was also commended for her success at gaining the confidence of the Aboriginal people, thus facilitating student recruitment (Third AR WMS PCC, 1916; Sixth AR WMS, PCC, 1919).

Concern over supervision and the need to have a male residing in the school building arose again when the farm instructor moved out of the school building: “Some things have taken place during the winter between the boys and girls that would not likely have occurred if there was a male member of the staff in charge of the boys” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 Part 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Jackson, dated 28 Apr 1919). The inspector failed to acknowledge that similar incidents had occurred at Birtle in 1915, while a farm instructor was living in the school building (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 19 Jun 1915). The church expressed their desire to appease the DIA and look for a suitable man to work at the school and reside in the building (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of Indian Affairs, 19 May 1919). Kate Gillespie faced similar apprehension when she was suggested for the principalship at the File Hills Boarding School, and she also managed to prove herself capable to even her worst critics (Dobbins, 1961).

Many of the principals at the Cecilia Jeffrey school in one way or another had trouble with its management. The first two principals, Gandier and McGregor, were considered
to be too inexperienced. When resigning, Gandier admitted that a more mature and experienced man would be preferable for the position (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Gandier to Rev. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). Mr. McGregor, on the other hand, had faith in his own ability to run the school, but the local missionary did not. The missionary, Rev. McKitrick, criticized McGregor’s administrative ability, arguing that “The school [was] suffering from lack of discipline and wise management” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Nov 1903). McKitrick recognized McGregor’s competence in teaching, yet contended he was neglectful of his duties outside of the school room. Gandier and McGregor both left the school after one year.

Rev. McKitrick, frustrated by the failures of the two previous principals, took over the management of the Cecilia Jeffrey school in May 1904. Upon visiting the school in 1905, a member of the Presbyterian Church noted that the school was in good condition: progress was being made in the classroom, discipline was maintained in and out of the classroom and a regular schedule was followed. Even though the school appeared to have been well-managed, this man opined that, because of his habit of interfering in others work, McKitrick was not suitable for the role of principal. He also mentioned that McKitrick was neglecting his missionary duties (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, John W. Little to R. P. Mackay; 25 Feb 1905). In August 1906, two of the top men of the FMC in Toronto visited the northwestern Ontario school. One of these men stated that McKitrick’s work was lacking, but because of his ability to run the steamboat and his knowledge of the waterways, his services could not be easily dispensed of. He
recommended that McKitrick should cease to be the principal and continue to do the missionary work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 89, James Farquharson to Dr. McKay, 1 Sep 1906). Only days later, a staff member of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Miss Bremner appeared before the FMC in order to voice staff concerns regarding the administration of the school. She complained that, among other things, Mr. McKitrick did very little missionary work and he had been financially wasteful. In general, the staff was dissatisfied with McKitrick and recommended a change in the administration of the mission (Minutes of the FMC, WD, PCC, 1906, pp. 33-24). Subsequently, the Western Committee of the FMC notified McKitrick that his services would not be required after May 1907. Despite a letter from Chief Redsky and others pleading that McKitrick be allowed to remain there, he was replaced (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 95, Chief Redsky to the Foreign Mission Society, 4 Mar 1907).

Troubles plagued the Cecilia Jeffrey school throughout the tenure of Frank Dodds. His competence in managing the school and maintaining discipline came into question a number of times. The first critical report came in June 1908. Based on a recent inspection, the DIA secretary reported the following: “The discipline is lax, the Principal being indulgent and disinclined to excite the hostility of parents, and, owing to his being overworked, cannot give effective supervision to the school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to R. P. McKay, 4 Jun 1908). In response, a church committee that visited the school argued that Dodds discipline was the opposite of lax and that the students’ parents considered his discipline to be too strict. The Committee acknowledged that the expectations on Dodds were so great that it was
"impossible for him to discharge them all satisfactorily," but they did not think that having two men, one as principal and one as missionary, would be acceptable. They did, however, recommend that a male teacher be hired to act also as an assistant principal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to visit the Cecilia Jeffrey School, Indian Mission Committee of the Synods of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, signed by William Patrick and James Farquharson, Jul 1908). At this time, this recommendation was not carried out.

In early 1911, allegations of sexual abuse surfaced against Dodds. Some of the female students revealed to the assistant matron that Dodds had made them "put their hands under his clothing and [play] with his breasts," and that he was also "in the habit of kissing the old girls" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 131, P. W. Gibson Ponton to R. P. MacKay, 1 Feb 1911). The assistant matron’s husband, also a former employee of the school, reported to Rev. Mackay of the FMC that "some things even more unpleasant" had occurred (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 131, R. P. Mackay to Dr. Farquharson, 3 Feb 1911). In replying to these charges, a church official who was acquainted with Dodds was skeptical: "Mr. Dodds, I believe to be a thoroughly good man. If the complaint had simply been that he takes things too easy, I could almost believe there was something in that, but I could scarcely think that he would do any unbecoming thing" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 131, James Farquharson to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 7 Feb 1911). No action was taken against Dodds in relation to these serious accusations and there was no mention of an investigation in the church correspondence.

Unfavourable reports continued to arrive from the DIA. Unsatisfactory conditions
reported by DIA inspectors and agents included excessive punishment of pupils (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Kenora and Savanne Agencies, dated 8 Jul 1914), incidence of immorality between female and male pupils (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, John Semmens to Duncan C. Scott, 10 Sept 1915), frequent truancy and general insubordination of pupils (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, dated 22 Jan 1917). The Department felt that Mr. Dodds was incapable of asserting authority, and thus, was not in control of the situation as was expected of a principal: “The Department is of the opinion that a man with more force of character than the present Principal should be placed in charge of this school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to J. H. Edmison, 29 March 1917). Two Shoal Lake bands wrote petitions asking for Dodds’ dismissal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Chief Kesik, Chief Redsky, et al. to Mr. McKenzie, 28 Mar 1917).

In hopes of improving the situation at Cecilia Jeffrey, an assistant principal was engaged (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1917). But four months later, the DIA’s inspector disclosed that no improvement in the management of the school had occurred. Truancy continued to be a problem: “Pupils lack interest in their work and prefer the hardships of a wild run through the forest to remaining under the discipline given” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to J. H. Edmison, 4 Aug 1917). The Secretary of the DIA recommended that Dodds be replaced. The Indian agent reported that attendance
was very low even though he had made serious attempts to get the parents to send their children back to the school. He described the school as being in "a very bad shape" and maintained that if some action was not taken quickly, he may be forced to close the school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract - Agent’s Monthly Report on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, Aug 1917).

The Church agreed to investigate, but did not visit the school until over five months later. Dodds continued to be supported by the Church and those who investigated argued that despite Dodds declining health, he should be allowed to remain at the school until the end of summer 1918: "... we are strongly of the opinion that his removal at this juncture would be construed by the Indians as the direct result of their appeal to the Department and a victory on their part. Such a sense of victory would be disastrous and would certainly lead to trouble for his successor in the future" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Copy - Report of Commission of Presbytery appointed to investigate conditions at Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, by Hugh J. Robertson and S. C. Murray, dated 26 Feb 1918). The DIA agreed to this proposal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to R. S. McKenzie, 11 Apr 1918) and Dodds stayed at the school until the end of September.

From all available reports, Mr. P. T. Martin was one of the more capable administrators of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. Initially, Martin was hired on a six month trial basis, starting in November 1918 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 29 Nov 1918). Mr. Martin had been on the job for a couple of months when the DIA inspector John Semmens reported his
impressions:

His addresses to the children and to the staff give evidence of an unusual ability to direct and counsel receptive minds. ... Should the Church decide to make his appointment permanent ... I am convinced that he will in a short while be able to show better results than the sch has ever known (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, report dated 8 Feb 1918).

In this report, Semmens also indicated a positive relationship between Mr. Martin and the local Aboriginal chiefs. Martin’s impressive record was highlighted in the 1919 annual report of the WMS: “Mr. Martin, our present principal, has solved some of the problems and accomplished much in a satisfactory manner despite the shortage of competent help during a greater part of the year” (Sixth AR, WMS, PCC, 1919, p. 98). Not surprisingly, after the probation period expired, he was granted the principalship of the institution on a permanent basis (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 12 Apr 1919) Martin continued working at the Cecilia Jeffrey school until July 1920 (Seventh AR WMS WD PCC, 1920).

Of the four men who acted as the head of the Crowstand school, only Neil Gilmour escaped allegations of mismanagement. He had a very hard time getting started, being required to make do without proper equipment, without adequate funds and with one of the school buildings in a very precarious state (ABP, G 1754-1774, Neil Gilmour to Rev. Baird, 16 Aug 1897). A few years into the work, he did not hesitate to state that financing the school was not an easy task: “I think this is the most difficult of all our Indian schools to finance, ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 9 Apr 1901). It appears that Gilmour was equal to the challenge.
His successor recognized Mr. Gilmour’s competence: “I am much pleased with the appearance of affairs here. The FMC is losing a very efficient worker in the person of Mr. Gilmour, judging from what I have seen. I hope I may be able at least to maintain the present high order of things, ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 48, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 8 Apr 1903). It is evident that the FMC were also impressed with and appreciative of Mr. Gilmour’s contributions to the work, as they later offered him a position as principal at the Regina Industrial School.

From 1888 to spring of 1892, the Crowstand Boarding School was under the management of Rev. G. Laird. He also invested much time and energy in the local missionary work (See MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, June 1889, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 6-8). During Laird’s first couple of years, the content of correspondence was largely limited to general day-to-day business of running the school (see for example: UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 111-112, Geo A. Laird to Prof Hart, 11 May 1889 and UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 257-258, Geo A. Laird to Rev. Prof Hart, 30 Dec 1889). Then, in March 1890, a letter written by Rev. Laird foreshadowed future troubles of the school. He acknowledged that his frequent trips necessary for his missionary duties made it “utterly impossible for [him] to do a very large amount of work in the school” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Geo Laird to Rev. Baird, 10 March 1890). In other words, maintaining adequate supervision of the pupils was not always feasible due to Principal Laird’s required travel.

In the fall of 1891, complaints of lax discipline, carelessness and neglect of duties on the part of Laird began to show up in the correspondence. These charges came from DIA employees and school staff. Fred Fischer of the DIA referred to incidents of immorality
among school students. He argued that such incidents resulted in animosity among the
Aboriginal people towards Rev. Laird (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1296-1297, Copy - Fred
Fischer to Indian Commissioner, 22 Sep 1891). The deputy superintendent general of the
DIA blamed Laird and his staff for the improprieties that had occurred, stating the staff
were “culpably careless and neglectful of their duties” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1336-1337, L.
Vankoughnet to Rev. Baird, 18 Sep 1891). He called for a thorough investigation in the
school’s management under Laird and also for an immediate change in management. The
Indian agent, too, suggested a change in management and criticized Mr. Laird for being
absent from the school too often (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1298, testimony by W. E. Jones,
attached to Fred Fischer to Indian Commissioner, 22 Sep 1891). The teacher at
Crowstand also mentioned the night time visitations made by some older boys to the girls’
dormitory. She disparaged Mr. Laird’s work with the boys, maintaining the boys had not
been properly trained in manual work nor were they properly disciplined (UCA-Wpg,
ABP, E 1257-1259, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 19 Aug 1891). Over the next few
months, two other staff members came forward, characterizing Mr. Laird as an abrasive,
unpleasant man to work for (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1491, Mr. Wright to Mr. Beard [sic], 20
Jan 1892; UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892).

A few changes in the right direction had been made. Mr. Wright was hired to take over
the training and supervision of the boys (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1331-1332, Geo A. Laird to
Prof Hart, 26 Oct 1891). A new school building was being used which, according to
Laird, made late night meetings between the male and female students “an impossibility.”
In addition, he asserted that since moving into the new building, discipline and order of the
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school had greatly improved (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1333-1334, G. Laird to Mr. Baird, 18 Sep 1891). Yet, these improvements did not reduce the pressure upon the Church to make a change in management.

The accumulated complaints required action. In mid-January 1892, Rev. Baird wrote Mr. Laird advising him to resign. Baird mentioned Laird’s previously stated desire to be relieved from the work on account of the educational needs of his sons. Baird also stressed the Church’s continued faith in him: “... we wish it to be clearly understood that we have every confidence in your character, in your devotedness to your work and in your desire to be a blessing to the Indians under your charge” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1527-1529, [Baird] to Mr. Laird, 20 Jan 1892). However, it was realized that the situation had gone beyond any attempt at damage control and thus a change in principal was inevitable. In response, Laird denied much of the allegations, arguing that the state of affairs had been greatly exaggerated. Nonetheless, he agreed to resign, acknowledging that his administration came “very far short” of what he had desired (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1556-1559, Geo A. Laird to Prof Baird, 6 Feb 1892).

During the first year under the management of Rev. C. W. Whyte, affairs of the Crowstand school ran smoothly. A year into Whyte’s tenure, the farm instructor accused Whyte of giving inconsistent orders (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 233, Mr. Wright to Prof. Baird, 22 May 1893). He also blamed a low school attendance on Mr. Whyte, arguing that Mr. Whyte was not fulfilling his obligations as missionary and, furthermore, contended that Mr. Whyte had a negative opinion of Aboriginal people: “I do not know how any man could pretend [sic] to work among the Indians, and say that he can see nothing good on
any of them, and that they are all rogues. ... I think that any man who looks at Brothers in Christ as rogues fails to have the work at heart” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 267-269, Mr. Wright to Prof Baird, 20 Jun 1893). The bottom line, according to Wright, was that Whyte did not have the confidence of his staff, of the local Indian agent nor that of the Aboriginal parents. Whyte, in turn, attributed low attendance to pupils’ absence due to sickness and also to the Indian agent’s lack in promoting the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 319-326, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 25 Jul 1893). The general want of harmony between Mr. Whyte and his staff continued, and FMC officials decided to grant Whyte a second chance and thus transferred three staff members to other schools (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267).

This action did not quiet all concerns. The Indian Commissioner had met with the Aboriginal people of the Swan River Agency and found that the parents were dissatisfied with Whyte. As well, the DIA was not impressed with Whyte’s practice of buying beef from the Aboriginal people, and paying them partly in provisions, at a large advance over the market price, sometimes charging 100 percent profit (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 521, Hayter Reed to Rev. Baird, 3 Feb 1894).

The church continued to back Mr. Whyte throughout his principalship at Crowstand. Baird responded to some charges made in April 1894. The Indian agent had contended that Whyte failed to allot enough time and attention to the advancement of the pupils. Baird replied that Whyte had been hired as missionary and the FMC was solely responsible for assigning him duties: “... by our instructions he is to give all the time that is required to his work as Missionary. His duties as Principal involve merely a supervision of the
school and a direction of its general policy” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, Andrew B. Baird to Deputy Sup’t General of Indian Affairs, 6 Apr 1894). The other staff members were responsible for the day-to-day details of school management, and therefore, Baird insisted, no fault could be found with Whyte. In March 1896, Baird visited the local Aboriginal people to inquire into charges made against Whyte. Without providing much detail, Baird concluded that “the feeling of some Indians against him is not well founded” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 128-129, Baird to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 5 Mar 1896).

Whyte’s resignation was accepted in March 1897. Despite the strong, continued support for Whyte, it was later indicated that this prompt acceptance was in part due to Whyte’s questionable practice of trading with the Aboriginal people at a substantial profit to himself (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1800-1805, [Baird] to Mr. Gilmour, 18 Aug 1897).

William McWhinney arrived at the Crowstand school in the spring of 1903. On the positive side, McWhinney was able to improve the financial standing of the school. The Indian agent commended him for this: “Mr. McWhinney, the principal, is to be congratulated on the good work done in his school, especially as he always has a credit balance instead of a deficit as is so often found in some schools” (CSP 1913, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1912, Report by Mr. Blewett, p. 367).

Despite such complimentary reports, throughout his time at the Crowstand Boarding School, Mr. McWhinney faced numerous challenges and problems. For example, a number of incidents of male students and men from the reserve making late night visits to the girls’ dormitory are recorded in the Church and DIA correspondence (see, for
example: UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 99, Copy, Wm McWhinney to Dr. Farquharson, 8 Jul 1907; NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Duncan C. Scott to W. M. Graham, 24 Oct 1911 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, W. McWhinney to Secretary of the Indian Department, 17 May 1915). A church committee assigned to investigate the occurrences of immorality in the summer of 1907, absolved McWhinney of charges of mismanagement. They argued that such incidents occurred at schools of all nationalities, and therefore the incidents at the Crowstand school did not reflect poorly of the school’s management (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Copy - Report of Committee appointed to enquire into the complaints made by the Indian Department against the Crowstand Indian School, 8 Aug 1907). At least one DIA employee strongly disagreed: “I cannot help expressing the opinion that in their anxiety to whitewash Mr. McWhinney they have used very lame arguments, the principal one being that such occurrences have taken place at other schools. Two wrongs do not make a right, and in my opinion these happenings were preventable with ordinary care and discipline” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Martin Benson to Deputy Superintendent General, 27 Aug 1907).

Truancy of male students was also a common difficulty and on one occasion Mr. McWhinney found himself in hot water with the DIA for his indiscreet method of returning a few of the runaway students. McWhinney retrieved some runaway boys in his buggy, and tied ropes around their arms and forced them to run behind the buggy. According to the Secretary of the DIA, the parents objected, saying their children should not be treated like dogs. When McWhinney was advised not to use such methods, he
asked what method should be used instead. The Department was displeased with the whole incident and was “inclined to question the advisability of Mr. McWhinney’s being continued in charge of the school” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, J. D. McLean to R. P. Mackay, 18 Jul 1907). The church committee which investigated this incident supported McWhinney:

The Committee agrees with the Indian Department that boys should not be brought back to any school tied with ropes, not because to do so is necessarily either cruel or wicked, but partly because to be seen bringing back boys tied thus is all but certain to lead to complaints of cruelty: and even more, because such a practice is in danger of degenerating into cruelty. Whether any particular case is actually wrong, must be determined by its circumstances. There is no doubt of the danger to which the boys would be exposed if the ropes had been made fast to the buggy as well as to the boys; but the ropes were not fastened to the buggy. The Committee can see no cruelty in making boys walk, or even run for reasonable distances (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Copy - Report of Committee appointed to enquire into the complaints made by the Indian Department against the Crowstand Indian School, 8 Aug 1907).

The Committee concluded that they had accepted McWhinney’s promise that such a method of returning runaways would not be used again, and suggested that the DIA should also accept it.

More problems burdened the school. In the spring of 1913, in addition to increased numbers of runaways, some boys had tried to burn the school down (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, W. McWhinney to W. G. Blewett, 18 Mar 1913). The agent argued that his attempts at recruiting students had been futile. He was very condemning of the school management when providing an explanation for his inability to get new students for the school: “I must say that there have been far too many desertions from Crowstand School the last year, and far too many girl graduates from
school turning out prostitutes and boys becoming drunken loafers. When I urge on an
Indian to send his child to school, he at once refers to this and asks me if I want his child
to become like that, and it is very hard to refute his arguments ...” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel
C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, W. G. Blewett to the Secretary of the DIA, 21 May
1913). Then, in 1914, McWhinney was considered to have mishandled the case of Mr.
Everett. Everett had admitted to having had sexual relations with some of the female
students and rather than seeing that he was punished, McWhinney ordered Everett to
leave the school immediately (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt.
1, W. M. Graham to Duncan C. Scott, 5 Sep 1914).

Clearly, the frequent runaways and incidents of immorality had a detrimental effect on
the opinion that the people of the Coté reserve held of Mr. McWhinney. Several times,
Chief Coté and his people demanded that McWhinney be replaced (see, for example:
NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Glen Campbell to Secretary
of the DIA, 2 Oct 1912 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1,
W. M. Graham to Duncan C. Scott, 5 Sep 1914). Members of the DIA were also
adamant that a change in the school’s management was necessary (for example: NAC, RG
10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, J. D. McLean to R. P. Mackay, 18 Jul
1907 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Volume 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Mr. Blewett
to Secretary of DIA, 21 May 1913). One DIA official went so far as to suggest that Mr.
McWhinney should be sent to a different line of work or at least transferred to a different
school, as the Aboriginal people had lost confidence in him (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel
C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Duncan C. Scott to Rev Andrew S. Grant, 19 Sep
While the people of Coté’s reserve were clearly dissatisfied with Mr. McWhinney’s management of the school, many were supportive of his plan to close the boarding school in favour of a semi-boarding/day school. In April 1915, Mr. McWhinney’s proposal was finally approved by the DIA; the boarding school was closed and replaced with an improved day school. With the backing of the Church, Mr. McWhinney endured through numerous controversies and remained principal and missionary at the Coté Reserve at least well into the 1920's (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Copy, W. McWhinney to Duncan C. Scott, 17 Jun 1926).

Unlike the other schools, the school at Portage la Prairie remained free of any allegations of mismanagement. All of the school’s principals were considered to be capable and dedicated.

For instance, a Department official commended the work done at Portage under the management of Miss Fraser: “The boarding school at Portage la Prairie ... is a model one, and is deserving of every encouragement from the department. Miss Fraser, the principal, and Miss Laidlaw, the teacher, are eminently qualified by natural and acquired ability for the positions they occupy” (CSP 1897, AR DIA for yr ended June 30th, 1896 by Superintending Inspector E. McColl, p. 105). The Secretary of the WFMS indicated her appreciation for Miss Fraser’s commitment: “We feel that she has given eleven years (the best of her life) of hard devoted work to this school and should have every consideration shown her” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1482-1486, C. M. Jeffrey to Prof. Baird, 24 March 1900). Fraser’s successor voiced a professional admiration for her: “She left her stamp
on the children and on the institution that was a credit to her personality and character” (as quoted in Murray, S. C., [1936]: 87).

Throughout Mr. Hendry’s long career, his competence and loyalty to the work was greatly appreciated by both Church and DIA officials. He was commonly noted for his talent and tact in working with Aboriginal children:

Mr. Hendry acts as teacher, and he evidently has the knack of imparting instruction (CSP 1904, AR DIA Yr ended June 30 1903, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 451).

He is thoroughly qualified to develop the varied dispositions of Indian children and has their perfect respect without fear (CSP 1909, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st 1908, Report by S. Swinford, p. 321).

He is devoted to his work, and I know no one who understands the Indian character better. He does everything in his power for the welfare of his pupils (CSP 1916, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1915, Report of Martin Benson, p. 166).

Equally impressive were accolades regarding Mr. Hendry’s adeptness for school management. The DIA inspector acknowledged his management ability, particularly his finesse in financial affairs: “Mr. Hendry is a master of finance, and always keeps the expenditure within the income. In this respect, as for several other important reasons, he would make an excellent head for a much more extensive institution” (CSP 1907, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1906, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 356). Almost 20 years later, Mr. Hendry’s aptitude for the work had not waned:

Mr. Hendry is thoroughly practical, and my only regret is that we have not more men of his stamp at the head of Indian boarding schools. I would say that it would do some of the other principals a great deal of good to spend a day or so with Mr. Hendry at the school, and see how he handles the affairs of the institution. ... This school is in an excellent financial condition, having several thousands of dollars to its credit, and with this year’s crop another large surplus will be added (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, M. Christianson to W. M. Graham, Sep 1925).
It is true that the principal assumed the greatest responsibility when it came to running the schools. Problems at the schools, which could have had a number of different causes, were often attributed to incapable management. Luckily for school administrators, the Presbyterian Church’s FMC tended to be very supportive, almost unconditionally. Unfavourable reports were regularly minimized and excused. The Department tended to be more critical, however, in the end, the wishes of the Church were usually abided by.
CHAPTER NINE

QUICK RESIGNATIONS AND LONG TERMS

Generally speaking, Aboriginal residential schools experienced high staff turnover rates. Many individuals stationed at residential schools were unable to adapt to the unfamiliar, semi-isolated environment. Some became discouraged and disillusioned by the less than desirable working conditions and the slow progress made or the privation required became too much to bear. These men and women sought to be relieved of their duties quickly. There were some individuals who were only mentioned once in school correspondence, because their stay was so brief. There are likely numerous more who were simply not mentioned at all in correspondence or annual reports due to their brief terms. There were others who were able to adjust and rise to the challenges. For these people, the work proved to be rewarding and some made it their lifelong careers.

Range of Terms by Position and School

Principals

Of all the positions, principals stayed in the field of Aboriginal education for the longest period of time. Many were also serving the Presbyterian Church as ministers, and when appointed to a particular post, they were expected to stay there for a number of years. The average stay for principals in this study was just over five and a half years at one school.  

In the decades studied, the shortest terms as principal of the Birtle school were held by Gilmour and McWhinney, at approximately one year each. Of the nine Birtle principals,
Walter McLaren, who was new to Aboriginal missionary work, stayed the longest: eight years. From the time it opened in 1902 until the early 1920's, the Cecilia Jeffrey school saw nine principals come and go. Frank Dodds stayed the maximum, at eleven years, while Rev. J. T. Ross departed from the school after about half a year. Short terms among the administrators were common at this school; seven of the nine principals stayed for less than two years. The Crowstand and Portage schools each had four principals in this period. William McWhinney was in charge of the Crowstand school for over twenty years. The other three had terms ranging from four to five years. Rev. Hendry was the head of the Portage la Prairie Boarding School for more than thirty years. Annie Fraser also had a lengthy career there at twelve years. Rev. Millar was compelled to leave after only two years at Portage.

Matrons and Their Assistants

The overall average time spent by matrons and assistant matrons at the four schools was four and a half years. Jessie Jamison spent less than a year as an assistant matron at the Birtle school, while Annie McLaren and Matilda McLeod established lengthy careers of twenty-five and twenty years respectively. All others for whom information was available resigned from Birtle in five years or less. At the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, it was rare for matrons and assistant matrons to remain for more than one or two years, however Mrs. C. C. Kay worked as the matron for nine years. Miss Wright resigned from her post as matron of the Crowstand school after only three months, whereas Jeanie Gilmour filled the positions of assistant and matron for a total of fifteen years and Miss Dunbar worked for over fifteen years, as an assistant matron for the majority of the time.
The next lengthiest terms were held by Miss McLeod and Miss Windel, at five years each.

Information was located regarding six women who were employed at the Portage school as either an assistant matron or matron. Mrs. Jean Hendry, with the longest career as matron at all four schools, extended over three decades. Mary Hendry worked first as matron and later as an assistant, for a total of eleven years. Three women worked at Portage for the minimum of two years.

**Teachers**

The average stay for all teachers was three years. Due to the fact that some principals were given the responsibility of the classroom, there were only five teachers mentioned in the data for the Birtle school: Eliza MacGregor taught for a duration of eight years; Miss Cameron worked for less than two years; the remaining three rendered their services for four to five years. Like Birtle, Cecilia Jeffrey principals were often responsible for the teaching, and thus information for only four was found. Zena Brodie continued her teaching career at Cecilia Jeffrey for over ten years, while the others continued on for less than a year. A couple of teachers at the Crowstand school, Miss Downing and Mary MacIntosh, had abbreviated terms of only a few months. Miss McLaren dedicated ten years of her life to providing classroom instruction to the students of the Crowstand school. Two women who had taught here for a few years, Kate Gillespie and May Armstrong, left Crowstand, yet continued in the same line of work. Sara Laidlaw taught at the Portage school for a stretch of seven years, compared to the majority, who remained for two years or less. Miss Clow discovered quickly, after three weeks, that she would not able to undertake the teaching duties at the Portage school.
Farm Instructors

On average, farm instructors remained at a school for one and a half years. William Perry's term of over five years as farm instructor of the Birtle school was the most extensive of farm instructors at all the schools. The others at Birtle made their departure in less than a year. The record among farm instructors at the Cecilia Jeffrey school was even worse. Mr. Billson was the only one to last a full year. A DIA inspector noted in 1911 that at Crowstand there were a "great many changes" in the position of farmer (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, 31 Oct 1911, Wm. Graham to the Secretary of the DIA), meaning a high turnover rate. Yet, Crowstand managed to keep some of its farm instructors for more than a year. Mr. W. J. Brigham instructed farming for four years, and James Hamilton and M. J. Wright did so for over two years. Mr. G. Coppin was more typical of farm instructors elsewhere, as he stayed for less than a year.

Nurses

Around 1915, the Department began the practice of hiring nurses for the Aboriginal residential schools. Often though, a nurse would be hired only on a temporary basis, when absolutely necessary, such as during an outbreak of a contagious disease. The length of terms of the nurses reflects this. For instance, the two nurses mentioned in the Birtle correspondence were each employed for only a few months. Cecilia Jeffrey school, on the other hand, did have permanent nurses, perhaps due to the great distance to the nearest doctor. Alberta Reid practiced nursing there for over five years. Another, Katherine Fraser, cared for the children and local adults of Shoal Lake for a two year period.
Elizabeth Grant stayed for only six months. Each of the seven nurses referred to in the data for the Portage school were employed for approximately one year. The overall term for a nurse, including those who were temporary, was 1.28 years.

For all positions, Portage school retained its staff the longest: 5.3 years on average. The Birtle school was next, with staff members staying an average of 4.2 years. The mean for time spent at the Crowstand school was 4.0 years. Cecilia Jeffrey school had the most difficulty keeping staff, with the average remaining on 2.2 years. It is important to stress that these averages are only approximate, as they include only those for whom information was available in official correspondence and annual reports. At all schools, there may have been a number of staff who left after such a brief time, that they were never mentioned in the data.

**Reasons for Resignation**

For nearly sixty percent of all the staff members discussed in this study, there was a reason cited in the data regarding their resignation. Impaired health was the most common reason provided by a staff member offering his or her resignation. In addition to his inability to acquire the local language, Neil Gilmour stated that his health would benefit from a change, as it had been “far from good” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 25 Sep 1902). Rev. Millar and Mrs. Millar resigned their positions as principal and matron because of Mrs. Millar being seriously ill (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 9 Nov 1911). Mrs. Lockhart ended her term as assistant matron at Crowstand when her deteriorating health began to interfere with the discharge of her duties. A couple of
months after her departure, her health had further declined and she “was likely to be laid up altogether” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 22 May 1896). Miss Clow lasted only three weeks as teacher at Portage because of her health. The trouble was a “weak throat” and Miss Clow, the rest of the staff and her doctor all agreed that she should not attempt to continue working (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 21 Jan 1893). After teaching at Crowstand school for only a short period of time, Miss Downing decided she was not suited for such work. She initially had intended to stay there for one year, but on account of the children not being very healthy she felt being in such an environment would-take a toll on her own health. Apparently she felt “her health giving a little already” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901). She left after several months. As was common, Miss MacIntosh was unable to cope with the physical demands of the after-school duties. Her job required her to go up and down stairs, which she found difficult as she had rheumatism in her ankles. She quit, asking to be transferred to a day school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 123, Mary S. MacIntosh to Rev. Baird, 8 Mar 1893). Harry Laidlaw’s doctor faulted the close confinement of the school for Laidlaw’s poor health, and on this account, he announced his resignation (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 819, Harry Laidlaw to Baird, 24 Aug 1898). After spending over five years as the nurse at Cecilia Jeffrey school, Alberta Reid left the school because of heart trouble (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Frank Edwards to Secretary DIA, 5 Jan 1925).

As previously mentioned, Mr. A. Matthews died of the Spanish Flu while on duty as the principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school.
Some cited family considerations as grounds for resigning. At least nine of the female staff tendered their resignations on account of their forthcoming marriages. Several were required to leave due to a family emergency. Isabella Henderson’s brother’s death and related family obligations forced her to withdraw from her job as the assistant matron at Birtle (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Copy - David Iverach to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). After eleven years as the assistant matron of the Portage school, Mary Hendry resigned owing to the illness of her sister. Cecilia Jeffrey, nurse, Lyla Stratton, contended that she had to leave the school because her mother required her assistance (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. A. Edmison to Mr. J. D. McLean, 4 Aug 1916). Hugh McKay, a former pupil of the Birtle and Regina schools, worked as the outdoor assistant for two years at the Birtle school. He resigned from the work in order to go live on the reserve and make a home for his widowed mother (Twenty-fourth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1899-1900, p. 41).

Others expressed concerns regarding their immediate families. Even though Birtle principal, William Small, got married and they later had a child, he and his family were expected to reside in the school building. This was the reason given for him leaving Birtle (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, W. J. Small to Rev. R. P. McKay, 8 May 1901). On numerous occasions, Rev. and Mrs. Whyte of the Crowstand school requested that a house be built for their family, but to no avail. After a five year term as principal, Whyte offered his resignation, stating that, on account of his wife’s health, it would not be safe for them to continue to reside in the school building (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1214-1218, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 12 Mar 1897). Although it was not what ultimately compelled
them to resign, Crowstand’s George Laird and Cecilia Jeffrey’s Austin McKitrick both expressed concern for the education of their children. In Laird’s case, the head of the Winnipeg division of the FMC empathized with this matter: “I was in the hope that you would give your life to this work but I can see that for a man with a family at the stage at which yours is, this involves [illegible] sacrifices” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, [Baird] to Mr. Laird, 19 Aug 1891, pp. 438-440). Mr. and Mrs. McKitrick had five children, some of which were school aged. There was a difference of opinion between the McKitricks and the school’s teacher as to how their children should be educated. McKitrick wrote to a member of the FMC, to share his frustration: “But if the F. M. C. should not wish our own children taught here, it would make a great difference to us. That would be the one thing that would make us want to leave the work. Neither Mrs. McKitrick nor I are satisfied if our own children are not getting as good a schooling as in any other school of a public school standard” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). The educational needs of their children was also found to be a popular reason for teachers leaving the Māori school system in New Zealand (Simon et al., 2001: 34).

Sometimes staff resigned as a result of the financial circumstances of the school. Rev. J. T. Ross, who had spent years as a missionary worker at schools in British Columbia, remained at the Cecilia Jeffrey school for merely six months. He was frustrated: the school was grossly underfunded, the sanitary condition was unsatisfactory and the building was close to collapsing. The local Indian agent concluded that while Mr. Ross was a capable principal, these challenges were too great even for an such an experienced man: “I
think Mr. Ross, is a first class man and understands his business thoroughly, but he finds it impossible to carry on as it is just now” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, R. S. McKenzie to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 11 Oct 1922). For similar reasons, Neil Gilmour offered his resignation soon after arriving at the Crowstand school. He was dissatisfied with the lack of equipment, lack of funds and the poor condition of one of the school buildings: “... I cannot undertake the work unless I have a clean slate to start with, and have such equipment as I feel is necessary to run the school. Otherwise I must ask to be relieved of the charge” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1670-1675, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 29 Jul 1897). The FMC refused to accept his resignation at that point and he remained at Crowstand for over five years. George McLaren did not specify finances as the problem, but he did concede that the main reason for his resignation was his disappointment with the overall progress of the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. McLaren, 30 Apr 1894, pp. 392-393).

From time to time, in order to resolve a staff conflict, one or more staff members chose to depart, asked to be transferred or were offered a transfer. Miss McIlwaine had worked at the Crowstand school for over a year when she requested to be transferred. In communicating this request, Rev. Baird of the FMC suggested that part of the reason for her desire to be transferred was a disagreement between herself and the matron regarding matters of discipline and management (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1997-1998, [Baird] to Mr. Mackay, 20 Oct 1897). Jennie Cameron was employed at the Cecilia Jeffrey school from February 1902 until October 1905. The principal Austin McKitrick acknowledged that Cameron’s competence in dealing with the Aboriginal people and their children made her a
valuable employee, (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 4 July 1905) yet her persistent failure to develop healthy working relationships with other staff began to overshadow her strengths and caused her to be seen as injurious to the school’s reputation (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 78, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 21 October 1905). She offered her own resignation, which the FMC approved (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC 1906-1907, p. 39). A Crowstand assistant matron, Florence McLean, clashed with the principal, Rev. Laird. While Laird was displeased with Miss McLean’s ability, McLean found him to be increasingly disagreeable to get along with (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892). This situation prompted her to resign. Due to a disruptive working relationship between Crowstand farm instructor, Mr. Wright and the principal, Wright was transferred to the school at Rolling River (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267). Officially, this transfer was considered a promotion (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 521, Hayter Reed to Baird, 3 Feb 1894). Mr. Wright’s sister-in-law, May Armstrong, was teaching at the Crowstand at this time. The FMC supported the principal, and set on giving him another chance, promised him a new staff for a new start. Thus, the Committee also let May Armstrong go, but ensured her employment as soon as a new opportunity presented itself (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267).

A few workers were asked to resign due to poor staff relations and were not offered transfers. The continued lack of amicable relations between the principal and matron of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Mr. J. O. McGregor and Sarah McGregor, on the one hand, and
the assistant matron and local missionary on the other, convinced the church representative responsible for investigating the situation that the only solution was for the McGregor's to leave the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, John W. Little to Rev McKay, 21 Mar 1904). They departed from the school within a couple of months (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Mar 1904). As a matron at Crowstand, Jeanie Henderson's inability to maintain pleasant relations with staff members and her repeated objections to the amount of work expected of her provoked Rev. Whyte, the principal to suggest her resignation (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 22 Mar 1895). The pressure on Henderson to resign continued, not only from Whyte, but also from other staff and the FMC (for example, see UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1069-1080, Kate Gillespie to Prof. Baird, 13 Jun 1895; and UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Flora Henderson, 12 Apr 1895, pp. 534-535). The FMC sent a final request for her resignation, citing continued antagonistic relations with the principal as a main consideration (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1132, [Baird] to Miss Flora Henderson, 3 Jun 1895). Miss Henderson gave in to the pressure: “With feelings of deep regret, I resign my position” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1207, Flora Henderson to Prof. Baird, 20 Jun 1895).

In two cases, principals were asked to offer their resignations because of allegations of mismanagement. As discussed above, George Laird of Crowstand and Austin McKitrick of Cecilia Jeffrey each faced charges of mismanagement from school staff and DIA or church officials. In Laird's case, the Indian agent initially suggested a change in management (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1298, testimony by W. E. Jones, attached to Fred
Fischer to Indian Commissioner, 22 Sep 1891). Over time, the accumulated complaints were acted upon. Subsequently, the FMC’s Rev. Baird wrote to Laird, suggesting that he resign. Baird also stressed that the FMC did not doubt Laird’s commitment and devotion to the work (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1527-1529, [Baird] to Mr. Laird, 20 Jan 1892). In Rev. McKitrick’s case, the staff were generally dissatisfied with McKitrick’s administration of the school. Prior to staff complaints, one church leader expressed disappointment in McKitrick’s performance: “Speaking for myself I do not think Mr. McKitrick’s work has been what it ought to have been …” (UCÁ, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 89, Rev. James Farquharson to Br. McKay, 1 Sep 1906). Furthermore, this church official suggested relieving Mr. McKitrick of his role as principal, while allowing him to continue with the mission work. However, he was not given the option of staying as the missionary. The Western Committee of the FMC notified Mr. McKitrick that his services would not be required after a specified date, adding that “the Committee had no reason to doubt his conscientiousness and integrity, but this action was considered necessary in the interests of the Mission work” (Minutes of the FMC, WD, PCC, 1906, p. 44). Rather than being asked to resign, the principal told Mr. H. Everett, the farm instructor at Crowstand, to leave the school after he admitted to having sexual relations with two of the school’s students (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, W. G. Blewett to Secretary DIA, 21 Jul 1914).

In offering their resignations, some claimed that someone else would be more appropriate for the position. In addition to strained staff relations, Florence McLean, mentioned above, conceded that even though she had done her best, “an older and more
experienced person “could have more adequately fill the position” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892). Six months before resigning, Rev. Iverach alluded to a desire to leave the work, suggesting that a more preferable arrangement would be to hire a married couple without children to act as principal and matron who could therefore reside in the school building (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Copy, David Iverach to Rev. A. S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). In his letter of resignation, principal of Cecilia Jeffrey school, Mr. Gandier, recommended that a married couple should be hired as principal and matron: “In the first place a married man is likely to remain for some time and his interests would be centred here almost entirely. Then if his wife were matron it would secure a unity of thought and work that would be impossible otherwise. ... I have tried by cautiousness and kindness to make up for youth and inexperience and I believe have accomplished something but yet I feel that a maturer man could accomplish more” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Gandier to Rev. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). Months into his term as administrator at the Crowstand Boarding School, Neil Gilmour implied his desire to resign by recommending that a medical doctor be stationed at Crowstand in his place (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 164-166, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 13 Dec 1897). The request was denied, however, as a physician was not found to replace him.

While seldom mentioned in letters of resignation, some staff were not satisfied with their salaries. A decrease in Lyla Stratton’s salary as nurse had been proposed, much to her dismay. An Indian Department inspector explained: “The very efficient nurse, Miss Stratton has I fear severed her connection with the school because she is compelled to
accept $40.00 per month and board instead of the $50.00 and board formerly allowed her by the Department. Should she finally decide to retire a very great loss will be sustained for she has been very helpful and successful in her work” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract, Report of Inspector J. Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Bdg, dated 22 Aug 1916). In fact quite a different reason was officially cited: her mother required her assistance (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. A. Edmison to Mr. J. D. McLean, 4 Aug 1916). John Black, a teacher at the Crowstand school, admitted that his decision was in part due to his pay: “At the present time I am not able to keep my-self and my wife on my salary - $450.” In addition, Black expressed his desire to take up farming “as that is the only trade that I ever cared for and I think God willing I could make my living on it” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Box E File 291, John Black to Prof Hart, 30 Jan 1890). A desire to change careers or a better employment opportunity was cited by other employees.

Birtle principal E. H. Crawford resigned because “an opening for more congenial work has presented itself” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Rev. R. P. McKay, 13 Feb 1905). Teacher, Miss W. Henderson, left Portage school in order to “take more normal work” in Calgary (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, Report by Rev. Hendry, p. 90). Garnet Hilborn resigned as Birtle’s farm instructor after only a number of months, as he accepted a more remunerative position as a building contractor (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Jul 1912). The head of the Portage school for over ten years, Annie Fraser, resigned in order to enter the nursing profession (Murray, S. C., [1936]: 88). After three
years of teaching the junior class at the Portage school, Miss MacKenzie resigned in order to attend medical college in preparation for mission work in China (Seventh AR, WMS, PCC, WD, 1920, p. 90).

Some staff members received promotions. Bessie Walker, principal of the Portage school, accepted an offer for the position of matron at the Regina Industrial School. An assistant matron at the Birtle school for one year, Jean Leckie was transferred to Regina Industrial School where she assumed the duties of matron. This was a considerable promotion, not only in regards to position, but also because Regina was a much larger school (CSP 1894, DIA, Yr Ended June 30, 1893, Report by Regina School Principal McLeod, p. 98). After eight years, Eliza MacGregor's hard work and devotion as Birtle's teacher was rewarded with a promotion, as she was transferred to the position of field secretary in the Northwest for the WFMS (Thirty-sixth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1911-1912).

For a number of individuals, their position at Birtle, Cecilia Jeffrey, Crowstand or Portage school was their final experience in the work force. After eleven years as the principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Frank Dodds retired. He and his wife initially moved to Toronto, but later bought a house on Lake Scugog (UCA-Wpg, Biographical Files, Rev. Frank Thomas Dodds, p. 10). Mr. and Mrs. Hendry retired from their positions as principal and matron of the Portage school in the mid 1930's. They each had worked there for over thirty years. Annie McLaren made a life long career as a matron of the Birtle school. Matilda McLeod, an assistant matron also of Birtle, retired after almost twenty years of continuous service.
Even those who left the work for reasons other than retirement often commented that they valued the experience. In writing to the head of the FMC, E. H. Crawford wanted to dismiss any idea that he had not enjoyed his time as the principal of the Birtle school: “I would not however give the impression here that my work has been uncongenial. On the other hand, I have enjoyed it very much and have gladly devoted my energy to the best interests of the school, as far as I was able. And it is not without considerable regret that I contemplate severing my connection with the institution” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Rev. R. P. McKay, 13 Feb 1905). When Rev. Whyte resigned, he was adamant that it was not disdain for the work that prompted him to do so: “I regret having to take this step because of the love which I have for this work and the pleasure which I have had in it during the past five years. I assure you we have become much attached to both people and children and will be very sorry to say our farewell, and we shall always have a very deep interest in the Indian race and especially in the Crowstand Mission” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1214-1218, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 12 Mar 1897). Bessie Walker concluded that, despite some difficulties, her overall experience in this field of work was positive: “It has been hard to give up the work, ... the years I have been allowed to spend in this work have been happy ones and in spite of all that was hard, I have enjoyed the four years service very much ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1889-1891, Bessie Walker to Prof. Baird, 27 Sep 1892). Sara Laidlaw shared Walker's feelings: “… it has been my happiest time, on the whole, what if there are things to do, distasteful I never mind - the opportunity for growth are many and we often get glimpses of higher things to which I hope we may obtain one day” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 9, Sara
Laidlaw to Mr. McKay, 5 Feb 1895.

Regarding resignations, there is some degree of similarity with findings of related studies. Gagan (1992: 200) found that women who had worked as Methodist missionaries among Aboriginal people in Alberta and British Columbia left the work for three main reasons: marriage, illness and death. Illness and marriage were also the most frequent reasons for women to leave the four Presbyterian schools in this study. Simon et al. (2001: 34) revealed that teachers who worked at Māori schools in New Zealand often resigned for a combination of reasons. Some had children who were ready to attend secondary education. Others departed because of career promotion. Another reason cited was a yearning to return to a less remote location. Only one of the Presbyterian staff members in the present study mentioned isolation as a reason for resigning. Maggie Nicoll wrote that one of her reasons for wanting to leave the Cecilia Jeffrey school was the difficulty of travel for three quarters of the year and also the fact that the staff members were “so far removed from the outside world” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). The failure of staff to mention isolation may be due to the fact that this study relied on official correspondence. A Presbyterian who expressed interest in Aboriginal missionary work in the 1890's and early 1900's would have been well aware of the isolated locations he or she could be sent to and therefore isolation may have been deemed an unacceptable reason to leave the work. While remoteness of location may have been a contributing factor in some resignations, employees may have felt it necessary to only mention reasons which would appease church officials, such as illness. In the study done by Simon et al. (2001), former employees were interviewed years after
they had left the work. Thus, their responses in comparison to those official reasons given by Presbyterian staff would presumably be more candid.

**Why They Stayed**

It is reasonable to speculate that, like in any occupation, those who stayed working at the Presbyterian boarding schools for longer than average, either enjoyed their jobs, were committed to the cause and/or were good at what they did. This is supported by statements or actions of staff members themselves or by comments made by DIA employees.

Walter McLaren and Rev. Hendry were successful principals. Walter McLaren's eight year term was the longest principalship at the Birtle school in the time period studied. After a few years into his work, a DIA representative described McLaren as an able administrator: “The principal has been in charge of the institution about three years and has made many improvements. He is enthusiastic, and this combined with discretion has enabled him to carry on the work of the school successfully” (CSP 1909, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1908, Report by S. Swinford, p. 320). McLaren displayed a genuine concern for the welfare of Aboriginal people. For example, he consulted with tubercular institutions in Great Britain and Canada and attended a Tubercular Congress in Edinburgh in order to ascertain proper treatment for sick pupils (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 part 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 25 Sep 1910). The lengthiest term of all the principals at these four schools was held by Rev. Hendry, who was the head of the Portage school for over thirty years. He was considered one of the most devoted and competent men working in Aboriginal missionary work. When researching the Native
Schools system in New Zealand, Simon et al. (2001: 40) found that the success of Pākehā teachers working with Māori students was more dependent on one’s interest and commitment to Māori than on previous training. Those who had positive attitudes to Māori and were able to develop harmonious relations with students and their communities proved to be the most effective. Walter McLaren and Hendry exemplify this in the Canadian residential school system.

The only Birtle employees staying on over twenty years were matron, Annie McLaren and assistant matron, Matilda McLeod. McLaren’s dedication, experience and established ties with the Aboriginal people of the surrounding reserves made her services invaluable. When she resigned, the annual report of the WFMS noted that she would no doubt be missed: “One cannot think of Birtle without her, and we know how the Indians of the Birtle agency must miss her, who was to them such a friend, one to whom they could always go and be sure of a loving welcome and sympathetic counsel” (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914, p. 53). Similarly, McLeod was considered to be a capable, hard worker (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, [Baird] to Mr. [illegible], Report on Indian Mission Schools under care of the Presbyterian Church, 20 Jun 1897, pp. 217-230). Miss Dunbar worked at the Crowstand school as assistant matron for over fifteen years. The principal characterized Miss Dunbar as “a splendid worker” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 20 June 1901). She was a hard working woman, as conditions at the school demanded. Jeanie Gilmour, who worked as assistant as well as matron at Crowstand, was also characterized as a dedicated woman suitable to the work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Neil Gilmour
Kate Gillespie taught at the Crowstand school for three years, but spent an additional four years as a teacher at Mistawasis day school and over seven years as the principal of the File Hills Boarding School. Dobbin (1961) argued that Kate Gillespie (Motherwell) was successful in her career as a teacher and principal in boarding schools because of her deep and genuine interest in the welfare of Aboriginal people. When she resigned her position at the Crowstand school, the FMC convener, Andrew Baird, acknowledged her competence and dedication: “We have valued very highly the self-denial, the constant cheerfulness, the intelligence and the Christian spirit of your work, and we appreciate fully the capacity you have shown for working harmoniously with other members of the staff” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1250, [Baird] to Miss Kate Gillespie, 23 Mar [1897]). Eliza MacGregor taught at Birtle for eight years. A DIA inspector, impressed with her teaching ability, stressed that she was “in love with her work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). Zena Brodie, the teacher at the Cecilia Jeffrey school for ten years, was considered to be “enthusiastic” and “very successful” (CSP 1916, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1915, report by John Semmens, p. 222).

Were Those with the Most Education and Experience the First to Resign?

In literature which tackles the issue of residential schools, it is a common observation that many staff at residential schools were otherwise unemployable. Based on this, it would be logical to conclude that those with the most education and experience would be the soonest to leave for better opportunities. There is limited support for this in the
current study. Any type of university degree in this time period would have opened a variety of career doors; no graduate would have to work at a boarding school as last resort employment. There were those who were university educated who did not remain long in the work. Mr. Gandier, who had a bachelor of arts, kept his job as principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school for only a year. A Columbia University graduate in arts and law, J. H. Snyder, remained at the Birtle school as the farm instructor and assistant principal for less than one year. Yet, there were some well educated individuals who had lengthy careers.

Three principals can be used to illustrate this. William Small studied at the Manitoba College and graduated from university with an honours degree in arts. He also had normal school training as a teacher. He had dedicated his life to do work for the Presbyterian church, and thus when he was assigned to manage the Birtle Boarding School, he stayed there for six years. Walter McLaren graduated from Toronto University where he earned the Mackenzie Scholarship in Political Science. Next he attended Knox College and was awarded the General Proficiency and Traveling Scholarships. Then he pursued a postgraduate course in Glasgow. Following this, he was ordained and appointed the principal of the Birtle school and missionary of the Bird Tail reserve. Prior the this appointment, he admitted that he had never thought of the Aboriginal mission field as a field he would become involved in (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Mackay, 16 Apr 1913). However, once he was appointed, he decided to give his life to it and stayed for eight years. Rev Hendry, principal at Portage for much of his adulthood, had an academic background that was more impressive than most
missionaries. After obtaining his second class certificate in teaching, he attended Guelph Agricultural College. At the end of his second year, he was awarded the associate diploma. Next he secured a first class Teacher’s Certificate and spent one year teaching in Algoma. He also fulfilled the requirements for a four year arts degree extra murally, the first three years through Queen’s University and the final year via Chicago University (Murray, [1936]: 88-89). He easily could have found higher paying, more agreeable work elsewhere. In fact, while employed at Portage, he was approached a couple of times with employment offers. In 1912, he received an offer for the position of dean of residence and instructor of mathematics at the Manitoba Agricultural College. The salary offered was double of what he was earning from the Presbyterian Church, and yet he refused the offer. A couple of years later he was offered the principalship of the Berry School for Boys in Georgia, also for a salary much larger than what he was receiving at Portage, with a free house added in. Once again Mr. Hendry declined the chance to enjoy a higher salary (Murray, [1936]). Clearly, some had the education and experience that would qualify them for higher pay and higher prestige positions, yet they dedicated years to the work.

Summary

The length of career at a Presbyterian boarding school was the longest for principals. Matrons and assistant matrons were next, followed by teachers. The farm instructors and nurses committed the shortest amount of time to their work at the schools, at an average of under two years for both.

Staff members provided various rationales when resigning. Health concerns were most
frequently cited. Considering the evidence in the data of overwork and Under staffing, this is not surprising. Teachers were more likely to claim a medical condition as their reason for resigning than those holding other positions. Many of the teachers at the four schools had previously worked at public schools and would not have been accustomed to the physical work that was required outside of the classroom.

The next most used reason for leaving the service of their church, marriage, was limited to matrons, assistant matrons and teachers. Other family considerations, such as parents requiring assistance and inappropriate accommodations were also frequently cited. The remaining motives for resigning included a clash between staff members, a new employment opportunity, being transferred, receiving a promotion, a problem with salary, isolation and, as in the case of George McLaren and Ross, disillusionment. Only four staff members left the work because of retirement: two principals, one matron and one assistant matron.
CHAPTER TEN

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Contribution to the Literature

By using fragments of correspondence by and about various Presbyterian boarding school staff members, this study has reconstructed the staff perspective of the early decades of residential schooling. Miller (1996) and Milloy (1999) each contribute a comprehensive overview of the Aboriginal residential school system, and include perspectives of government officials, church leaders, the students, as well as staff. The current study provides a more in-depth examination of a small number of schools of the same denomination. More importantly, student perspectives tend to be over-represented in the existing residential school literature. The student perspective is indeed a very important one, however, the other side, the staff perspective, must also be represented in the literature. This study is a step in this direction. The following is a summary of the main points of the preceding chapters, as well as the contribution that this thesis makes to the current literature.

Too often individuals who were appointed or hired to work at the boarding schools lacked relevant training and experience. The church’s main requirements appear to have been good health and a Christian spirit. Inferior health was sometimes tolerated, but individuals who had not professed their faith in Christianity were not. A majority of the principals were ordained ministers, and only two had previous school administrative experience. Many of the teachers had some experience in public schools, yet, presumably,
the methods used on English speaking Euro-Canadians would have been inappropriate for children of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Most of the women who were employed as matrons and assistant matrons had some housekeeping skills, but few had experience training children. The same is true of the farm instructors: they had practical experience, but most had no background in teaching youth. Knowledge of Aboriginal peoples and their cultures was not deemed essential, and thus, for many, their first day at school was also their first introduction to people of Aboriginal descent. Previous studies have noted that residential school staff tended to be under-qualified and lacked relevant experience, yet little has been written about their actual training, education and previous work experiences. This study, on the other hand, offers such information. In addition, unlike existing literature, a detailed account regarding the specific duties and responsibilities of each position is provided. This study also provides some insight into individuals' motivations for participating in such work.

Positive relationships between school staff and the local Aboriginal communities were instrumental for the success of a school. The interactions that occurred between staff and Aboriginal adults from neighbouring Aboriginal communities were discussed in Chapter Five. Primarily, these interactions involved meetings for missionary purposes and pupil recruitment. Many characterized the missionary work as an uphill battle, and any little progress was considered laudable. The need to keep the school at its maximum enrolment, for financial reasons, made active recruiting a necessity. Regular visits to the closest reservations were made for this purpose.

When discussing attitudes regarding the appropriate education for Aboriginal children,
existing studies focus on official church and government perspectives. This study highlights staff members' vision of Aboriginal education. Staff members seemed to have been supportive of the half-day system. Despite the fact that most staff found the children to be bright, they tended to consider academics of less curricular importance than practical training.

The school employees had to care for the students in all aspects of their lives. They were responsible for everything from medical treatment to discipline. Keeping watch over and caring for the students twenty-four hours a day was a tall order, and at times staff fell short. For many, though, their interactions with the children, their parents and the other Aboriginal adults with whom they came into contact were considered the most rewarding part of the job.

In Chapter Six, the working conditions that existed at the four boarding schools were described. For someone who had left the comforts of a family home and the company of friends in Eastern Canada and began work at a semi-isolated school, the adjustment required was overwhelming. In addition, no orientation was provided before or upon arriving. The chronic underfunding of the schools meant that employees had to improvise in the face of inadequate equipment. Fiscal management was ultimately the principal's responsibility, and this added much strain and anxiety. The schools were rarely adequately staffed, which resulted in existing staff being required to labour long hours. In addition, opportunities for respite were rare. Most staff members' living space consisted of a bedroom in the main school building, which allowed for minimal privacy. Some school buildings had poor ventilation and poor sanitation, and thus the staff were subjected to
possible health risks. Physical and mental exhaustion were likely to result from such conditions, and the conditions explain, to a large extent, the high staff turnover at these schools. Working conditions have been discussed in previous literature. By analyzing only four schools, this study avoids the tendency to generalize. The heterogeneity in working conditions of these four schools is further discussed below.

As stated in Chapter Seven, FMC executives often stressed the importance of fostering harmonious relationships amongst school staff. Conflicts at these schools stemmed primarily from disputes over duties and struggles over authority. Characteristics of abrasiveness and non-cooperation also contributed to staff disagreements. Of course, such conflicts created further tension and stress for school employees and were impediments to their work. Some current studies do mention staff conflicts, however this study provides a descriptive account of staff dynamics at each of the four schools.

Existing literature portrays staff as primarily incompetent. In assessing the ability of school employees at the Crowstand, Portage, Cecilia Jeffrey and Birtle schools in Chapter Eight, it was found that for all positions, some excelled, whereas others were very poor at fulfilling the duties of their respective positions. There was a range in competence, and thus, when a school received a new staff member with no previous Aboriginal residential school experience, it was a matter of 'hit or miss,' for both the students and the existing staff.

Lengths of terms and reasons for resignations, topics largely ignored in current studies, were examined in Chapter Nine. The average stay at a school was the most for principals, averaging at 5.6 years. The farm instructors and nurses only stayed an average of less
than two years. A variety of reasons for leaving the work were provided, with the most common being illness and family considerations.

The appendix strengthens this study in that the biographical information presented provides a context in which to better understand the data that were discussed in the body of the thesis.

This thesis contributes to the literature in a number of disciplines. In regards to the fields of native studies and Canadian history, this thesis, by focusing on the staff perspectives of the residential school experience, provides a new layer of depth and documentation which has not been drawn out in other studies. This study also contributes to at least a couple of sub-disciplines within sociology. In this time period, it was the goal of the Canadian government to transform the Aboriginal person into an imitation European. Aboriginal values and world views were to be eliminated and replaced with Christian, capitalist ones. The residential school was considered integral to these efforts. Thus, this study contributes to social psychological work regarding identity and self.

Regarding the sociology of colonialism, this thesis provides another avenue through which to understand the relationship between the Euro-Canadian colonialists and the indigenous peoples, as it presents the point of view of staff members, who were, in essence, agents of colonialism. This research is also relevant to governmentality studies. For instance, Peikoff (2000) uses the Foucauldian concept of governance to analyze the re-socialization of students of residential schools. The current work touches on this re-socialization of the children, although not as explicitly as Peikoff (2000).
Relationship of Work Conditions with Mismanagement and Physical Abuse

Working at a boarding school was an unenviable career. The work was physically demanding and often done under adverse conditions. Inadequate numbers of staff and inferior equipment and buildings were just a couple of the consequences of the poor financial backing received by the schools. As victims of underfunding, staff members were often overworked. Principals who doubled as missionaries had a particularly hard time fulfilling their obligations. Members of the mission committee and some principals themselves admitted that the principal-missionary role was next to impossible to discharge successfully. They were expected to be in two places at once: on the reserves preaching and managing the school.

Neglect of students, lack of supervision and physical abuse may all be, to some degree, attributed to the stress, frustration and exhaustion experienced by staff. How could a few people, each absorbed in their own responsibilities, provide constant supervision of dozens of children? It would simply not have been possible for all children to be watched over at all times. Also, due to fatigue, some accidents would occur that would not have if members of the staff had received adequate rest and regular respite. Based on the findings of this study, it is reasonable to contend that many did the best they could under the circumstances.

The conditions under which staff worked were harsh. Staff members, and principals in particular, had a great deal of responsibility riding on their shoulders. Under such pressure, frustrated and irritated and experiencing feelings of futility, a person would be more likely to physically lash out at someone, and someone more vulnerable at that.
Milloy (1999) and Miller (1996) came to similar conclusions in their studies. Milloy (1999: 135) explained: “Working conditions for staff that destroyed morale and drove them to opposition and resignation could in no way benefit the children. Indeed, at times, in staff correspondence, those two strands — the mistreatment of staff and neglect and abuse of children — are drawn together.” Miller (1996: 422) agreed: “In the stressful and physically exhausting circumstances in which staff worked, it would have taken superhuman patience and dedication not to have fallen into harsh treatment and oppressive actions towards the inmates.” Whereas physical abuse can be, in part, attributed to the poor working conditions, such abuse cannot be condoned. School conditions are not an excuse for abuse, nor are contemporary sensibilities regarding childrearing or racial superiority. Such explanations do nothing to mitigate the very real physical and psychological effects that such abuse had on the children, and continue to have within some communities. Those who used excessive corporal punishment to discipline the students cannot be absolved; this point cannot be emphasized enough.

**Heterogeneity in Work Experience Depending on School**

A strong conclusion that can be made based on the data is that staff experience depended largely on the school at which one worked. As mentioned, Portage and Birtle schools were located very close to their respective towns, whereas Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey were miles away from non-Aboriginal communities. Those who worked at the Portage school enjoyed support from the local Presbyterian church membership. As mentioned, one Birtle principal, Small, was able to participate in town sporting activities such as curling. According to one principal, the matron, Annie McLaren did a fair amount
of entertaining at the same school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 18 May 1901). Clearly, at least some of the staff at the Birtle and Portage schools engaged in social interactions with residents from the nearby town. Staff at the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools did not enjoy such advantages; their interactions were limited to other staff members and the local Aboriginal populations. The proximity of the Birtle and Portage schools to a town also benefitted the schools in regards to access to medical care. These schools had an easier time accessing the assistance of a doctor.

It was not as difficult to finance the Birtle and Portage schools as it was the other two. Crowstand principal, Neil Gilmour, argued that, due to a number of factors, the Crowstand school was more costly to run than the Portage, Birtle or Round Lake schools. These factors included the school's greater distance from a market or railway and a higher annual fuel bill (ABP, H 758-763, Neil Gilmour to Rev. Baird, 1 Jun 1898). One principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school complained that, while most schools were able to grow vegetables for their own consumption and feed for their livestock, the Cecilia Jeffrey school was located on such poor agricultural land, that most food and feed had to be purchased and transported in (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8152, Vol. 6039, File 160-1, pt 1, John T. Ross to Rev. C. Brouillet, 21 Jul 1920). These examples illustrate that administrators of the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools were forced to make their funding dollars stretch further than at Birtle and Portage la Prairie.

The hiring of new staff and maintaining existing staff seemed to be more difficult in the more isolated schools. There was correspondence in the case of both Cecilia Jeffrey and
Crowstand schools which stressed the disadvantage in recruiting new staff on account of their remote locations (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Secretary DIA, 23 Aug 1916; ABP, H5-9, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 28 Oct 1897; ABP, H 267-268, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 6 Jan 1898). From time to time, the Crowstand school staff had to manage without a teacher, because of the difficulty of securing a new one. As mentioned above, if the Portage staff were awaiting a new teacher, local public school teachers would often offer their services temporarily, and thus staff members were not required to fill in. Both Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand schools did have some long-term employees. For instance, principal Frank Dodds and teacher Zena Brodie each remained at the Cecilia Jeffrey school for over ten years. William McWhinney managed the Crowstand school for over twenty years. However, the average of length of stay for staff was highest at the Portage school and second highest for the Birtle school. A case in point, Rev. Hendry worked as the administrator of the Portage la Prairie Boarding School for over thirty years. In the fall of 1909, Hendry received a requested transfer to the school at Alberni, British Columbia. He was appalled by the unhealthy condition of the children and the dilapidated buildings, and immediately tendered his resignation (Minutes of the FMC, WD, PCC, 1909-10, p. 68). He was urged to stay and he did so for less than a year. When the post at Portage became available, Hendry was looked upon to fill it. His willingness to remain at the Portage school for numerous years and his reluctance to stay long at the troubled Alberni school indicates that the conditions at the Portage school were more preferable.

Harmonious staff relations were considered to be particularly important in the more
isolated schools, where staff members relied only on one another for their socializing. Unfortunately, as illustrated in Chapter Seven, the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools appear to have had more staff problems than Portage and Birtle schools. Based on the data, the Portage la Prairie school did not have any staff conflicts, at least that were not dealt with internally and without outside, FMC intervention. The Birtle school did have its problems, but one staff member, Annie McLaren, appears to have been the cause of the tension. At Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools, conflicts over different issues, involving a variety of staff members, at different times occurred. Arguably, the remote locations of these schools contributed to the lack of continued, positive staff relations.

Another observation made is that allegations of mismanagement and abuse were greater at the isolated schools. While a few Birtle principals did receive some charges against their school management, it was not to the extent as at the Cecilia Jeffrey and Crowstand schools. The Portage school was continually commended for its excellent management. Frank Dodds of the Cecilia Jeffrey school was accused a number of times of the use of excessive physical punishment against his students. William McWhinney, at the Crowstand school, was also remonstrated for using inappropriate punishments. In light of the existing literature which highlights the abuse that occurred in residential schools of all denominations, it is highly doubtful that the incidents of excessive corporal punishment in the correspondence provide a fair representation of the extent to which physical abuse actually occurred. Nevertheless, it does appear to have happened more often at the more isolated schools, and this in turn can be explained by the fact that these schools tended to have more inhospitable working conditions.
There is, however, an alternate explanation for the apparent lower incidence of abuse at Portage and Birtle schools. The Portage and Birtle schools were located closer to non-Aboriginal communities and farther away from Aboriginal communities. Thus, Portage and Birtle schools may have been in a better position to cover up such abuse. There is evidence in the data that shows that parents regularly dropped in to the Cecilia Jeffrey school, and thus would have had a greater surveillance of the school’s staff and students. In fact, numerous complaints regarding the treatment of the students originated from the parents. Parents of students attending the Portage and Birtle schools did not have the opportunity to have such a close watch over their children. Supervision of parental visits and feeding the parents (as was done for a time at Cecilia Jeffrey school) would have created extra work for the staff. Parental visits would also have, presumably, added to an already stressful job, as the staff would have been under greater scrutiny. The work at the Portage and Birtle schools was in no way easy, but for the above stated reasons, they seem to have been more congenial schools to work in than the Crowstand and Cecilia Jeffrey schools. Heterogeneity in work experience depended on a number of other factors, including the personality of coworkers. Disagreeable colleagues could turn a positive experience sour and conversely, cooperative, sincere associates could lessen a difficult work environment.

**Limitations**

This study examines a variety of facets of the Aboriginal boarding school experience from a staff perspective. Unfortunately, there is much about their experiences that is not mentioned in the official church and DIA correspondence. For instance, the data is absent
of the verbal and psychological abuse against the students that has been documented in other studies. Staff members would have been less candid than they would have been in letters to family and friends. For some, their reasons for resigning may have been much different from what was cited officially. Also, there might be more evidence of disillusionment and opposition to the system in personal letters. When using archival data, findings are shaped by the available data. Also, the findings in this study cannot be generalized to schools of other denominations nor can it be considered a fair representation of what occurred even in those same schools in later years.

**Future Studies**

Similar studies could be done for a different set of Presbyterian schools or for schools of other denominations. Such studies could be used for comparative purposes and to test the contention made above that certain schools, particularly those located close to a non-Aboriginal community, had somewhat more favourable work environments. Research relying on interviews with former staff members would be an excellent contribution to the residential school literature. Autobiographical narratives by former staff members would also be a useful addition to the current literature.

Some situations discussed in this study, such as the skepticism received by a female principal, reflect gender relations within the schools. Future work could pay greater attention to these gender relations. In Chapter Eight, the relationship between staff members and DIA officials is discussed somewhat in regards to allegations of mismanagement. However, the staff would have come into contact with the local Indian agent on a fairly regular basis, and with the DIA inspector about once or twice a year.
more detailed examination of the relationship between staff members and DIA agents and inspectors would be useful.

If the data used, official church and DIA correspondence, were taken at face value, it would be argued that physical abuse was a relatively rare occurrence in the schools studied. Of course, there are good reasons why such abuse would have been omitted from these official sources. Accounts from former students reveal excessive physical punishment and often arbitrarily meted out. The current study could be used as a starting point to move to a more balanced, complete account of the residential school experience. This would require triangulation by using oral histories from past students. Student oral histories could also be used to examine their perception of what the staff members’ roles were in the schools.

This was a study about staff perspectives. As such, it is probable that some of their views about the Aboriginal students and their behaviours were based on misconceptions due to cultural differences. For instance, the students were punished for theft and sexual immorality. The notion of theft would have been perceived much differently by the Aboriginal youths involved since in Aboriginal cultures, there was no distinction between public and private property; all assets and resources were shared (Brant, 1992: 25). In regards to sexual immorality, different Aboriginal nations had different codes of sexual conduct. Due to such cultural differences, in some cases, the students may have been unaware of why they were being punished. Students were considered to be lacking ambition. Such behaviour was likely reflective of the Aboriginal focus on collectivism rather than competitiveness. Future work should highlight the vastly different cultural
sensibilities of Euro-Canadian school staff and the Aboriginal students and their parents.
ENDNOTES


2. J. A. Macrae, 1892, cited in Miller, 1996a, p. 112.

3. It is worth noting that the principal failed to express any concern for the health of the Aboriginal children with whom Hamilton came into contact with at the school.

4. The average length of stay for principals was calculated per school. For instance, when calculating the average for the Birtle school, Neil Gilmour’s term there was approximately one year long. However, Gilmour’s career in Aboriginal missions, spent at a few schools and one mission, was about ten years.

5. Those who were only mentioned once or not at all in the correspondence or annual reports obviously could not be included in the calculations. Therefore, the averages are higher than if data for each and every employee could be included. This also applies to teachers, farm instructors and nurses.
REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Archives of the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Conference of the United Church of Canada, Winnipeg (UCA-Wpg)

- Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1888-1920
- Annual Reports of the Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Western Division
- Annual Reports of the Women’s Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in Canada
- Biographical Files - Reverend Frank Thomas Dodds
- Biographical Files - Reverend W. A. Hendry
- Reverend Andrew Browning Baird, Personal Papers, 1888 to 1910 (ABP)
- Minutes of the Foreign Missions Committee, Western Division
- Minutes of the Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church of Canada

National Archives of Canada (NAC)

- RG 10 - Records of the Department of Indian Affairs
  - School Files

Presbyterian Church of Canada Archives, Toronto

- *Foreign Missionary Tidings*
- *Monthly Letter Leaflet*

United Church of Canada Central Archives, Toronto (UCA)

- *Presbyterian Church in Canada, Board of Foreign Missions (Fonds 122)*
- *Records Pertaining to Missions to the Aboriginal People in Manitoba and the Northwest*
- *Records Pertaining to Missions to the Aboriginal People in British Columbia*
Secondary Sources


APPENDIX

STAFF BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Biographical information provided includes qualifications, educational background, employment experience, attitude to work, work-related experiences and reasons for resignations. Unfortunately in some cases the data were limited to the time period spent and the position held at a certain school. Some biographical information was also obtained from secondary sources. This information provides a context in which to better understand the data that were presented and discussed in the preceding chapters. Factors such as experience, education, motivation and time spent in Aboriginal missionary work will all have had a bearing on an individual’s work experience and their ability to adapt to the conditions.

Andrew, Emma

In 1916, Miss Andrew was in charge of the kitchen at the Cecilia Jeffrey school (CSP 1917, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1916, p. 206). She was later the matron at the Birtle school (Sixth AR, WMS, PCC, 1919).

Armstrong, E. May

Miss Armstrong began teaching at the Crowstand school in 1889. The principal, Mr. Laird, while believing Miss Armstrong to be a promising teacher, expressed doubts regarding the state of her physical health (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 257-258, Geo. A. Laird to Rev. Prof. Hart, 30 Dec 1889). She requested a leave of absence due to health concerns more than once during her time at Crowstand (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 308, E. May Armstrong to Baird, 20 Feb 1890; ABP, E 1997, E. May Armstrong to Baird, 7 Dec 1892). Miss Armstrong’s work extended beyond the school. When time allowed, she would spend time with the adults of the nearby reserve, conducting religious meetings (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 361-364, E. M. Armstrong to Mr. Baird, 31 March 1890) and sewing circles among the women (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 971-973, E. M. Armstrong to Mrs. Baird, 17 March 1891). Despite her earnest efforts, in October 1893, her position at the school was unceremoniously revoked. Interpersonal problems existed between the principal, Mr. Whyte and his staff. Mr. Whyte’s work relations with Mr. Wright, the carpenter (Miss Armstrong’s brother-in-law), were particularly strained. The FMC supported the principal, and set on giving Mr. Whyte another chance, promised him a new staff to start over. The personal connection between Miss Armstrong and Mr. Wright provided the Committee an additional impetus to let Miss Armstrong go. She was, however, ensured employment as soon as a new opportunity presented itself (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267).

Miss Armstrong was employed as the general secretary of the YWCA in Victoria when she heard that the position of teacher at the Alberni Indian School was soon to be vacant, and thus sent a letter of application (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPBC, Box 1, File 6, E. 291
May Armstrong to McKay, 30 May 1895). She was offered the position and, as at Crowstand, her work extended beyond the classroom: "... the new teacher - Miss Armstrong - is a grand acquisition .... She is not satisfied with routine work — and has already started a "Bible Class for Women" in addition to ordinary SS [Sunday School] teaching — and has other plans in process ...." (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPBC, Box 1, File 9, Swartout to McKay, [ ] Nov 1895). After a little over a year at Alberni, she was transferred to the day school at Ucluelet, British Columbia (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPBC, Box 1 File 13, E. May Armstrong to MacKay, 22 Oct 1896). Miss Armstrong’s successor at Alberni expressed praise for her teaching ability: “Miss Armstrong was no average teacher, and she left the school greatly improved at the end of only one year” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPBC, Box 1 File 16, John Ross to R. P. MacKay, 30 Aug 1897).

Her visitations among the Aboriginal families at Ucluelet aided in securing a reasonable attendance at the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPBC, Box 1, File 15, Report of the Foreign Mission Committee of the Synod of British Columbia to the Synod now Assembled, Received 25 May 1897). Armstrong was listed as being a teacher at Ucluelet in the DIA annual reports until 1903 (CSP 1902, 1903, 1904).


**Armstrong, Mattie**

Mattie Armstrong became involved in this line of work through her sister, May (above). When requesting a leave of absence because of her health, May Armstrong suggested that her sister fill in for her, claiming that her sister was interested in “Indian work” and had for a short time taught school, thus deeming her capable of the position (ABP, E 308, E. May Armstrong to Baird, 20 Feb 1890). Mattie was allowed to come to Crowstand in order to help out her sister. Her position was intended to be temporary, giving May an opportunity to regain her health, but became permanent (ABP, E 339, Laird to Baird, 10 March 1890). Mattie’s duties included imparting sewing skills to the female students (ABP, E 971-973, E. May Armstrong to Mrs. Baird, 17 March 1891).

In December 1892, Mattie made known her intention of resigning because of her pending marriage to Mr. Wright, also an employee of the Crowstand Boarding School (ABP, Letterbook 4 Regarding Indian Schools and Missions, Baird to Miss Mattie [Armstrong], 20 Dec 1892).

In early, 1894, Mrs. Wright accompanied her husband to Rolling River to take charge of the school (ABP, F 521, Baird to Deputy Superintendent General of IA, 6 April, 1894). In a letter to her husband, Rev. Baird of the FMC acknowledged the contribution she was expected to make there: “We are quite aware that very likely you will not care much for the actual work of school teaching but it seems to us that with the help of Mrs. Wright and by making the Industrial element as large as possible a great deal of good may be done” (ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Mr. Wright, 27 Oct 1893, pp. 255-256).
Baird, Jean M.

Miss Baird was installed as teacher at the Portage school in 1900. She was sister to Reverend Andrew Baird, one of the joint conveners of the Presbyterian Church's Foreign Missions Committee for the synod of Manitoba and North-West Territories in the 1890's. Miss Baird was a qualified teacher and had taught at a number of public schools previous to her placement at Portage. In a history written about the Portage school, she was characterized as having had an “intense” interest in working among Aboriginal people (Murray, [1936]: 83).

Bannerman, A

Miss Bannerman had been familiar with the Aboriginal people from the community of Portage since her childhood. She began to work at the Portage school as a substitute nurse. For example, in 1914, Miss Bannerman worked at the school during Mrs. Hendry’s three month long furlough (38th AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914, p. 55). She was later hired as nurse on a more permanent basis, but remained at the Portage Boarding School for only about one year (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, J. H. Edmison to Mr. Scott, 17 Jul 1919).

Bates, Miss

Miss Bates taught for a brief period of about two months at the Cecilia Jeffrey school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Rev. Dr. Grant, 25 Aug 1916). In resigning, Miss Bates cited ill health (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 14 Jan 1916).

Bennett, R. M.

Miss Bennett was hired as teacher at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School in December 1912. The Secretary of Home Missions for the Presbyterian Church (Western Section) summarized her credentials to the DIA:

She holds a senior Cambridge certificate from England. ... All these testimonials speak very highly of Miss B, and state that she has the qualities of an honorable christian [sic] lady and a most able teacher. Miss B taught in an Indian School at Moose Factory under the Indian Dept for eight months. Since then she has been acting as governess in the homes of the two Hudson’s Bay Company Managers who write testimonials on her behalf (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt. 1, J. H. Edmison to Secretary DIA, 4 Dec 1912).

This, her first stint at Cecilia Jeffrey school, lasted less than one year. She resigned in September 1913 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, General Superintendent of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada to Secretary DIA, 22 September 1913). Miss Bennett returned to this school in November 1923 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Frank Edwards to Mrs. Clarke, 19 Nov 1923).
Billson, Mr.

Mr. Billson began working at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, soon after arriving from England in 1903. He was hired as farm instructor but was more suited to operating the steamboat (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). Mr. Billson was teaching for a time, and was “doing well” at it (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 2 Jun 1904). He left the work in fall of 1904 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 65, McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 13 Sep 1904).

Black, John

John Black, an Aboriginal man was educated from childhood under the care of Presbyterian missionaries. After passing the entrance examination to university, he was engaged as teacher at the Crowstand school in 1889 (Presbyterian Year Book for the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland, 1889, Report by Rev. A. B. Baird, p. 40).

Principal Laird and some members of the FMC considered his marriage to an Aboriginal woman unlikely “to prove helpful to him” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Baird to Mr. Hamilton Cassels, 24 Aug 1889). In fact, when Black was temporarily unable to work because of sore eyes, Principal Laird blamed John’s wife for his poor health: “He seems a great deal run down. I think he has neither proper food nor has it properly cooked since he got married.” Furthermore, Laird suggested that Black would be better suited to an occupation in agriculture (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Box E File 162, Laird to Rev. Baird, 11 Sep 1889).

Mr. Black had been teaching at another Presbyterian school when he communicated his desire to resign. He expressed his desire to take up farming “as that is the only trade that I ever cared for and I think God willing I could make my living on it” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Box E File 291, John Black to Prof. Hart, 30 Jan 1890). Financial and health considerations also played a part in his decision to resign.

Blackbird, Susette

Susette Blackbird was placed in the Birtle Boarding School by her guardians when she was approximately four years old. By 1910, at the age of nineteen, she had spent fifteen years at the school. She had graduated, yet remained at the school. It was not uncommon for Susette to be given the responsibility of substitute teacher whenever one was needed. Also, she along with another pupil, had charge of the kitchen work for seven weeks (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1 Birtle, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 23 Feb 1910). The local Indian agent spoke highly of the work done by Miss Blackbird and thus the Department proposed utilizing her services in some of the day schools. The principal, Mr. W. W. McLaren, was asked for his opinion regarding this suggestion (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1 Birtle, Secretary DIA to W. W. McLaren, 16 Jan 1910). A doctor’s letter accompanied that of Mr. McLaren’s. Dr. Wotherspoon opined that when Susette’s physical or mental capabilities were overtaxed, she was susceptible to “emotional outbreaks.” The responsibility of a day school, without having someone in authority, he argued, would be too much for her
McLaren echoed the doctor's concern in addition to issues regarding her ability:

She has no original gifts but is able to follow a routine to which she has been accustomed - with wonderful fidelity. She also is able to maintain good discipline - this largely b/c she has our support to fall back upon ... ...teaching is a little beyond her and she could not undertake this kind of work without extra training. She is deficient in reasoning power and in prolonged application. On this account we had to forgo our plans of having her go on for her entrance and teachers examination. We also found the necessary concentration of mind was having a baneful effect upon her mind. We find the work is beginning to tell on her and that it would be inadvisable to ask her to continue it. Anything requiring long mental strain or necessitating worry tends to arouse the dangerous symptoms of her recurrent physical ailment mentioned in Dr. Wotherspoon's favor. Teaching on reserve would therefore be out of the question.

According to McLaren, Susette's niche was proving to be nursing. She had assisted Dr. Wotherspoon and he reported that "she showed unusual talents for the work." Besides, Susette herself had repeatedly indicated an interest in nursing (SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 23 Feb 1910). Later that year, Mr. McLaren announced that Susette would be attending the Ewart Training Home "with a view to getting training in nursing and household service with a view to becoming qualified to assist as matron or nurse in our school or hospital" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 25 Sep 1910).

In 1911, Miss Susette Blackbird and principal W. W. McLaren were married. Mrs. McLaren and her husband remained at Birtle school until October 1, 1913 (SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, G. H. Wheatley to Secretary DIA, 2 Oct 1913). During this time, Susette continued to fill in as teacher or in the kitchen, as needed (see for example: CSP 1913, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1912, Report by Duncan C. Scott, p. 345; UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 152, R. P. MacKay to Dr. Grant, 8 Nov 1912).

**Bolton, Rose Anna**

Miss Bolton, a graduate nurse was appointed to the Portage la Prairie in April 1915 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Principal, Portage la Prairie Boarding School, 14 Apr 1915). She resigned from her nursing duties a year later (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Assistant Deputy Secretary to Rev. W. A. Hendry, 5 Apr 1916).

**Bradbrook, Charles**

The principal of the Crowstand school hired Charles Bradbrook as an outside helper. Bradbrook was a family friend of a current staff member and thus, the principal felt he would be more reliable than a stranger. The principal was satisfied with him: "He is a gentlemanly young fellow, and quite willing to put his hand to anything" (UCA-Wpg.
ABP, G 1751-1753, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 13 Aug, 1897). Bradbrook left the following winter, as he had the “Klondike fever” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 6 Jan 1898).

**Brebner, Alex**

Mr. Brebner came to the Crowstand school in 1912 to fill the position of farmer. He had previously worked at the school in the same position (CSP 1913, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1912, Report by Mr. Blewett, p. 366).

**Bremner, Miss**

Miss Bremner was employed at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School as an assistant matron. The principal she worked under was somewhat critical of her work, yet commended her Christian spirit: “Miss Bremner hasn’t learned yet how to get the girls to work instead of doing it herself. But she will learn I think, and she has a beautiful christian [sic] character and is a valuable worker from a missionary standpoint” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, McKittrick to MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). The principal established that, due to her physical deficiency, she would be better suited as matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Austin McKittrick to Dr. MacKay, 15 Feb 1906.). Shortly, she was appointed matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 79, Report of the Meeting of the Indian Mission Committee of the Synod of MB + NW, 16 Nov 1905). In evaluating Miss Bremner’s capability as matron, principal McKittrick conveyed that she was lacking in numerous ways. Yet, he was willing to overlook her shortcomings as she was making an honest effort and above all she had a “kindly, forgiving Christ like spirit” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Austin McKittrick to Dr. MacKay, 15 Feb 1906.)

**Brigham, W. J.**

After four years as farm instructor at Crowstand, Mr. Brigham resigned in 1907 (CSP 1908, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1907, Report by John Semmens, p. 323).

**Brodie, C. E. (Zena)**

Miss Brodie was first appointed teacher at the Cecilia Jeffrey school in Sept 1913. She held a second class certificate for Ontario. (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Andrew S. Grant to Secretary DIA, 22 Sep 1913). Although it was common in boarding schools for teachers to take on responsibilities outside the classroom, Miss Brodie’s strength was not agreeable for such additional duties. In fact, it was her lack of strength which prevented her from working in public schools for extended periods of time (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, F. T. Dodds to Rev. Dr. Grant, 25 Apr 1916).

Miss Brodie was still listed as being employed at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School in 1924 (Eleventh AR, WMS, PCC, 1924, p. 80).
Brown, Margaret

The position of nurse at the Portage school in 1920 was held by Miss Brown (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Health Report for September 1920 by nurse Margaret Brown). The last year that she was listed as the nurse at the Portage school was 1922 (Ninth AR, WMS, PCC, 1922, p. 90).

Cameron, Miss (later Mrs. Forsyth)

Miss Cameron taught at Birtle in the early 1890's. The matron expressed a hope that she could stay on there even though she was getting married (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 15-17, Annie McLaren to Rev. Baird, 10 Jan [1893]). However, she was not mentioned in any further correspondence.

Cameron, Jennie

Miss Cameron began her work at Cecilia Jeffrey as an assistant matron in February 1902 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 78, Miss Jennie Cameron to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 14 Oct 1905). Early on, Miss Cameron was considered to be tactful and cautious in her dealings with the Aboriginal people: “The assistant Miss Cameron is making a good impression among the Indians I think and is one that will go softly until she knows the ground” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, Mr. J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 6 March 1902).

Miss Cameron was overlooked for promotion when an opening for matron presented itself. The principal assessed that Miss Cameron was not “able to control the children here at all as a matron should” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Sep 1902). About a year later, the local missionary contradicted Mr. Gandier’s statement, arguing Miss Cameron had successfully been able to exercise restraint over the female students since the school first opened (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 14 Nov 1903). In May of 1904, Miss Cameron was elevated to matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 2 June 1904).

Miss Cameron’s persistent failure to develop healthy working relationships with other staff began to overshadow her strengths and caused her to be seen as injurious to the school’s reputation (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 78, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 21 October 1905). She offered her own resignation, which the FMC approved (Minutes, FMC, Western Division, Presbyterian Church in Canada 1906-1907, Volume 18, p. 39).

Carson, E. C.

Miss Carson began working at the Crowstand school in June 1895 as assistant matron. She was recommended by the teacher: “Miss Gillespie recommends her very highly as one who has the Christianity, intelligence and experience requisite for the position” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Rev Prof Baird, 22 Mar 1895). After only two weeks at the school, the principal commended her work and proposed to promote her to matron (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1184-1191, C. W. Whyte to Rev Prof. Baird, 14 Jun 1895).
The following principal also viewed Miss Carson in a favourable light: “She is physically strong, even tempered, and has herself well in hand” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1754-1774, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 16 Aug 1897).


Clark, Estella

Miss Clark held the position of nurse at the Portage school for approximately one year. Miss Clark and the previous nurse, Miss Hughes, were acquaintances and when an emergency situation required Miss Hughes to leave the school suddenly, she sent Miss Clark to replace her. Miss Clark was a graduate nurse of a Scottish hospital and was said to have much experience and ability (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Rev. W. A. Hendry to The Secretary DIA, 16 Dec 1916). For the first few months, Miss Clark was on trial. She proved herself and was granted the appointment (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 13 Jan 1917).

Clow, Miss

Miss Clow came to Portage la Prairie from Athens, Ontario in order to teach at the boarding school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 9 Jan 1893). She had several years experience as a teacher. She lasted only three weeks at Portage because of her health. The trouble was a “weak throat” and Miss Clow, the rest of the staff as well as her doctor all agreed that she should not attempt to continue working (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 21 Jan 1893).

Cookson, Mr. W.

For a couple of years in the early 1920's, Mr. Cookson was employed as the principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. The local Indian agent applauded Mr. Cookson for the general improvements made to the school while under his management (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, Frank Edwards to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 4 Jan 1922). Mr. Cookson urged the DIA and the Presbyterian Mission Board to either build a new school at a better location (near Kenora) or if not, to have much needed repairs and additions made to the existing school building (for example, see NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, W. J. Cookson to Captain Edwards, 11 April 1922; SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, Frank Edwards to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 14 Jan 1922). He was particularly adamant in his plea for the necessity of proper accommodations for sick students (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, Copy, W. J. Cookson to Captain Edwards, 2 Feb 1923). The Indian agent actually implied that Mr. Cookson was overambitious: “Mr. Cookson is [a] good man, and very conscientious in his work, but I do not know if all his ideas can be
carried out” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, Frank Edwards to Secretary of the Department of Indian Education, 17 Jan 1922). Mr. Cookson resigned in October 1923, and returned to his home in New Zealand (Tenth AR, WMS, 1923, p. 101). Even though according to the Secretary of the WMS, in two years he spent over $7000 on repairs and equipment for the school, many of his goals did not come to fruition (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, Frank Edwards to Mrs. Clarke, 19 Nov 1923).

Coppin, George
In the DIA’s 1911 annual report, Mr. Coppin was listed as Crowstand’s farmer (CSP 1912, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1911, Report by W. M. Graham, p. 474). It is likely that he was at the school for less than one year, as there was a frequent turnover of farm instructors (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1 pt 1, W. M. Graham to Secretary DIA, 31 Oct 1911).

Cormie, Miss
From 1914 to 1915, the position of first assistant matron at the Cecilia Jeffrey school was held by Miss Cormie (CSP 1916, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1915, Report of Rev. John Semmens, p. 222).

Cowan, Miss J.
Miss Cowan filled the position of second assistant matron for about two years, between 1909 and 1911 (Thirty-fifth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1910-1911).

Craig, Miss
Miss Craig was employed as laundress in 1916 (CSP 1917, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1916, Report of Rev. John Semmens, p. 206).

Crawford, E. H.
In the spring of 1903, at the age of 23, Mr. Crawford began his two-year administration of the Birtle Boarding School. He was depicted as an enthusiastic principal, “a young man, full of energy and zeal” (CSP 1905, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1904, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 424).

After a year at the school, Mr. Crawford conveyed a greater sense of confidence in his work: “During this time I have learned a great deal more about the children and their parents and how to deal with them. I have the affections of the pupils and the good wishes and trust of most of the parents” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 60, E. H. Crawford to R. P. McKay, 27 April 1904).

Not long after, Mr. Crawford came under criticism from Church and DIA officials. The regional Inspector of Indian Agencies indicated that while Mr. Crawford had some admirable personal qualities, he felt that Mr. Crawford was not the appropriate person for the position of principal (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905).
There was also the issue of unpleasant staff relations. Mr. Crawford insisted that he had maintained congenial relationships with the assistant matron and teacher, but that the matron was moody and inconsiderate of the other staff (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Miss Craig, 28 Feb 1905). Conversely, it was the opinion of a Church official and the DIA Inspector that the three ladies on the staff worked well together, but that Crawford was somewhat of an outsider to this little group. Furthermore, they argued that the ladies resented being under control of such a young and inexperienced man, and suggested that Crawford be transferred and possibly place one of the women in charge (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, Andrew B. Baird to Dr. Mackay, 28 Jan 1905; UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905).

Another criticism advanced was that many of Mr. Crawford’s responsibilities were more appropriate for a general labourer than for a principal (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, E. H. Crawford to Dr. McKay, 10 June 1904). In his letter of resignation, Mr. Crawford hinted at a degree of dissatisfaction regarding his time at Birtle (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Rev. R. P. McKay, 13 Feb 1905). Mr. Crawford did not specify what his new position would be, but there was nothing in his letter to suggest it was in connection with the Church.

**Currie, Isobel**

Miss Isobel Currie was appointed to the position of assistant matron at the Crowstand school in May of 1898 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 649-650, [Baird] to Rev. N. Gilmour, 27 May 1898).

In a letter of application, Miss Currie summarized her qualifications and personal information. She was then, at 31 years old, residing in Woodstock, Ontario. She stated that she had been involved in housekeeping since she was old enough to do so. While she had little experience in making children’s clothing, she had served as an apprentice to a first-class dressmaker for six months. Her experience with children was limited. As singing was a common activity in such schools, she commented on her background in the musical sphere: “With reference to music I sing and play fairly well, having sung in the Birtle Choir while there and have played for the last 15 years more or less.” Although Miss Currie had been involved in volunteer activities for the Church, she had taken only minimal part in Sunday School and Christian Endeavor work. She did not mention any previous missionary work among Aboriginal people. Lastly, she claimed that based on her past experiences, she anticipated no difficulty in maintaining harmonious work relations with other staff (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 646-647, Miss Isobel Currie to Rev. Prof. Baird, 10 May 1898).

Miss Currie remained at Crowstand for a little more than one year (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1363, Isobel Currie to Professor Baird, 12 Jul 1899).

**Davis, Mrs. F**

Mrs. Davis was initially called upon to assist the staff of the Birtle Boarding School during an outbreak of influenza in February 1920. She was not a professionally trained
nurse, yet the principal considered her to be adequately capable of taking on the nursing responsibilities of the school. In addition, Mrs. Davis was more than willing to help out around the school in any way possible. Mrs. Davis was still working at the school a few months later and the principal requested DIA authority to retain Mrs. Davis as a permanent nurse on staff (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 Pt. 1, Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA to W. M. Graham, 17 May 1920). The Department however refused to appoint a permanent nurse to the Birtle school, suggesting that one be employed temporarily only when absolutely essential (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 Pt. 1, Assistant Deputy and Secretary DIA to Dr. Philip W. Head, 19 Oct 1920).

**Derby, Jean**

At the age of 31, Miss Jean Derby was hired as nurse at the Portage la Prairie Boarding School. She was employed at this school from March 1918 to July 1919. Miss Derby had graduated from the Royal Alexander Hospital at Fergus, Ontario in 1913. The medical superintendent of the hospital provided a positive testimonial in regards to Miss Derby: “She is a most competent nurse. Her work is the very best and her character beyond reproach” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 13 Feb 1918). Since graduation, she had been involved in district nursing and private nursing.

**Dodds, Rev. Frank Thomas**

Mr. Frank Dodds was responsible for the administration of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School from 1907 to 1918.

Mr. Dodds was born in 1850 in Bowmanville, Ontario. He was of Scottish descent, his parents having moved to Ontario from Scotland. In 1871, Dodds moved from Owen Sound to Winnipeg, Manitoba. Here he held a variety of occupations. Then in 1886, he took up farming near Dugald. This same year he married Alice Brown of St. Mary’s, Ontario. In the course of the ten years spent on this farm, Mrs. Dodds gave birth to their two children.

In 1897, Mr. Dodds’ friend, Dr. Andrew Baird (then a convener for the FMC of the PCC), urging the immediate need for a missionary at the Moose Mountain reserve, persuaded Dodds to go into mission work among Aboriginal people (UCA-Wpg, Biographical Files, biography written by one of his children, Rev. Frank Thomas Dodds). Mr. and Mrs. Dodds were praised for their good work and were reported to be well accepted by the people of Moose Mountain:

... he is well thought of by the Indians, who always receive him pleasantly in their houses, and listen with patience to what he says to them. ... Both he and his wife are kind and patient with the Indians under all circumstances, and never tire in helping them in any way possible. They have visited the sick from day to day, Mrs. Dodds taking with her on her visits any little luxury in the way of food that she thought would help the sick. The work and life of such people as Mr. and Mrs. Dodds must and I doubt not, will, have a good effect upon the Indians, ... (CSP 1899, AR DIA

As there was no church built here, the missionary work consisted of making house to house visits. Frank Dodds succeeded in learning enough of the Cree language to make himself well understood when reading and preaching to the Aboriginal people in their own language.

In 1907, Rev. Dodds was offered the position of missionary-principal at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. According to one of his children, he was offered this job partly because of his experience in navigation that he had gained while growing up near the Georgian Bay. This school was located on a peninsula in Shoal Lake, and therefore travel was done by steamboat in the summer months (UCA-Wpg, Biographical Files, Rev. Frank Thomas Dodds).

Thus, his responsibilities at Shoal Lake were multifaceted. As principal, he was in charge overseeing the school’s operation. Duties included the discipline of a co-educational school, the supervision of staff, book-keeping and financing on limited funds. When Dodds was not fortunate enough to have a farm instructor on his staff, he would be required to care for the stock, gardens and to do any outside work. In extreme cases, he would take on the roles of dentist and doctor, as the nearest town, Kenora, was forty miles away. As was common during this period, the position of principal and missionary were one and the same. For distant reserves, this meant occasional trips often taken while the school children were on summer holidays. Nearby reserves were visited on a regular basis. Thirdly, Dodds was the captain of the steamer which was employed to pick up the mail and haul all essential supplies for the school.

During Rev. Dodds’ term, the Cecilia Jeffrey school received its share of unfavourable reports from the DIA (see, for example: NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Kenora and Savanne Agencies, dated 8 Jul 1914; SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, John Semmens to Duncan C. Scott, 10 Sept 1915; SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, 22 Jan 1917). In 1917, the Department stated that Mr. Dodds was incapable of asserting authority, and thus was not in control of the situation as was expected of a principal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to J. H. Edmison, 29 March 1917). In hopes of improving the situation at Cecilia Jeffrey, an assistant principal was engaged (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1917). But four months later, the DIA’s inspector disclosed that no improvement in the management of the school had occurred, and thus it was recommended that Mr. Dodds be replaced (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to J. H. Edmison, 4 Aug 1917). In response, the Church generally defended Mr. Dodds and argued that despite Dodds’ declining health, he should remain at the school until the end of summer 1918 in order to give the future principal, the current assistant principal, a chance to become acquainted with the navigation of the lake (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Copy - Report of Commission of Presbytery appointed to investigate conditions at Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, by Hugh J. Robertson and S.
C. Murray, 26 Feb 1918).

Dodds’ retirement began October 1, 1918. He and his wife initially moved to Toronto. But they “pined for the open country, and the sound of water, ...” and so found a house at Caesarea on Lake Scugog (UCA-Wpg, Biographical Files, Rev. Frank Thomas Dodds, p. 10). Dodds passed away January 28, 1926.

**Dodds, Mrs. Alice (nee Brown)**

Miss Alice Brown married Rev. Frank Dodds in 1886. When living at Dugald, Manitoba, she participated in the mission board (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, Rev. Baird to Mrs. Jeffrey, 2 Apr 1897). While stationed in Moose Mountain, Mrs. Dodds played a vital part in the missionary work (CSP 1899, AR DIA, for Year Ended 1898, Report by H. R. Halpin, farmer in charge, p. 152). For the last couple of years at Cecilia Jeffrey school, Mrs. Dodds held the position of matron (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1918).

**Downing, Miss**

After teaching at Crowstand school for only a short period of time, Miss Downing decided she was not suited for such work. She initially had intended to stay there for one year, but on account of the children not being very healthy she felt being in such an environment would take a toll on her own health. Apparently she felt “her health giving a little already” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901).

Mr. Gilmour, the principal, questioned Miss Downing’s motive for entering the work and doubted her adaptability for work among Aboriginal children. He advocated for the hiring of someone with a genuine interest in missionary work, unlike Miss Downing, who in his opinion, was only concerned with securing employment. Furthermore, he doubted her ability to effectively teach Aboriginal children (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 12 Sep 1901).

Miss Downing offered to remain at the school until the end of the year if necessary. Miss Downing was still at the school in mid-December, yet she was anxious to get home (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 11 Dec 1901). It is likely that she departed prior to the new year.

**Dunbar, Sarah**

Sarah Dunbar began her lengthy career at the Crowstand school in 1900. As assistant matron, her duties included sewing and milking the cows. The principal characterized Miss Dunbar as “a splendid worker” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 26, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 20 June 1901). She was a hard working woman, as conditions of the school demanded. In July 1901, the principal noted she had not had one day off in a year and a half, and thus warranted a much deserved holiday (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 27, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 4 July 1901). In December of the same year, Mr. Gilmour revealed concern regarding her physical health: “Miss Dunbar has not been very well for some time; although she says she is quite well. She is working
too hard. I have told her she will play out in about six months more, that it would be better to do just a fair amount of work, and be able to continue it, but she says the work is there, and must be done" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 11 Dec 1901). At this time, Miss Dunbar was offered the position of matron, but she declined.

Years later, in 1914, Miss Dunbar became matron. Miss Dunbar remained working as matron even after the boarding school was closed and replaced with the Coté Improved Day School (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, p. 94).

**Everett, Mr.**

Mr. Everett worked at the Crowstand school as the farmer in 1914. After admitting to having had sex with some of the female pupils, the principal ordered that he leave the school (NAC, RG 10, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt 1, W. G. Blewett to Secretary, DIA, 25 Aug 1914).

**Finnie, Miss**

Miss Finnie’s first experience with residential school work was at the Portage school in 1892. She was appointed as matron, but only stayed for a short time. Over the following ten years, she would occasionally fill in as matron or assistant matron. When Mr. Hendry took over the administration of the Portage Boarding School in 1901, Miss Finnie was assistant to Mr. Hendry’s sister Mary, who was then matron. Approximately a year later, Miss Finnie was no longer on staff as Mr. Hendry’s wife became the matron and his sister took over Miss Finnie’s former position (Murray, [1936]: 61, 83, 90).

Shortly after Miss Finnie’s position at Portage had ended, the assistant matron at the Birtle school recommended that the FMC hire her on a permanent basis: “I am writing to ask if we could not have Miss Finnie appointed on the staff, she is through at the Portage and it would be a great comfort to me if we could have her here. She is at present relieving Miss McLaren who is taking a short holiday. She understands the work so well and will be more helpful to me than any one else we could get” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, Tillie McLeod to Dr. Mackay, 9 Jul 1902). Miss Finnie was hired and she stayed there until 1903 (CSP 1904, AR DIA for Yr Ended June 30 1903, Report by S. J. Jackson, p.466). While principal of Birtle school, Mr. McWhinney contended that Miss Finnie was the only one on staff with whom he maintained affable relations (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 48, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 8 Apr 1903).

**Fleming, A. J.**

Miss Fleming was engaged as teacher at the Birtle Boarding School in 1919, and she was still employed there in 1924 (Eleventh AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1924, p. 78).

**Folliott, Alison B**

Previous to entering her work as matron at the Birtle school in 1913, Miss Folliott had already acquired considerable experience working with Aboriginal children in the
United States. She had worked for ten years in Fort Berthold Mission School in South Dakota, two years in Oahe School, South Dakota and one year in Pipestone, Minnesota in a government school (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 21 Oct 1913). She remained at Birtle for several years. A Miss Folliett is listed as matron of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School in 1918, but it is unclear whether this was the same woman (Fifth AR, WMS, PCC, 1918, p. 84).

**Fraser, Annie**

Throughout her thirteen years at the Portage Boarding School, Miss Annie Fraser filled the positions of teacher, matron and principal.

Annie Fraser was born in London, Ontario, as the youngest daughter of James Fraser and Catherine McGilvray. Annie moved to Manitoba in 1887, and shortly after she was engaged as an assistant to Miss Walker at the Portage school. In 1892, after Miss Walker was transferred to Regina Industrial School, Miss Fraser was placed in control of the school as principal and matron. Miss Fraser’s work was not restricted to the school, but also included missionary work, particularly with the Aboriginal women (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F1262-1269, [Rev. Baird] to Mrs. Jeffrey, 12 Aug 1895).

According to the author of a history of the Portage school, the children loved Miss Fraser and saw her as their ideal (Murray, S. C., [1936]: 87). Miss Fraser, in turn, conveyed a fondness for the children and each were granted individual consideration by her: “Our family of sixteen forms a happy circle - contented, cheerful, agreeable. One absent is missed as much as when we had only four or five. ... We do love our little Indian children enough to see the good in each, ...” (Report of the FMC, 1893, as cited in Murray, S. C., [1936], pp. 66-67). A Department official commended the work done at Portage under the management of Miss Fraser: “The boarding school at Portage la Prairie ... is a model one, and is deserving of every encouragement from the department. Miss Fraser, the principal, and Miss Laidlaw, the teacher, are eminently qualified by natural and acquired ability for the positions they occupy” CSP 1897, AR DIA for yr ended June 30th, 1896 by Superintending Inspector E. McColl, p. 105). The Secretary of the WFMS indicated her appreciation for Miss Fraser’s commitment: “We feel that she has given eleven years (the best of her life) of hard devoted work to this school and should have every consideration shown her” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1482-1486, C. M. Jeffrey to Prof. Baird, 24 March 1900).

Miss Fraser resigned in September 1901 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 29, W. A. Hendry to Dr. R. P. McKay, 26 Sep 1901). The new principal voiced a professional admiration for his predecessor: “She left her stamp on the children and on the institution that was a credit to her personality and character” (as quoted in Murray, S. C., [1936]: 87).

She took a break after retiring from the school, and then entered the nursing profession. She graduated as a trained nurse from St. Luke’s Hospital in St. Paul. Miss Fraser spent twenty-four years in nursing. Most of her summers were spent vacationing at her sister’s in Portage la Prairie. While there, it was common for former pupils to visit with her and talk over old times.
Miss Fraser caught pneumonia while on duty and passed away in 1928 (Murray, S. C., [1936]).

Fraser, Katherine M

While a graduate nurse would have been preferable, the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions hired Mrs. Katherine Fraser as nurse for the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School in fall of 1916. She was a woman of about 40 years old, and a widow of a Presbyterian missionary. While she was deemed to be of a suitable character, there was some apprehension due to her lack of a formal education in nursing. She was not a graduate nurse, yet she did have some experience. In preparation for work as a home or foreign missionary, she had taken a course in surgery at the Glasgow Royal Infirmary. Prior to coming to Canada, Mrs. Fraser had also been involved in outdoor and home nursing in the district where she was deaconess for eleven years. The appointment of Mrs. Fraser was initially for one year, after which her compatibility for the work was to be judged (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Secretary DIA, 23 Aug 1916).

The DIA inspector of Aboriginal schools considered Mrs. Fraser a dedicated, competent employee:

... I have come to regard Mrs. Fraser as a superior type of woman, as a capable and conscientious nurse, as a faithful and devoted member of the school staff and as an exemplary christian [sic] lady. Her work was well done, the infirmaries were very clean and orderly and she appeared to have a knack of ministering to the sick, and of nursing them back to health which marked her as a person of special worth (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, date of inspection 21 Jun 1918).

Yet a situation arose in which the school’s principal refused to sign Mrs. Fraser’s pay cheque. He had insisted that she was not responsive to discipline, had violated school rules and was prone to gossiping. Mrs. Fraser answered to the complaints by commenting on the management of the school, criticizing the amount of fatty food supplied, declaring her faithfulness to her duty and defending herself against the accusation of gossiping. Furthermore, she agreed to leave the service if the Department so decided. The Department felt this to be a personal dispute and challenged the principal’s decision to withhold Mrs. Fraser’s pay.

Possibly due to this confrontation, Mrs. Fraser communicated her resignation in September 1918 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Asst Deputy and Secretary to R. S. McKenzie, 25 Sep 1918).

Gandier, Joseph C.

A university graduate, Mr. Gandier, was secured as the teacher and principal at the Cecilia Jeffrey school in December 1901. The local missionary was pleased as he was familiar with Gandier’s accomplished brother: “... I hope he will prove a success, if he is like his brother I am sure he will.” Yet, Mr. McKittrick had his reservations regarding this appointment. Mr. Gandier had declared his intentions to leave the work after two or three
years. Mr. McKitrick expressed his hopefulness that in time Mr. Gandier would reconsider remaining at the school for an extended period: “One who is planning to leave work is not likely to take the same interest in it or in the Indians as if he wished to make it his life work. But if he has the christlike and true missionary spirit he may when he comes see and realize that there is no more needed nor blessed work under heaven than leading these young pagan children out into the light and nothing at which his talents and university degree could be better spent” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, A. G. McKitrick to Rev R. P. MacKay, 17 Dec 1901).

Mr. McKitrick was to be disappointed. Gandier declared his decision to resign after less than one year at the school. In his letter of resignation, Mr. Gandier recommended that a married couple should be hired as principal and matron. As well, he insisted that he had put his best effort into his work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Gandier to Rev. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902). He offered to stay until the end of the following summer, and indicated that he would return to college at that time.

Gillespie, Kate (later Mrs. Motherwell)

Prior to coming to the Crowstand school in 1894, Miss Gillespie had previous teaching experience at several public schools.

Born in Teeswater, Ontario in 1866 to William Gillespie and Janet McAuley, Miss Gillespie received her public and high school education in her birth town. She went on to enter the teaching profession. In 1889, the Gillespie family moved to western Canada, near Balsamores, Saskatchewan. Her initial contact with Aboriginal children was at her second school in Saskatchewan. According to Dobbins (1961), these children left an impression on Miss Gillespie and she maintained an interest in the welfare of Aboriginal people for the remainder of her life. In the spring of 1894, the idea of committing her services to her church as a teacher-missionary became reality.

An opening for a teacher at the Crowstand mission school had presented itself, and Gillespie was offered the position. After a number of months there, she was enthusiastic about the school work: “I still feel quite happy and contented in instructing my little dark skinned friends and of late my interest has been somewhat increased by the arrival of several little new comers” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 971-972, Kate Gillespie to Prof. Baird, 9 Jan 1895). Gillespie also taught the adults on the reserve to read and write (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, July 1894, Volume 11, No. 3, letter by Gillespie dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 74). Her missionary work consisted of a Sunday women’s meeting. She, along with the nine women who attended, agreed that she would learn the Bible in their language and they would learn it in English (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 969, Report of the School at Crowstand for the quarter ending December 31, 1896, by Kate Gillespie).

In an attempt to become better qualified for mission work, Gillespie withdrew from her work at Crowstand in order to take a short course in hospital training. Miss Gillespie offered to fill any upcoming teaching vacancy and acknowledged how difficult it would be for her to depart from Crowstand (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1205-1206, Kate Gillespie to Baird, 9 Mar 1897).

It was not long before she was offered her next mission field at the Mistawasis reserve,
where she taught at the day school. After a successful four years at Mistawasis, Miss Gillespie received a much deserved promotion as she was appointed principal of the File Hills Boarding School. In a brief report written for the Annual Report of the WFMS (1901-02), Miss Gillespie expressed her fondness for the work and the children at File Hills: “The children have been very obedient, and even thoughtful. The work is full of interest, and we have grown to love them. There are some dear little ones among them, and the older ones have been helpful, ...” (p. 47).

Miss Gillespie decided to give up her position when she got married. She resigned her position as principal of File Hills Boarding School in 1908. Dobbin (1961) maintained that this was a bittersweet time for Miss Gillespie and the Aboriginal children and adults of File Hills. The wedding ceremony of Kate Gillespie and W. R. Motherwell was performed at the File Hills Boarding School, and many of the guests were local Aboriginal people.

Following their marriage, Mr. and Mrs. Motherwell spent many years residing in Regina and Ottawa. Yet, as she had promised, Mrs. Motherwell maintained contact with her Aboriginal friends.

The appreciation and gratitude of the File Hills people for all Mrs. Motherwell had done for them over the years was evident at a celebration they planned for her on Mother’s Day, close to her 80th birthday. She was invited to the newly constructed school building for a special ceremony (Dobbin, 1961). The continued close relationship between Mrs. Motherwell and the people of File Hills was a testament to her genuine interest in their spiritual and educational welfare. Mrs. Motherwell passed away on July 6, 1952.

Gilmour, Jeanie

Miss Jeanie Gilmour’s lengthy career at the Crowstand school ended in 1914 as illness compelled her to resign (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914. p. 53).

Like her cousin Neil Gilmour, Miss Gilmour had had two years experience in the Regina Industrial School prior to her appointment at Crowstand. It was her employment at Regina that made her a suitable candidate for the opening of assistant matron at Crowstand: “She is thoroughly competent for any part of the Matron’s work, having been in charge of the cooking at Regina and having made her living for some time in Winnipeg by dress making” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 229-231, [Baird] to Mrs. Jeffrey, 12 Jan 1898). When the matron Miss Carson resigned, Miss Gilmour was recommended to be advanced to matron. According to the principal, Miss Gilmour was not one to take advantage of the position in a way that may make work unpleasant for the staff member working under her. As well, he argued that even though she was not a cultured woman, she possessed the necessary qualities: “Miss Gilmour has not much education, and has not that polish and ease of manners which would qualify her, as an entertainer in society - but the latter is not a vital matter at Crowstand. She is lady like, and has a quick firmness, which, enables her to get on well with Indian Girls” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 463-465, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 31 Mar 1898). She was indeed promoted to matron.

Miss Gilmour proved to be a very dedicated, hard working employee. After a year and a half at Crowstand, she revealed that she had not had even one day off. She desired a vacation during the summer, but as there would be workers at the school doing repairs,
she was willing to forgo a vacation and would be satisfied to have only a few days to attend the exhibition in Winnipeg (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1326, Jeanie Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 17 Jun 1899).

Miss Gilmour expressed her desire to resign in April 1901, and departed in June (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 26, N. Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 12 Jun 1901). However her resignation was only temporary.

The principal Mr. Gilmour was hopeful that Miss Gilmour would return to Crowstand (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to MacKay, 19 Sep 1901). Miss Gilmour re-entered the work at Crowstand in December 1901 as she indicated “a strong desire, to go where she believed the Master wanted her” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 11 Dec 1901.)

An indication of Miss Gilmour’s ability was that she was chosen to fill in as acting principal when Mr. McWhinney went on furlough for a few months in 1911 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 134, James Farquharson to R. P. MacKay, 2 May 1911).

It appears that the work at the Crowstand school suffered following Miss Gilmour's resignation. The local Indian agent inspected the school a period of time after her departure and found the building to be unsanitary and the children unkempt. According to the Agent Blewett, this was a direct result of Miss Gilmour’s absence: “Miss Gilmour’s retirement from this school seems to have started it on the down grade and now it is not fit for children to stay in, ...” (as quoted in NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, part 1, Memorandum, Martin Benson to Mr. Scott, 11 Nov 1914).

Miss Gilmour had spent over 14 years employed at Crowstand school.

Gilmour, Neil

On the merits of his Normal School training and previous experience in the field, Neil Gilmour was considered well-qualified for the position of principal of the Crowstand Boarding School in 1897. Mr. Gilmour held a second class Ontario Normal School certificate, as well as a teacher’s certificate for the Northwest Territories (CSP 1896, AR DIA Yr ended June 30, 1895 Report by T. P. Wadsworth p. 123).

In 1892, as a single man at the age of 25, Gilmour was appointed teacher and assistant principal of the Regina Industrial School. The principal of the school approved of the appointment: “... we secured the services of an efficient and enthusiastic assistant and teacher, Mr. Neil Gilmour. Under his management, gratifying results show themselves in the school-room” (CSP 1893, DIA, Yr Ended June 30, 1892, Report by Principal of Regina Industrial School, A. J. McLeod, p. 208). He spent close to two years at Regina.

From there, Mr. Gilmour was promoted to the principalship of the Birtle Boarding School (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Neil Gilmour, 24 Aug 1894, p. 454). As principal, Mr. Gilmour was responsible for all the teaching and proved to be effective with Aboriginal children (CSP 1896, AR DIA, Yr Ended June 30, 1895, Report of T. P. Wadsworth, p. 123). He stayed at Birtle for less than one year. Perhaps this brevity of office was a result of a deficient working relationship between himself and the matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 1 May 1901). He was granted a transfer to the Hurricane Hills mission, to be in charge of both
the school and mission (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1355, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 4 Oct 1895).
Due to health concerns, in the summer of 1897, Gilmour was appointed missionary and
principal at Crowstand: "I am glad Mr. Gilmour is going where he will not require to
prepare his own meals he does not look at all strong and should have more comfort than
he does at present" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1670-1675, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird,
29 Jul 1897). Dr. Baird of the FMC was adamant that he remain (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G
1800-1805, [Dr. Baird] to Mr. Gilmour, 18 Aug 1897). Correspondence regarding these
issues continued for a couple of months, when finally a plan was devised to which Mr.
Gilmour consented, and he vowed to "give the work a fair trial" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G
1895-1905, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 14 Oct 1897). Not long thereafter, Gilmour
implied his desire to resign by recommending that a medical doctor be stationed at
Crowstand in his place (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 164-166, Neil Gilmour to Prof. Baird, 13
Dec 1897). Despite concerns, such as an inadequate salary, his inability to acquire the
local language and persisting financial difficulties, Mr. Gilmour persevered for a number of
years. He stated his health and failure to learn the language as reasons for resignation
(UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 25 Sep
1902).

It is evident that the FMC were also impressed with and appreciative of Mr. Gilmour’s
contributions to the work, as they later offered him a position as principal at the Regina
Industrial School. He declined, citing his adverse views towards industrial schools as the
reason (Minutes, FMC, WD, Vol.17, 1904-05, letter from Gilmour, dated 11 Feb 1905, p.
100). It is not clear what line of work Mr. Gilmour took up after his time at Crowstand.

Glenn, Mr.

Mr. Glenn worked as outside instructor at the Cecilia Jeffrey school in 1915 (CSP

Glenn, Mrs. A. D.

As the second assistant matron, Mrs. Glenn was responsible for the cooking at the
Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. She was employed there from 1913 to 1915 (First AR,
WMS, PCC, 1914-15, p. 56).

Gordon, Miss

From 1913 to 1915, the position of second assistant matron at Crowstand was held by
Miss Gordon (First AR, WMS, PCC, 1914-15, p. 56).

Gould, Miss M.

Originally from Halifax, Miss Gould was responsible for teaching the junior class at the Portage school in 1920 (Seventh AR, WMS, PCC, WD, 1920, p. 28).

Grant, Elizabeth

Miss Elizabeth Grant’s employment at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School began in October 1918. She undertook the nursing duties. As a graduate nurse, she was considered to be “thoroughly qualified” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 14 Oct 1918). Due to illness, Miss Grant resigned, her resignation taking effect April 12, 1919 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 9 Apr 1919).

Hamilton, Mr. James

James Hamilton began working at the Crowstand school in the summer of 1895. He was hired as the trades instructor, however a more appropriate title may have been carpenter/boys’ supervisor. His duties included: “the care of the boys’ dormitory and everything in it; the keeping of the boys clean in every respect; the superintendence of the boys at all their outside work and at the scrubbing of the dormitory; and the charge of the boys when rising and retiring and carpenter work.” Much work was expected of Mr. Hamilton, as there was always a list of carpentry projects needing to be completed: “At the present time a number of things about the school are waiting for him, e.g. roof of milk house, wainscoting [sic] stairway in stone building where plastic is badly broken, cupboard in laundry, pot cupboard in kitchen and painting of roofs” (UCA-Wpg, ABP G 180-184, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof Baird, 26 March 1896).

The principal, Mr. Whyte, disclosed concern over Mr. Hamilton’s health a number of times. In one letter, Mr. Whyte stated that Mr. Hamilton was unable to complete his duties: “His own work about the school is itself more than he is able to overtake. During the last week he has been laid up and his general health is such that he is not equal to any extra exertion” (UCA-Wpg, ABP G 107-110, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof Baird, 28 Feb 1896). Just a few months later, Mr. Whyte communicated that Mr. Hamilton, who previously had scrofula, had been re-inflicted. Furthermore, Mr. Whyte suggested that for the sake of Mr. Hamilton’s health, he should leave Crowstand (UCA-Wpg, ABP G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof Baird, 22 May 1896).

According to the 1897-1898 annual report of the WFMS, Mr. Hamilton was paid only a portion of his annual salary, thus implying that he resigned during that time.

Harvard, R.

Miss Harvard was able to utilize her primary school training as the junior class teacher at the Portage school. She commenced her duties in 1920. The children made progress despite the challenge of an overcrowded classroom: “The provincial school inspector gave an excellent report, although the work is being done under almost impossible conditions,
as we have 35 pupils in a room suitable for 14 at most” (Ninth AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1922, p. 93). Miss Harvard was still at the school in 1924 (Eleventh AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1924, p. 79).

**Henderson, Flora**

After only a month as the matron of Crowstand school, Miss Henderson began questioning the amount of work for which she was responsible (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 831, Flora Henderson to [Baird], 4 Oct 1894). Her duties included the preparation and serving of meals and in order to reduce her work, a cook was hired to assist her (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 930-934, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 7 Dec 1894).

Miss Henderson’s inability to maintain pleasant relations with staff members and repeated objections to her share of the work provoked the principal to suggest her resignation. He alleged that the previous matron accomplished more than Miss Henderson and without grievance (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 22 Mar 1895). In reply, Henderson defended her charges of overwork: “I have worked very hard much harder at first than my strength was able for I tried to do the impossible. I sometimes complained to Mr. Whyte that I had too much to do when he would call me to task for something that he thought I should have done. But I feel that I never did complain without a very just cause.” Moreover, she professed her passion and dedication to the work: “I am strongly attached to the children and they are to me and I dearly love the work and do not want to leave. I gave myself to the Lord and his work in coming here and I do not take myself back. I have done my work faithfully” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1066-1068, Flora Henderson to Secretary of the Foreign Mission, 18 Apr 1895). Pressure for Miss Henderson to resign continued, not only from Mr. Whyte, but also from other staff and the FMC (for example, see: UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1069-1080, Kate Gillespie to Prof. Baird, 13 Jun 1895; and UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Flora Henderson, 12 Apr 1895, pp. 534-535). The FMC convener did not to place all the blame on Miss Henderson (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, Baird to Miss Henderson, 10 May 1895, p. 542-543), but did eventually request her resignation, citing continued antagonistic relations with the rest of the staff as a main consideration (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1132, [Baird] to Miss Flora Henderson, 3 Jun 1895). Miss Henderson gave in to the pressure and sent in her resignation a couple of weeks later (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1207, Flora Henderson to Prof. Baird, 20 Jun 1895).

**Henderson, Isabella**

For one and a half years, Miss Isabella Henderson was responsible for the laundry as an assistant matron at the Birtle Boarding School. She came from Oak Lake with no experience with Aboriginal people. The principal felt she would adapt well to the work given her outstanding personality, strong Christian character and experience in managing a household (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 14 Jan 1914). Her brother’s death and related family obligations compelled Miss Henderson to withdraw from the work (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251,
Henderson, W.

At twenty-five years of age, Miss W. Henderson was appointed teacher of the Portage Boarding School (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Andrew S. Grant to Assistant Superintendent General of the DIA, 27 Sep 1913). She had completed one year of university in arts, and held a second-class non-professional certificate, as well as a third-class in Normal training. She was characterized as an efficient teacher: "She keeps excellent order in the school and has good control over the pupils" (CSP 1917, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1916, Report of S. J. Jackson, p. 213). The principal, Mr. Hendry also found her work encouraging: "She is a young girl of fine disposition and will do better work the coming year as she is now understanding the children" (First AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1914-1915, by Rev. Hendry, p. 63). Upon finding more commonplace employment, Miss Henderson tendered her resignation (Second AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1915, by Rev. Hendry, p. 90).

Hendry, Mrs. Jean (nee Robertson)

In fall of 1901, when Annie Fraser resigned her position as matron of the Portage Boarding School, the current principal, Mr. Hendry, suggested his fiancee as a replacement. Mr. Hendry stressed Miss Robertson's eagerness to work with Aboriginal people (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, W. A. Hendry to Dr. R. P. McKay, 26 Sep 1901). The two were married in July 1902, and Mrs. Hendry was appointed matron.

Mrs. Hendry had a strong background in nursing. She was a graduate nurse of the General and Marine Hospital at Owen Sound, and she had also completed a post graduate course in Erie County Hospital in Buffalo, New York (Murray, S. C., [1936]: 95-96). This training proved invaluable due to the frequent health problems of the students: "Mrs. Hendry is a trained nurse and her skill has prevented many visits of the doctor" (CSP 1909, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1908, Report by S. Swinford, p. 321).

In 1909, Mrs. Hendry, along with her husband, were transferred to the Alberni Boarding School in British Columbia (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel 8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, part 1, Assistant Secretary, DIA to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 16 Oct 1909). They served there as matron and principal for a couple of years, then returned to the Portage school, where Mrs. Hendry continued on as matron until 1934 (Murray, S. C., [1936]).

Hendry, Mary

Mary Hendry arrived at the Portage school in 1901 with her brother, Rev. W. A. Hendry. Prior to this appointment, she had been involved in teaching for approximately 5 years. She held a second class certificate (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 915, W. A. Hendry to Prof. Baird, 26 Nov 1898). Miss Hendry was matron for approximately one year. She was then appointed assistant matron, as Rev. Hendry’s wife took over the duties of matron. As assistant matron, Miss Hendry was responsible for supervising the work performed in the kitchen and dining room (CSP 1909, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 313
1908, Report by S. Swinford, p. 321). After 11 years of dedication and challenging work, Miss Hendry resigned owing to the illness of her sister (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914, p. 53).

Hendry, Rev. W. A., B.A.

One of the more devoted, qualified and competent men working in Aboriginal missions, Mr. Hendry dedicated over thirty years of his life to the principalship of the Portage Boarding School.

Mr. Hendry was born in Heathcote Grey County, Ontario on May 9, 1873. He grew up on a farm, which provided him with a background in agriculture.

Mr. Hendry’s academic background was more impressive than most missionaries. After obtaining his second class certificate in teaching, he attended Guelph Agricultural College. At the end of his second year, he was awarded the Associate Diploma. Next, he secured a first class teacher’s certificate and spent one year teaching in Algoma. He also fulfilled the requirements for a four year Arts degree extra murally, the first three years through Queen’s University and the final year via Chicago University. In 1902, he received a Bachelor of Arts degree (Murray, [1936]: 88-89).

After teaching for five years in Ontario, Mr. Hendry offered his services to missionary work. In 1896, Mr. Hendry accepted a teaching position at the Red Deer Industrial School, despite the fact that Mr. Hendry was a Presbyterian and the school was run by the Methodist church. However while at Red Deer, he wrote the FMC requesting a position with the Presbyterian church: “... as I am a Presbyterian I would much rather be devoting my energy on the work of our own church” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1016, W. A. Hendry to Secretary [FMC], 18 Jan 1897). Mr. Hendry was offered the position of teacher at Round Lake (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 86, [Baird] to W. A. Hendry, 16 Nov [1897]), and even though the salary offered was less than his at Red Deer, his preference to work for the Presbyterian church was strong enough to express an interest in the position. He requested information regarding the duties of teacher prior to accepting the position and enquired as to whether the school was a “perfectly disciplined one” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, W. A. Hendry to Prof. Baird, 28 Nov 1897). Hendry was urged by a fellow staff member to remain at Red Deer and chose to stay there until June 1898 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 179-180, W. A. Hendry to Prof. Baird, 7 Dec 1897). Eventually, in 1899, Hendry began teaching at the Round Lake school (PCC, Minutes of the 18th Synod of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, 1900, p. 43).

In 1901, he was promoted to principal of the Portage la Prairie Boarding School (Murray, [1936]). In addition to the general management of the school, he was also responsible for class room instruction and for the missionary work of the nearby Sioux village.

On July 30 1902, Mr. Hendry married Jean Robertson, who was appointed matron of the Portage school.

In 1909, Mr. and Mrs. Hendry were to experience a change of location, as they were transferred to Alberni. According to the author of a history of the Portage school, the WFMS requested the Hendry’s to go to Alberni in order to improve the school’s
management: “Friction had developed at Alberni and wise leadership was necessary to its removal. It was a fine tribute to Mr. Hendry’s administrative ability that the Women’s Foreign Missionary Society looked to him at this juncture, in confidence that he was the right person to take the tangles out of Alberni. He was requested to go west with Mrs. Hendry, and take charge at Alberni. They were told if they would go, they would be given their choice of remaining in the west or returning to Portage la Prairie which they desired” (Murray, [1936]: 103). However, the DIA and FMC correspondence tells a different story. It seems that for a couple of years, Mr. Hendry himself had requested to be transferred to British Columbia (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, R. P. MacKay to Mr. S. Stewart, 19 Oct 1909). The Secretary of the FMC apprehensively approved of the transfer: “I am not sure that you will be more comfortable in Alberni than you are in the Plains. However, you have served so well and if there is anything like preference in Alberni you have a right to the consideration” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 122, R. P. Mackay to Mr. W. A. Hendry, 14 Jun 1909).

It was true that the Alberni school had been mismanaged. Mr. and Mrs. Hendry entered into their duties on September 1, 1909 and found dilapidated buildings, unhealthy children and unacceptable conditions in general. In the face of such adversity, Mr. Hendry tendered his resignation. Yet, the FMC urged him to persevere and “to employ whatever labor might be necessary to put the school into proper order” (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, Volume 22, 1909-10, p. 68). The FMC’s Secretary was aware that Mr. Hendry was insistent on leaving Alberni the following spring and Dr. Mackay would not oppose him: “I do not like keeping him there if he is unhappy, and I can understand how on Mrs. Hendry’s account he might be unwilling to remain” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 128, R. P. Mackay to Rev. W. W. McLaren, 7 Dec 1909). Mr. and Mrs. Hendry vacated their post at Alberni on March 25, 1910 (CSP 1911, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1910, Report by Principal Mr. H. B. Currie, Alberni Boarding School, p. 524).

The Hendry’s returned to the Portage school in December 1911 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, MacKay to W.A. Hendry, 27 Dec 1911). Mr. Hendry was no longer teacher of the school, but he was again responsible for the school’s management and the missionary work. Due to the necessity for Mr. Hendry to perform baptisms and marriage ceremonies, an application was made to the General Assembly to have him ordained, admitting him to the full status of the ministry. Permission was granted and he was ordained on November 17, 1914 (Murray, [1936]: 118). Mr. Hendry retired from the Portage la Prairie Boarding School in the mid-1930's (Murray, [1936]: 89).

Throughout Mr. Hendry’s long career, his competence and loyalty to the work was greatly appreciated by both Church and DIA officials. He was commonly noted for his talent and tact in working with Aboriginal children: “…Mr. Hendry was possessed of special gifts invaluable to one who had to do with Indians — He was deliberate and self-controlled - as a disciplinarian he was firm, yet kind - and always just” (Murray, [1936]: 89).

Equally impressive were accolades regarding Mr. Hendry’s adeptness for school management. The DIA inspector acknowledged his management ability, particularly his finesse in financial affairs: “Mr. Hendry is a master of finance, and always keeps the
expenditure within the income. In this respect, as for several other important reasons, he would make an excellent head for a much more extensive institution” (CSP 1907, AR DIA Yr. Ended June 30th, 1906, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 356).

Mr. Hendry’s hard work and dedication was also noticed elsewhere. In 1912 he received an offer for the position of Dean of Residence and instructor of Mathematics at the Manitoba Agricultural College. The salary offered was double of what he was earning from the Church, and yet he refused the offer. A couple of years later he was offered the principalship of the Berry School for Boys in Georgia, also for a salary much larger than what he was receiving at Portage, with a free house added in. Once again Mr. Hendry declined the chance to enjoy a higher salary (Murray, [1936]: 123-124). This underscores Mr. Hendry’s genuine interest in the welfare of the Aboriginal people he worked with at Portage and the surrounding reserves.

Hilborn, Garnet

Garnet Hilborn occupied the position of farm instructor for only a short time at the Birtle school. Previous to his employment at the school, Mr. Hilborn had resided in the district north of Teulon, Manitoba. He was 30 years old, and brought 15 years of agricultural experience with him, having a background in hog and poultry raising and dairy (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Mar 1912). Mr. Hilborn arrived at Birtle in March 1912 and remained there only until July 1912, as he accepted a more remunerative position as a contractor/builder (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Jul 1912).

Hill, F

In 1910 and 1911, Miss Hill acted as seamstress for the Crowstand school (CSP 1913, AR DIA Yr. Ended March 31st, 1912, Report by Mr. Blewett, p. 366).

Hughes, Isabella

Miss Isabella Hughes took her place as the resident nurse on the staff of the Portage school in April 1916 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Assistant Deputy Secretary to Rev. W. A. Hendry, 5 Apr 1916). According to the principal, her departure from the school was “owing to the dangerous condition of her gentleman friend who was sent home from France lately”(NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1 pt. 1, Rev. W. A. Hendry to the Secretary DIA, 16 Dec 1916) He had been wounded and was expected to recover in Winnipeg, but rather his condition was deteriorating and Miss Hughes had been called to be with him there. A replacement was found and she did not return to work at the school.

Huston, E. (Later Mrs. Edward Brown)

A staff member who had recently announced her resignation from the Portage la Prairie Boarding School recommended Miss Huston for the position of teacher, writing that Miss Huston was:
The Church authorities took Miss Walker’s advice and appointed Miss Huston as teacher in January 1892 (Murray, [1936]). She remained working at the school until 1893, when she married Mr. Edward Brown (UCA-Wpg, Residential School Files, Notes on the Early History of the Indian Industrial School Portage la Prairie by Mrs. A. D. McKay [no date]). After they were married, her husband regularly accompanied and assisted the ladies of the Portage school in conducting religious service at the Sioux village (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 12, A. Jeffrey to Rev. R. P. McKay, 3 Aug 1897). Over the years, the Brown’s had employed a couple of former pupils as domestic helpers (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 328, Sara Laidlaw to Prof. Baird, 4 May 1896).

Iverach, David

At about 40 years of age, married with four small children, Rev. David Iverach undertook the principalship of the Birtle school beginning in October 1913. (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, G. H. Wheatley to the Secretary DIA, 2 Oct 1913). He had ten years experience as teacher and principal in Manitoban public schools, as well as ten years as minister in Springfield, Manitoba. He had been brought up on farms, first in Scotland and later in Manitoba, where his family had moved to when he was a boy. Thus, he had a good knowledge of agriculture. Academically he had completed a Bachelor of Arts. His predecessor, Walter McLaren, was satisfied that with his educational background and experience, Rev. Iverach “should prove a successful and efficient principal” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, W. W. McLaren to Secretary DIA, 27 Sep 1913).

During Rev. Iverach’s tenure of office, truancy (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. D. Iverach, 24 Nov 1913) and immorality among students (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 19 June 1915) were concerns at the Birtle school. The DIA inspector attributed such behaviour to lack of proper supervision. The Church attempted to rectify this problem by relieving Principal Iverach from all responsibilities for missionary work on the surrounding reserves.

Rev. Iverach alluded to a desire to leave the work, as he suggested a more preferable arrangement would be to hire a married couple without children to act as principal and matron who could reside in the school building (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Copy, David Iverach to Rev. A. S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915). Rev. Iverach resigned the following January and left the school at the end of March (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, Andrew S. Grant to D. C. Scott, 31 Mar
Iverach, Donald

Rev. David Iverach hired his brother Donald as farm instructor on a temporary basis. According to Rev. Iverach, Donald was highly experienced in various types of farm work. He held a certificate from the Manitoba Government diary school, and had practical experience in the field (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 27 Apr 1914). Donald stayed at Birtle only a number of months, citing poor health as grounds for resignation (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 14 Dec 1914).

Jamison, Jessie

Miss Jamison came to the Birtle school with previous experience at the Hampton Institute, Virginia and the Children’s Aid in Belleville, Ontario. Both employers highly recommended her. She was hired as assistant matron and dietitian, and after a couple of months on the job, the principal noted that she had “shown herself a careful and conscientious worker” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 16 Nov 1915). No further information was located regarding Miss Jamison.

Kay, Mrs. C. C.

Despite being an employee for numerous years, Mrs. Kay is seldom mentioned in the Cecilia Jeffrey school correspondence. According to the 1914/1915 annual report of the WMS, Mrs. Kay had been working at the school since 1907. Inspector of Indian Agencies, John Semmens, described her as a capable worker: “The matron is a marvel of activity and devotion, and enjoys the affection of the pupils” (CSP 1915, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1914, Report of John Semmens, p. 207).

Mrs. Kay concluded her work as matron in 1916, as the principal’s wife took over her duties. A few years later, a Mrs. Kay is listed as seamstress at Cecilia Jeffrey in the WMS’s 1920 annual report. Thus it is possible she returned to work at the school.

Kidd, Christina

Miss Kidd was hired at Birtle as second assistant matron in fall of 1915, with her primary duty being the laundry. She had been transferred from the Onion Lake Indian School. After a short time at the Birtle school, the principal commented that she was “proving herself a faithful and efficient worker” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 16 Nov 1915). It is not clear how long she stayed at the school, but she had left by 1918, as she is not mentioned in a staff list contained in a letter by the Indian Agent (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, part 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary, 22 Jan 1918).

Kilburn, Mr. B. and Mrs.

On March 30, 1905, Mr. Kilburn, along with his wife, arrived at the Cecilia Jeffrey
Boarding School (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 72, Austin McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 3 Apr 1905). Mr. Kilburn had had 28 years experience as a farmer near Neepawa, Manitoba (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Mr. B. Kilburn to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 5 Jul 1905). Initially the principal was pleased with the Kilburns (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 72, Austin McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 3 Apr 1905). Three months later, Rev. McKitrick’s opinion of Mr. Kilburn had changed. Mr. Kilburn’s work was no longer adequate. He failed to work the required ten hours per day and relied on the large boys to perform the majority of the work. As well, McKitrick was disappointed in his inappropriate demeanour in the presence of the students (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Austin McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 4 Jul 1905). When McKitrick attempted to discuss these issues with Mr. Kilburn, he was defensive and threatened to quit. Mr. Kilburn tendered his resignation, mentioning the inability of Mr. McKitrick and himself to maintain a harmonious work relationship as the reason (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 75, Mr. B. Kilburn to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 5 Jul 1905).

Mrs. Kilburn’s position was not specified in the data collected.

Laidlaw, Harry

Harry Laidlaw was hired as the assistant teacher in order to help his sister Sara and Annie Fraser at the Portage school. While the FMC acknowledged the need for another staff member, there was some apprehension about hiring Harry Laidlaw: “... in view of his youth and probable inexperience, we have some misgivings on the subject. If, however, Miss Laidlaw could in a measure take oversight of the school-work, it seems to us that the presence of her Brother might relieve the situation greatly, and we are quite willing to appoint him with that subject in mind” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2013-2014, [Baird] to Miss Fraser, 27 Oct 1897). Sara Laidlaw replied to a request for his qualifications, stating that he had a collegiate training in Toronto, with specialization in book-keeping and drawing. She believed that Harry had “an adaptability to teach” and specified that she would help him by spending any free time in the classroom. She also stressed the temporary nature of her brother’s position: “... we only looked upon his coming in the light of a servant until better arrangements could be made” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 2024-2044, Sara Laidlaw to Baird, 29 Oct 1897). Mr. Laidlaw remained at the school for close to one year.

His doctor faulted the close confinement of the school for Mr. Laidlaw’s poor health, and on this account, he announced his resignation (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 819, Harry Laidlaw to Baird, 24 Aug 1898).

Laidlaw, Sara (later Mrs. Marshall)

On the advice of church official Dr. R. P. McKay, Miss Sara Laidlaw from Toronto was hired to teach at the Portage school (Murray, [1936]: 62). Miss Laidlaw was also highly recommended by a previous employer:

Miss Laidlaw taught for some time in one of my Schools and from all I know of her devotion to her work as a teacher, her fitness for that work, and thoroughness for carrying it on, combined with her real Christian character, and unselfish devoted spirit;
I can most conscientiously and heartily recommend her to you, in the full belief that
whatever place she fills in God's Providence, will be filled successfully (UCA-Wpg,
ABP, F105, Thomas McKee [Presbyterian minister, Barrie, Ont] to Mrs. Ewart [Pres
of WFMS], 3 Mar 1893).

In her letter of application, Miss Laidlaw briefly discussed her qualifications: she held a
third class certificate, had done some high school teaching and attended the Toronto
College for about six months (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 159-160, Sara Laidlaw (Toronto) to
Mr. Baird, 28 Mar 1893).

She began her career at Portage school in May 1893. Her duties were not limited to
teaching, as she was responsible for other day to day obligations in the school and was
involved in missionary work, especially with the Aboriginal women (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F
1262-1269, [Baird] to Mrs. Jeffreys, 12 Aug 1895). After a few months at the school,
Laidlaw acknowledged her initial uncertainty regarding her ability to get along with the
children. In a short time though, her fears had been alleviated: "... I have not had any
trouble; they have obeyed from the first, both in and out of school." Furthermore, she
contended that she had "grown to be very fond of all the children" (MLL, Oct 1893,

On account of her nearing marriage to James Marshall, Sara Laidlaw ended her seven
years as a successful teacher and faithful missionary at Portage la Prairie.

Sixteen years later, Mrs. Marshall returned to the Aboriginal missionary field. She was
appointed principal of the Birtle Boarding School, initially on probationary terms. Due to
her success at the Portage School, church officials were confident in her potential to
perform the job (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, Andrew S.
Grant to D. C. Scott, 31 Mar 1916).

The DIA Inspector, on the other hand, was uneasy about having a woman in charge of
the school without constant assistance from a man (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol.
6251, File 575-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 27 Jun 1916). The
Superintendent of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church continued to advocate on
Mrs. Marshall's behalf, as he pointed out that the farm instructor, Mr. Perry, was in
charge of the boys and he opined that "with Mrs. Marshall in residence, and because of
her ability and long experience in this class of work, that she is quite capable of handling
the situation, with Mr. Perry assisting her" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251,
File 575-1 part 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 29 Jun 1916).

Over time, Mrs. Marshall ably proved herself even to previously skeptical DIA
employees. The local Indian Agent commented that "under the supervision of the
energetic Principal, Mrs. Marshall, strict discipline is maintained, with kindness, and the
good progress being made is the result." Agent Wheatley also stressed Mrs. Marshall's
superior financial management: "Strict economy in all the departments, is adhered to, both
in purchases for the school and consumption of same. This is carried on without stinting
the pupils, either in provisions or the necessary clothing requirements" (NAC, RG 10, SF,
Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 Part 1, G. H. Wheatley to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA,
22 Jan 1918).

Mrs. Marshall resigned from Birtle in 1921. According to the annual report of the
WMS for that year, she was obligated to leave due to unspecified circumstances beyond her control. Adelaide Clark and H. R. Horne of the WMS expressed their disappointment and appreciation: “We all regretted exceedingly to part with Mrs. Marshall who, for over several years, was most successful in her work at Birtle; ... The temporal and spiritual side of the work were both carried on, and harmony between Principal and staff always prevailed” (Eighth AR, WMS, PCC, 1921, p. 98). For a second time, Mrs. Marshall’s departure was not permanent; in 1924 she was teaching at the Coté Day School (Eleventh AR, WMS, PCC, 1924, p. 82).

Laird, Rev. George A. (B. A.)

From 1888 to spring of 1892, the Crowstand Boarding School was under the management of Rev. George Laird. His wife assisted with the housework. Rev. Laird also invested much time and energy in the local missionary work (See MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, June 1880, Volume 6, Number 2, p. 6-8).

During Laird’s first couple of years, the content of correspondence was largely limited to general day-to-day business of running the school (see, for example UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 111-112, Geo A. Laird to Prof Hart, 11 May 1889 and ABP, E 257-258, Geo A. Laird to Rev. Prof Hart, 30 Dec 1889). Then in March 1890, in a letter, Laird acknowledged that his frequent trips necessary for his missionary duties made it difficult for him to do much of the work around the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Geo Laird to Rev. Baird, 10 March 1890).

In August 1891, Mr. Laird had contemplated resigning. In response, Rev. Baird of the FMC empathized with Laird’s frustrations but also urged him to continue on:

I know your work is hard. The discouragements in it are many and especially the thankfulness of not a few of these on behalf of whom you are spending your strength. But you begin now to know the Indians pretty well, you should have a good grip of the language by this time and I should think that although some of your difficulties will always be present yet others such as those connected with the language are now mainly in the past. I was in the hope that you would give your life to this work but I can see that for a man with a family at the stage at which yours is, this involves [illegible] sacrifices (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1 Regarding Indian Schools and Missions, pp. 438-440, [Baird] to Mr. Laird, 19 Aug 1891).

Laird adhered to Rev. Baird’s request to stay on.

At this time, complaints of lax discipline, carelessness and neglect of duties on the part of Laird began to surface. These charges came from DIA employees as well as school staff. Fred Fischer of the DIA referred to incidents of immorality among school students. He argued that such incidents resulted in animosity among the Aboriginal people towards Rev. Laird (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1296-1297, Copy, Fred Fischer to Indian Commissioner, 22 Sep 1891). The Indian Agent suggested a change in management and criticized Mr. Laird for being absent from the school too often (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1298, testimony by W. E. Jones, attached to Fred Fischer to Indian Commissioner, 22 Sep 1891). Over the next few months, two staff members came forward, characterizing Mr. Laird as an abrasive, unpleasant man to work for (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1491, Mr. Wright to Mr. Beard...
[sic], 20 Jan 1892; ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892).

In response to the complaints, a man, Mr. Wright, was hired to take over the training and supervision of the boys (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1331-1332, Geo A. Laird to Prof Hart, 26 Oct 1891). A new school building was being used which, according to Rev. Laird, made late night meetings between the male and female students “an impossibility.” In addition, he asserted that since moving into the new building, discipline and order of the school had greatly improved (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1333-1334, G. Laird to Mr. Baird, 18 Sep 1891). Yet these improvements did not reduce the pressure upon the Church to make a change in management.

Further action was required. In mid-January 1892, Rev. Baird wrote to Laird, advising him to resign. Mr. Baird mentioned Laird’s previously stated desire to be relieved from the work on account of the educational needs of his sons. Baird also stressed the Church’s continued faith in him: “... we wish it to be clearly understood that we have every confidence in your character, in your devotedness to your work and in your desire to be a blessing to the Indians under your charge” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1527-1529, [Baird] to Mr. Laird, 20 Jan 1892). In response, Laird denied much of the allegations, arguing that the state of affairs had been greatly exaggerated. Nonetheless, he agreed to resign, acknowledging that his administration came “very far short” of what he had desired. He also expressed interest in a return to mission work in the future (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1556-1559, Geo A. Laird to Prof Baird, 6 Feb 1892).

Despite Mr. Laird’s deficient school management, upon his retirement, his accomplishments were outlined in the WFMS annual report (1891-1892):

Mr. Laird has been a devoted and laborious missionary, and a marked change is visible at the Crowstand since he settled there. There have been signs of progress, not only among the adult Indians [sic], but the school, which on his arrival was only a small day school, has grown to be the largest Industrial school under the control of the Church (pp. 31-32).

Leckie, Mrs. Jean

Mrs. Leckie of Fergus, Ontario spent two years at a training institute in Chicago in preparation for mission work (Sixteenth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1891-92: 31). In the summer of 1891, the principal of the Birtle Boarding School suggested Mrs. Leckie as a temporary assistant for the matron (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1214-1218, Mr. McLaren to Rev. Baird, 6 Aug 1891).

Months later, Jean Leckie arrived at the Birtle school. She was responsible for meal preparation and the kitchen work. Initially she experienced some difficulty, but as time went by, she began to enjoy the work (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, March 1892, Volume 8, Number 11, letter written by Mrs. Leckie, dated 12 Jan 1892, p. 220). Miss McLaren confirmed this when discussing her impression of how Mrs. Leckie found the work:

Mrs. Leckie is getting on very nicely. I think she was perfectly dismayed at the commonplace nature of the work but as she grows fond of the children, she forgets that. She is willing, [illegible] and conscientious to a fault almost, but worries too much for her own good (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1595-1597, Annie McLaren to Mr.
Baird, 1 Mar 1892).

Another fault of Mrs. Leckie’s, according to Miss McLaren, was her complaints of coldness during the winter months. Annie McLaren admitted that the school building was very cold, but wished for a harder woman when a replacement was to be found for Mrs. Leckie. Mrs. Leckie also often complained of loneliness (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 15-17, Annie McLaren to Mr. Baird, 10 Jan [1893]).

After one year at Birtle, Mrs. Leckie was transferred to Regina Industrial School where she assumed the duties of matron. This was a considerable promotion, not only in regards to position, but also because Regina was a much larger school. Mrs. Leckie’s specialization in nursing while at the training institute proved to be of great use to her at Regina: “... she has rendered most excellent services in many thoughtful arrangements for the prevention of sickness, and in kind and watchful care over those who have been troubled with scrofulous diseases and other ailments” (CSP 1894, DIA, Yr Ended June 30, 1893, Report by Principal McLeod of Regina p. 98).

Mrs. Leckie resigned from Regina on account of her health. The physical and mental strain of the work had taken its toll and she returned to Ontario to regain her strength (Nineteenth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1894-95, p. 23). Within a couple of years, she was working at the Lakesend school (A&P, PCC, 1896, App. 6, p. iii).

Leslie, Florence

Florence Leslie, who held a second class teaching certificate for the province of Ontario, taught at the Birtle school from 1915 to 1919. She also had eight years’ practical experience, with three years as a teacher in Bruce County, Ontario and five years as principal of the Elmwood Public School, also in Bruce County (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 16 Nov 1915).

Miss Leslie’s talent and ability were recognized by the Church and the DIA (see, for example, NAC, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 Pt. 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 22 Jan 1918 and Third AR, WMS, PCC, 1916, p. 70).

Levers, Mrs.

Mrs. Levers was employed as the dietician at the Portage la Prairie Boarding School for a number of years. The work was considered to be quite laborious and demanding, yet Mrs. Levers managed: “The dietician department is difficult, as the baking is included with all the other work for over 100. Mrs. Levers, who is in charge, is on her fourth year and giving excellent satisfaction” (Ninth AR, WMS, PCC, 1922, pp. 93-94).

Lockhart, Mrs.

Mrs. Lockhart, assistant matron of the Crowstand school from 1894 to 1896, was considered a worthy candidate because of the practical experience she had acquired as a farmer’s daughter and as a housewife. Also, it was thought that she would stay longer most women, because she was a widow (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 641-644, C. W. Whyte to Baird, July [ ], 1894).
It was not unusual for Mrs. Lockhart to labour fourteen hours a day, from 6 o’clock in the morning to 8 o’clock at night (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 180-184, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 26 March 1896). These long hours adversely affected her health. Ultimately, she resigned because her deteriorated health began to interfere with the discharge of her duties. The principal remarked that she would be dearly missed by all neighbours, Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian alike, as her “exceptional good nature made her a general favorite ...” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 107-110, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 28 Feb 1896).

Unfortunately, a couple of months after her departure, her health had further declined and she “was likely to be laid up altogether” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 22 May 1896).

**Lytle, Miss Mary**

Miss Lytle was hired as the teacher of the junior class at the Portage school in October 1915. Principal, Rev. Hendry characterized Miss Lytle as a strong teacher: “Miss Lytle has done work in music and in the kindergarten room, of a character which has passed my expectations. In 3 months she had 22 small children speaking English” (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, p. 90).

**MacGregor, Eliza** (also spelled McGregor)

Eliza MacGregor was an employee of the Birtle Boarding School from 1904 to 1912. Initially she was hired to perform housekeeping duties. She also undertook a small amount of the teaching. The principal explained why he soon chose to rearrange the assigned duties and place Miss MacGregor in full charge of the teaching responsibilities: “She enjoyed the classroom work much more than the house work, and being a much better teacher than I, I saw it was for the best interests of the school that she should be there” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 62, E. H. Crawford to Dr. McKay, 10 Jun 1904). The position of teacher was consistent with her educational and employment background. She possessed a second class nonprofessional certificate and received her Normal training in Ottawa. She had taught for about 13 years prior to her appointment at Birtle (CSP 1912, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1911, Report by S. J. Jackson, p. 463).

In a short time, MacGregor was receiving accolades for her propensity for instructing Aboriginal children. The DIA officer responsible for inspecting residential schools characterized her as an even-tempered woman with a natural ability to teach Aboriginal children (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905). The fact that she remained at the school for eight years is in itself a testimony to her fondness for the work and the children.

In 1912, Miss MacGregor’s hard work and devotion was rewarded with a promotion, as she was transferred to the position of field secretary in the Northwest for the WFMS (Thirty-sixth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1911-1912, p. 50).

**MacIntosh, Mary S.**

Miss MacIntosh taught at the Crowstand school for a number of months in 1893. She
was from Toronto, although she had resided in the North West for some months prior to her employment at Crowstand (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 6, Rev. Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 9 Jan 1893).

As was common, Miss MacIntosh was unable to cope with the physical demands of the after-school duties. Her job required her to go up and down stairs, which she found difficult as she had rheumatism in her ankles. She asserted that she was thought “a great deal of the Indian children” and was quite willing to remain in Aboriginal mission work. She admitted though that she did not have the extra strength required of the position, and thus recommended she be transferred to a day school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 123, Mary S. MacIntosh to Rev. Baird, 8 Mar 1893). A few weeks later, Miss MacIntosh again conveyed these sentiments (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 152, Mary S. MacIntosh to Rev. Baird, 22 Mar 1893). Subsequently her name disappeared from the Crowstand correspondence. She was later working at the Okanase day school. A DIA inspector found her to be an able teacher: “[She] is a most capable teacher, holding an Ontario professional certificate - she is self-contained, patient and adopts the very latest methods of imparting instruction” (CSP 1895, DIA AR for the Year Ended June 30th, 1894, by T. P. Wadsworth, p. 229). Due to her upcoming marriage, she retired from the Okanase school in 1895 (A&P, PCC, 1896, App. 6, p. xxv).

**MacKenzie, Miss**

After three years of teaching the junior class at the Portage school, Miss MacKenzie resigned in order to attend medical college in preparation for mission work in China (Seventh AR, WMS, PCC, WD, p. 90).

**Marshall, Mrs. Sara (see under Laidlaw)**

**Martin, P. T.**

After the previous principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school died suddenly, Mr. Martin agreed to assume the responsibilities of the school’s management. Initially Mr. Martin was hired on a six month trial basis, starting in November 1918 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 29 Nov 1918). At this time, the thirty-seven year old Martin had been residing in Kenora, but was originally from Williamsport, Indiana. He was a lawyer, as well as a minister of the Congregational Church.

Mr. Martin had been on the job for a couple of months when the DIA inspector, John Semmens, reported his impressions of Mr. Martin. He described Martin as levelheaded, conciliatory, mechanically inclined, and not afraid of hard work (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract - Report of Inspector Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, report dated 8 Feb 1918). Semmens also indicated a positive relationship between Mr. Martin and the local Aboriginal chiefs. Not surprisingly, after the probation period expired, he was granted the principalship of the institution on a permanent basis (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 12 Apr 1919)
Mr. Martin continued working at the Cecilia Jeffrey school until July 1920 (Seventh AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1920, p. 89).

Matthews, A

In 1917, various problems plagued the Cecilia Jeffrey school which were largely attributed to the principal’s lack of administrative ability (for example, see NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to J. H. Edmison, 29 Mar 1917.) In hopes of rectifying the situation, the Church authorities appointed Mr. A. Matthews as assistant principal (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to R. S. McKenzie, 16 Apr 1917). The Secretary of the Board of Home Missions briefly delineated Mr. Matthew’s background: “He is a young man and will no doubt help to restore discipline in the school. Mr. Matthews is a son of Rev. A. Matthews our Indian missionary at Rolling River. He understands Indian life and ought to prove a serviceable man. ... During the past winter he has had charge of our mission at Eriksdale, Manitoba” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1917). His wife accompanied him to the school.

Apparently Matthews experienced some challenges in adapting to his new position. The Indian Agent observed: “Mr. Matthews is very painstaking but is very much handicapped, as everything appears to go wrong. ...” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Report of Agent McKenzie on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, 29 Sep 1917). Mr. Matthews’ trouble in adjusting to the work could be somewhat blamed on the quality of duties assigned to him. He was characterized as being treated as “no more than a common choir boy,” and this he resented (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract - Agent’s Monthly Report on the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School, August 1917 by R. S. McKenzie). Yet, when Mr. Dodds, the principal, announced his resignation, Matthews was appointed to replace him. Dodds remained at the school for a number of months in order to allow Mr. Matthews an opportunity to become more familiarized with the work and to learn how to operate the steamboat (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 2 Apr 1918).

Mr. Matthews officially took over the principalship on October 1, 1918. Unfortunately his time as school administrator was brief. The school experienced an outbreak of the Spanish Flu. Mr. Matthews became ill and succumbed to the illness after ten days (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev. J. Semmens, 24 Oct 1918).

McCurdy, Elizabeth R.

Elizabeth McCurdy of Halifax applied for a teaching position at the Birtle school in January 1912. Educationally, she had attained a first class Nova Scotian certificate with Normal training. She had taught successfully in Halifax for nine years (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 4 Mar 1912). There was, however, a concern regarding her suitability for the position. Rev. Farquharson summarized the opinions expressed by the supervisor of the Halifax schools
in regards to Miss McCurdy’s teaching ability:

He has always regarded her as an earnest christian [sic] girl and although he has not been intimately acquainted with her he thinks that we will find her to be diligent and faithful. The one doubt he has regarding her is as to whether she be sufficiently strong for our work. It seems she has been compelled to give up teaching 2 or 3 years ago because of her health, ... (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 142, Rev. Dr. Farquharson to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 12 Jan [1912]).

Miss McCurdy herself had asserted that she was strong and in good health. Despite some apprehension, Miss McCurdy was offered the position, as hers was the only application received.

Miss McCurdy’s success with the lower grades was regularly recognized, yet her inability to discipline the older grades was also noted (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Extract - Report of Inspector S. J. Jackson on the Birtle Boarding School, dated 27 May 1915; NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Copy - David Iverach to Rev. Andrew S. Grant, 7 Jul 1915).

After almost four years at the school, McCurdy was replaced (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 16 Nov 1915).

**McGregor, Mr. J. O. and Mrs. Sarah**

In February 1903, J. O. McGregor wrote to the FMC, expressing his desire to undertake Aboriginal mission work (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1902-03, p. 86). From May 1903 to May 1904, Mr. and Mrs. McGregor held the positions of principal and matron at the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. Mr. McGregor had close to twenty-five years of experience as a head master or assistant in public schools and high schools. Neither Mr. or Mrs. McGregor had any previous experience working among Aboriginal people (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, J. O. McGregor and Sarah McGregor to R. P. McKay, 27 Nov 1903).

Mr. and Mrs. McGregor’s stay was limited to one year in large part because of an ongoing dispute between themselves and the local missionary Mr. McKitrick. Mr. McKitrick admitted that initially he had been positive regarding the potential for the principal and matron to succeed in bringing about the necessary improvements to the school. Over time he was not so optimistic and became very critical of Mr. McGregor’s administrative ability (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Nov 1903). Mr. McKitrick recognized Mr. McGregor’s competence in teaching, yet contended he was neglectful of his duties outside of the school room. Mrs. McGregor was accused of harsh treatment towards the assistant matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 57, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 18 Jan 1904). Mr. and Mrs. McGregor wrote a couple of letters in defense of the various charges. In summary, they expressed faith in their own ability to run the school:

For our part our consciences are clear that we have given them no reason for treating us as they have. As we said before we were new to the work, but we have learned a
great deal, and feel ourselves now more capable of managing the school properly (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, J. O. McGregor and Sarah McGregor to R. P. MacKay, 27 Nov 1903).

In dealing with the difficulty, the FMC evidently sided with McKitrick. In December, Mr. McKitrick was granted authority over the school. Even with this change, the lack of amicable relations between Mr. and Mrs. McGregor on the one hand and the assistant matron and Mr. McKitrick on the other continued. The Church representative responsible for investigating the situation became convinced that the only solution was for the McGregors to leave the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, John W. Little to Rev McKay, 21 Mar 1904). They departed from the school at the beginning of May (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, Austin G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Mar 1904).

McGregor, Robert

Robert McGregor of Saskatchewan was appointed farm instructor of the Birtle school in January 1914. His qualifications made him a very suitable person for the position. He had been previously employed as farm instructor at the Crowstand school for ten months and had also been acting principal for a short time. He possessed a thorough practical knowledge of farming and had an engineer’s certificate which authorized him to manage the school’s heating plant. In addition, he had taken a year and a half in missionary training at the Moody Institute in Chicago (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 14 Jan 1914). Mr. McGregor resigned in April of the same year (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 27 Apr 1914).

McIlwaine, Marjorie

While still residing in Scotland, where she had been born and raised, Marjorie McIlwaine spent several years teaching. In Canada, she had been employed for a number of years as a stenographer in Toronto and Hamilton. She was an active member of the St. Paul’s Church in the latter location (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1997-1998, [Baird] to Mr. Mackay, 20 Oct 1897). Miss McIlwaine applied for mission work at any of the Presbyterian residential schools. In April 1896, she was offered the position of sewing instructress at the Crowstand Boarding School.

Miss McIlwaine had completed several months at the school, when the principal conveyed his satisfaction with her (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 514-516, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 10 Jul 1896).

Rev. Baird had warned McIlwaine of the severe physical strain demanded of the position (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 205-206, [Baird] to Miss M. McIlwaine, 29 Apr 1896). After a number of months on the job, McIlwaine learned this for herself. She became concerned about her physical health and she expressed regret at the prospect of having to leave mission work: “I am sorry to have to say that I fear my own strength is hardly equal to the duties of my present position. It would be a great disappointment to me to have to give up the work, in which I am so much interest” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 904, Miss
McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 2 Dec 1896). And yet she persevered, remaining at the Crowstand school for another year.

Miss McIlwaine had been informed that the position also offered “many opportunities for direct and real missionary work among young people” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 205-206, [Baird] to Miss M. McIlwaine, 29 Apr 1896). Miss McIlwaine had been considerably involved in this aspect of the work. She organized a Junior Christian Endeavour Society, with fifteen children as members. She along with another woman on staff taught Sunday School (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 969, Report of the School at Crowstand for the Quarter Ending December 31 1896 by Kate Gillespie). Miss McIlwaine also participated in missionary work among the adults of the nearby reserve. She even purchased her own pony and buggy to facilitate visitations. She began a weekly women’s meeting which involved prayer and teaching sewing and knitting (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1887-1888, Marjorie McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 23 Sep 1897). In the absence of Rev. Whyte, she was known to conduct the Sunday Church services. Due to her missionary efforts, she was characterized as “a woman of aggressive Christian spirit” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, Report on Indian Mission Schools under the care of the Presbyterian Church, 20 Jun 1897, pp. 217-230).

When the position of matron became available, the new principal was disinclined to recommend McIlwaine for the position. He argued that she was not very physically strong, and thus tended to be irritable at times. He maintained that as the position of matron required an even temper and sufficient vitality to undertake the work, she would not be suitable (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Neil Gilmour to Professor Baird, 16 Aug 1897). She was thus overlooked for a promotion.

In October 1897, Miss McIlwaine applied to be transferred to the school in Alberni, British Columbia. In communicating this request, Rev. Baird spoke positively of her work at Crowstand. He suggested that part of the reason for her desire to be transferred was the disagreement between herself and the matron regarding matters of discipline and management. He also expressed disappointment at the prospect of Miss McIlwaine leaving Crowstand: “...if Miss McIlwaine leaves us she will be serious loss to the Crowstand and our Committee will be sorry to part with a woman of such high Christian character, such self-denial and such admirable self-restraint” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, [Baird] to Mr. Mackay, 20 Oct 1897).

She was not appointed to Alberni, but instead was sent to the school at Makoce Waste, near Prince Albert, to take charge of the industrial department (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 146-147, [Baird] to Miss McIlwaine, 14 Dec 1897).

In her resignation from Crowstand, McIlwaine declared her fondness for the work: “I am very much grieved to leave the work at Crowstand and especially to have to give up the women’s meetings, which I have enjoyed very much, and I think good work could be done in the homes. Nothing would induce me to leave but a strong feeling that it is for the best interests of the school” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 144-145, Marjorie McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 9 Dec 1897).

Six months into her work at Makoce Waste, Miss McIlwaine requested a one year leave of absence in order to visit her family in Scotland (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 702, [Baird]
to Miss McIlwaine, 15 Jun 1898). The principal at Makoce Waste remarked that Miss McIlwaine would be missed: “We are all sorry to part with her; she has been a very efficient, conscientious worker, and by her kindness to the children and Indians they have become much attached to her” (FMT, WFMS, PCC WD, Sept 1898, Volume 2 Number 5, by Miss Baker, p. 153).

She remained in Scotland longer than anticipated due to the illness of her mother. While in Scotland, she decided to occupy her time in the study of medicine, which she thought would be helpful in her work with Aboriginal children (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 821, Marjorie McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 24 Aug 1898). She returned to Canada in April 1899, and she was anxious to once again be engaged in the “Indian work” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1255, Marjorie McIlwaine to Rev. Baird, 18 Apr 1899). The next reference to her in the data gathered was in September 1905, when she had accepted a position as teacher and bookkeeper at the Regina Industrial School (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC. 1905-1906, p. 23). She was later in charge of the school at Swan Lake (CSP 1911, DIA AR for Year Ended 31 March 1910, Report by Duncan C. Scott, p. 306).

McKay, Hugh

Hugh McKay, a former pupil of the Birtle and Regina schools, was a staff member at the Birtle school for two years. He acted as the outdoor assistant. As well, he often accompanied the matron on reserve visits and served as an interpreter (FMT, WFMS, PCC WD, May 1898, Volume 2 Number 1, by Miss McLaren, pp. 22-23). According to one of his co-workers, he performed his duties “very faithfully” (FMT, WFMS, PCC WD, May 1898, Volume 2 Number 1, by Miss McLeod, p. 19). He resigned from the work in order to go live on the reserve and make a home for his widowed mother (Twenty-fourth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1899-1900, p. 41).

McKitrick, Rev. Austin G

In May 1891, Mr. Austin McKitrick penned a lengthy letter to the Presbyterian Church requesting a missionary position among Aboriginal people anywhere in Canada. He began the letter by underscoring his Christian motives (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).

At the age of thirty, McKitrick had a respectable educational background, as well as practical experience in the field. He held an Intermediate High School Certificate, which at the time was equivalent to a second class teacher’s certificate. He also spent two years in high school, where he acquired some Latin, Greek and French. For one term, he studied courses such as theology and church history at the Moody Bible Training Institute in Chicago.

Upon leaving Chicago, McKitrick entered the Presbyterian Home Mission work in the Presbytery of Regina. During the last six months of the two years he spent there, he lived among the Aboriginal people at Muscowpetung’s reserve, teaching and assisting in the boarding school under Rev. Moore. McKitrick gained a degree of comprehension of the Cree and Ojibwa languages. From there, he continued his work among Aboriginal people at the Morley Methodist Mission, where he undertook the responsibilities of missionary-
teacher. He summarized how his background would be beneficial to work of a similar vein in the future: “If placed amongst either Cree, Stonies or Ojibways, I could soon dispense with an Interpreter except in Sunday services, and could get along in simple conversation without one form the beginning. The knowledge of the Indians ways, customs habits, character, disposition, mode of life &c, I have of necessity [sic] learned, would be very useful” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).

In his letter of application, McKitrick also noted relevant previous employment and miscellaneous activities. He mentioned ten years experience in mechanical trades as a machinist, carpenter and blacksmith, which he argued “would be very helpful in an isolated Indian Mission.” He had taught Sunday school for fifteen years and had been involved in evangelistic work through the Young Men’s Christian Association for several years. He desired a position with the Presbyterian Church, since he had been a member of that denomination since he was 14 years old and his wife was also a Presbyterian (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 4, McKitrick to Dr. Wardrop, 18 May 1891).

This first application was unsuccessful. A year later, he was still stationed at the Morley Mission (CSP 1893, AR DIA, Yr ended June 30, 1892). He continued to work under the Methodist Church for almost a decade. In 1897, Mr. McKitrick was in charge of the Saddle Lake school (CSP 1898, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30, 1897). Subsequently he worked at the Methodist mission at White Whale Lake (Twenty-fourth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1899-1900, p. 38).

McKitrick made a repeated attempt to enter the Aboriginal missionary work of the Presbyterian Church in December 1898 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1042, Austin McKitrick to Mr. McQueen, 17 Dec 1898). A somewhat uncomplimentary letter was sent to Rev. Baird relaying McKitrick’s request for a position:

He is the same man who ‘fell foul’ of the Supt. in [Home Mission] work in our church by leaving his field and going off to one of the Reserves and spending weeks with one of our Indian Msrs or teachers. Since then he has been with the Methodist Church, but has never felt at home there and wishes to return to the fold of his forefathers. ... His wife is much ‘the better half’ of the combination. Her people are staunch Presbyt’s. ... I do not wish to be understood as recommending him for yr work for I know nothing of his suitability ... (UCA-Wpg, ABP, D. G. McQueen to Mr. Baird, 26 Dec 1898).

Nonetheless, he was approved for a position in northwest Ontario. He was given the task of opening a new Presbyterian mission among the Ojibway peoples on the west side of the Lake of the Woods (Twenty-fourth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1899-1900, p. 38).

Initially, along with his evangelistic duties, McKitrick oversaw the construction of the school buildings. He offered to open the school and take charge of it temporarily, yet he declined to undertake the school management or the teaching in addition to his missionary work on an ongoing basis (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 30 Sep 1901). However, after two inexperienced principals failed to make the school a success, he acknowledged that he had made a error: “... one mistake was when you asked me to take the supervision of the school as other missionarys
[sic] do when they have a boarding school in their mission field, and I objected and asked for a Principal and staff independent of the [Missionary]" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 55, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 14 Nov 1903). Thus in May 1904, Mr. McKitrick took over the management of the Cecilia Jeffrey school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 59, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 23 Mar 1904).

Mr. and Mrs. McKitrick had five children, some of which were school aged. There appeared to be a difference in opinion between the McKitricks and the teacher as to how the children should be educated. The teacher disapproved of the way in which Mr. McKitrick spoke to her regarding this issue. McKitrick defended his actions: “But if the F. M. C. should not wish our own children taught here, it would make a great difference to us. That would be the one thing that would make us want to leave the work. Neither Mrs. McKitrick nor I are satisfied if our own children are not getting as good a schooling as in any other school of a public school standard” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). From this disagreement, a general want of harmony between the McKitricks and the rest of the staff transpired.

In early September 1906, a staff member of the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Miss Bremner appeared before the FMC in order to voice staff concerns regarding the administration of the school. In general, the staff was dissatisfied with McKitrick and recommended a change in the administration of the mission (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1906, pp. 33-24). Even prior to this, one church leader expressed disappointment in McKitrick’s performance: “Speaking for myself I do not think Mr. McKitrick’s work has been what it ought to have been ....” Furthermore, this church official suggested relieving Mr. McKitrick of his role as principal while allowing him to continue with the mission work (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 89, Rev. Dr. James Farquharson to Dr. McKay, 1 Sep 1906). Subsequently, the Western Committee of the FMC notified Mr. McKitrick that his services would not be required after May 1907, adding that “the Committee had no reason to doubt his conscientiousness and integrity, but this action was considered necessary in the interests of the Mission work” (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1906, p. 44). Despite a letter from Chief Redsky and others of Shoal Lake pleading that Mr. McKitrick be allowed to remain there, Mr. McKitrick was replaced (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 95, Chief Redsky to the Foreign Mission Society, 4 Mar 1907).

McLaren, Miss

Even though Miss McLaren dedicated ten years of her life to teaching at the Crowstand school, there is very little mention of her in church correspondence. During her first year at the school, she was described by Professor Hart as “an earnest and efficient teacher” (PCC, Minutes of the 22nd Synod of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, 1904, p. 29). More than midway through her career at the Crowstand school, the principal described her pedagogical achievement: “Classroom work has been giving improved results on account largely of Miss McLaren’s long experience in the work here and consequent knowledge of the individual peculiarities of each child” (Thirty-sixth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1911-1912, p. 51). Miss McLaren resigned in order “to go to a home
of her own” (First AR, WMS, PCC, 1914-1915, p. 59).

McLaren, Annie

Miss Annie McLaren was the devoted matron of the Birtle school for an unusually lengthy period of twenty-five years. She was born in Western Ontario of Scottish descent (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 2, Baird to Mr. [ ], 20 Jun 1897, pp 217-230). She, along with her brother, arrived at the Birtle Boarding School for its opening in December 1888 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 26, G. G. McLaren to Rev. Baird, 15 Dec 1888).

According to one of her co-workers, McLaren had a genuine fondness and concern for her students. Mrs. Leckie briefly described Miss McLaren’s treatment of her pupils: “... Miss McLaren thinks there never were such children, and she cares for each with a mother’s care. It would do anyone good to see how good she and Mr. McLaren are to these children” (MLL, WFMS, WD, March 1892, Volume 7 Number 11, p. 220). Miss McLaren maintained contact with former students: “She keeps a close supervision of the ex-pupils, and her advice and counsel is always well received by them, much to their profit” (CSP 1906, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1905, Report by S. R. Marlatt, p. 389). As well, she enjoyed visiting the adults and had “won in an exceptional way the esteem and confidence of the Indians among whom she has labored so faithfully...” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 21 Oct 1913).

Miss McLaren was a headstrong woman who took on more responsibilities than the typical matron. She did not merely carry out the instructions given by the principal, but rather she was in control of the management of the domestic department of the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1806-1808, [Baird] to Miss Carson, 18 Aug 1897). In fact, many considered Miss McLaren, for all intents and purposes, to be principal of the Birtle school (see, for example UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, J. L. Small to Dr. MacKay, 18 Apr 1901). Neil Gilmour succeeded George McLaren as principal, and he insisted that Miss McLaren “was determined that in all but name she should be principal” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 18 May 1901). A few times during her career, Annie McLaren was indeed offered the principalship, yet she declined (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1902-03, p. 76 and Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1904-05, p. 74). The reasoning behind promoting Miss McLaren to the position of principal was convincing: “…the principalship might be given to Miss McLaren, who in point of experience, in grip of the situation and acquaintance with all its details, in having the supreme management of house keeping, and, in some degree, in public estimation is the head of the school and is certainly the strongest character on the staff” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 69, Andrew B. Baird to Dr. Mackay, 28 Jan 1905). McLaren maintained that she was content with her designation as matron. In reply to a comment made by a gentleman suggesting that she become principal, she remarked “I want neither the honor, the responsibility nor the salary” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 746, Annie McLaren to Rev. Baird, 18 Aug [1894]).

Unfortunately her assertive, overbearing personality often resulted in strained
relationships with other staff members. From 1894 to 1905, the four principals employed at the school each specified irreconcilable difficulties with the matron as at least a partial cause of their respective resignations. Mr. Gilmour, for example, contended that he endured "opposition, unfriendliness, lack of sympathy and of cooperation" from Miss McLaren and accused her of having a "weakness for usurping authority" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Dr. McKay, 18 May 1901). Mr. Crawford expressed similarly negative opinions of her: "Again she is most inconsiderate of the comfort or feelings of the rest of the staff, the greater part of the time. She likes to interfere with other people's affairs and neglects her own" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, E. H. Crawford to Miss Craig, 28 Feb 1905). A degree of frustration and impatience with novice staff from one who had so much experience in the work at Birtle may be understandable. Yet, the situation appeared to be dire in November 1905 when the whole staff allegedly threatened to resign if Miss McLaren was not removed (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1904-05, p. 52).

Despite the animosity that sometimes existed between Miss McLaren and other staff members, Miss McLaren remained on Birtle Boarding School's staff list until the end of 1913. Perhaps her immense experience and established ties with the Aboriginal people of surrounding reserves made her services indispensable. The annual report of the WFMS (1913-14) noted that she would no doubt be missed: "One cannot think of Birtle without her, and we know how the Indians of the Birtle agency must miss her, who was to them such a friend, one to whom they could always go and be sure of a loving welcome and sympathetic counsel" (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1913-1914, p. 53).

McLaren, George G.

George McLaren acted as principal and teacher at the Birtle Boarding School from late 1888 until his resignation in the summer of 1894. For much of this time, George and his sister Annie were the only staff at this school. In addition to his school duties, Mr. McLaren performed some mission work in neighbouring reserves (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 707-708, Annie McLaren to Rev. Baird, 3 Aug 1894).

The difficulties Mr. McLaren encountered were commonly experienced by residential school administrators. These included the occasional truancy of students, impediments to recruiting students and time constraints which made it nearly impossible to complete paper work requirements of the DIA (see, for example: UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 108, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Prof Hart, 8 May 1889; UCA-Wpg, ABP F 168, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Professor Baird, 13 Apr 1893 and UCA-Wpg, ABP F 266, Geo. G. McLaren to Rev. Baird, 13 May 1893). Aside from the fact that the drawbacks confronted by McLaren were typical of most such schools, he resigned in large part because of his disappointment with the progress of the school. On notification of Mr. McLaren's resignation, Rev. Baird of the FMC declared his confidence in him: "We have not only been well pleased with the fidelity with which you have discharged your duties but we bear willing testimony to the fact that we have had undeniably little trouble with the internal management of the institution and that we have had to differ from your own judgment so little in matters that concerned the Indians" (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. McLaren, 30 Apr
of married existing duties W. Aboriginal Schools 18 enthusiastic, Box of Manitoba Northwest Territories of missionary Alex Hamilton, McLaren reserve postgraduate McLaren awarded educated man. To college 1894, pp. 392-393). The DIA was satisfied with McLaren’s ability to instruct the school’s pupils: “... his kindly manner and attainments as a school teacher particularly fitted him to train Indian children” (CSP 1895, DIA AR for Year Ended 30 June 1894, Report by T. P. Wadsworth, p. 229).

McLaren returned to the school temporarily to fill in after the principal was transferred to another school and the new principal had not yet arrived (A&P, PCC, 1896, App. 6, p. xxv). Several years after leaving Birtle school, Mr. McLaren was attending a business college in Nashville (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1056, Annie McLaren to Baird, 30 Jan 1897).

McLaren, Walter. W.

Rev. Walter McLaren arrived at the Birtle Boarding School in 1905 a relatively well educated man. In 1901, he graduated from Toronto University where he earned the Mackenzie Scholarship in Political Science. Next he attended Knox College and was awarded the General Proficiency and Traveling Scholarships. Then he pursued a postgraduate course in Glasgow.

At 32 years of age, following his ordination by the Presbytery of Minnedosa, Mr. McLaren was appointed principal of the Birtle school and missionary to the Bird Tail reserve (UCA-Wpg, The Minutes of the 33rd Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1915, obituary written by Alex Hamilton, p. 5). Mr. McLaren disclosed that he had entered into Aboriginal missionary work by default, due to his deficient health (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to Dr. Mackay, 16 Apr 1913).

At the outset of his career, a representative from the Church conveyed his confidence in the new principal: “[He has entered with great enthusiasm on his duties and his efforts are already telling beneficially on the school”(UCA-Wpg, The Minutes of the 23rd Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1905, written by Thomas Hart, p. 32). Three years later, Mr. McLaren’s administration of the school was given a stamp of approval by a DIA representative: “The principal has been in charge of the institution about three years and has made many improvements. He is enthusiastic, and this combined with discretion has enabled him to carry on the work of the school successfully” (CSP 1909, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1908, Report by S. Swinford, p. 320). Mr. McLaren displayed a genuine concern for the welfare of Aboriginal people. For example, he consulted with tubercular institutions in Great Britain and Canada and attended a Tubercular Congress in Edinburgh in order to ascertain proper treatment for sick pupils (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 part 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 25 Sep 1910). As a result of his devotion to the work, in the summer of 1911, Mr. McLaren was appointed Superintendent of Indian Missions and Schools of the Presbyterian Church for Manitoba and Saskatchewan, in addition to his existing duties (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 7 File 133, Mackay to Farquharson, 18 Apr 1911).

In late 1911, Walter McLaren and former Birtle school student Susette Blackbird were married (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Extract from Report of the Birtle Boarding School for the month of November 1911, G. H. Wheatley). Shortly
thereafter, dissatisfaction with McLaren surfaced in the church correspondence (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, R. P. MacKay to Dr. Farquharson, 11 Dec 1911).

A spokesperson for the Church’s administrative committee in Winnipeg minimized the alleged grievances: “... I will be greatly surprised if anything serious can be laid to his charge regarding the management of the work. The ladies of the staff I know now do complain a little, not only because of his marriage, but regarding him before that date, yet I have not heard a single complaint that might not easily be explained by the state of Mr. McLaren’s health. A nervous man often does and says many things which if his nerves were in a better state he would never mention” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, James Farquharson to R. P. MacKay, 14 Dec 1911). Mr. McLaren’s marriage did however become the source of controversy in regards to the couple’s living arrangements.

Mr. and Mrs. McLaren wished to convert an old schoolroom in the main building into their residence. Church authorities did not approve: “... the very fact that Mr. McLaren’s wife is an Indian makes it impossible that they can occupy any part of the school building. It looks at present as if Mrs. McLaren were getting a good deal of information from her husband and giving her old class mates the benefit of it” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 141, James Farquharson to R. P. MacKay, 14 Dec 1911). This concern was compounded by the fact that Mrs. McLaren was able to speak fluently to the students in their native language, while the other staff members were unable to understand. The McLarens were offered and urged to accept a transfer to the Round Lake Boarding School. Church official Dr. R. P. McKay was “sorry that [Mr. McLaren’s] matrimonial arrangements have impaired his usefulness [at Birtle] and yet the hope is that when moved to new environment where she will be away from the girls where she was brought up, things may be better.” He also stressed the importance of maintaining Mr. McLaren’s involvement in Aboriginal missionary work: “It is so seldom that we can get a man of outstanding scholarship and ability to give himself to the Indian work that the loss of Mr. McLaren would be serious” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 151, R. P. McKay to Dr. Hugh McKay, 4 Oct 1912).

Understandably, McLaren conveyed his dismay regarding the discriminatory treatment he and his wife had received from the various Church committees (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 8 File 154, W. W. McLaren to R. P. MacKay, 16 Apr 1913).

Mr. McLaren severed his connection with the Birtle school in October 1913 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt. 1, Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA to W. W. McLaren, 3 Oct 1913). He accepted a call to Kenton, “where his people profited by his instructions and by his enthusiasm for missionary service, and showed their attachment to him” (UCA-Wpg, The Minutes of the 33rd Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1915, obituary written by Alex Hamilton, p. 5). He died in Moosomin on August 18, 1915, leaving his wife Susette and their two children.

McLean, Florence

Miss Florence McLean took her place on the staff of the Crowstand Boarding School
in October 1889. She was hired to assist the matron with the housework. Given her background, she was considered to be qualified for the position: “She seems to be a young woman well fitted for the place, a farmer’s daughter who has resided for a number of years in this country; about 22/23 yrs old, strong and active with sufficient education to entitle her to teach school under a permit, fond of children, willing to work, and interested for a number of years in the subject of missions” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 1, Baird to Mr. Laird, 24 Oct 1889, pp. 153-154). Miss McLean’s duties included teaching sewing and knitting to the female students, as well as making repairs to clothing. (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 275, E. M. Armstrong to Mrs. Baird, 1 Jan 1890). While Miss McLean was away on holidays, the teacher at the school who undertook a portion of Miss McLean’s responsibilities, described the duties as “by no means light, and some of them are very unpleasant” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jan 1891, Volume 7 Number 9, letter by Miss E. M. Armstrong, dated 2 Aug 1890, p. 6). A year later, the same teacher reported McLean’s work as being satisfactory (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1257-1259, E. M. Armstrong to Rev. Baird, 19 Aug 1891).

The principal, Mr. Laird, on the other hand, occasionally felt the need to speak to Miss McLean in order to correct undesirable work habits: “The complaint I make is that Miss McLean does not display the qualities of a thorough and conscientious housekeeper in as large a measure as I would desire, while she seems impressed with the idea that there is no reason for this complaint and that I am too exacting” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1549-1552, Geo. A. Laird to Mr. Baird, 30 Jan 1892). While Mr. Laird was displeased with Miss McLean’s ability, she found him to be increasingly disagreeable to get along with. Miss McLean’s proposed resignation stemmed from this uncomfortable situation, yet she also added that although she had done her best, “an older and more experienced person” could more adequately fill the position. She was sorry to have to leave the Aboriginal people (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1554-1555, Miss McLean to Mr. Baird, 3 Feb 1892).

When Mr. Laird was replaced, McLean withdrew her resignation and was excited about the prospect of staying on at the school (ABP, E 1745-1746, Florence McLean to Rev. Baird, 28 Apr 1892). Within a year, after four years service, she left the Crowstand Boarding School. As shown by her own words and as stated in the 1892-93 annual report of the WFMS: “She was very much attached to the young people, and her labour was one of love” (Seventeenth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, 1892-93, p. 35).

McLeod, Miss

Miss McLeod received her appointment as seamstress at the Crowstand Boarding School in April 1902 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 36, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 14 Apr 1902). The principal expressed optimism, yet had some reservations about Miss McLeod’s compatibility with her new position:

I will be very glad indeed if she develops into a suitable person for the position, but she will have to improve a great deal. Miss McLeod is a good girl, she is gentle, and agreeable, and willing, but has no capacity for work. As regards her sewing, I believe Miss Dunbar could do more work before breakfast than she can do all day. ... I cannot understand how any one, from meeting her would be favorably impressed with her
suitableness for the kind of work required of her. She is nearly six feet tall and very slender. However I will not condemn her yet. We will give her every opportunity of getting into the work and it may be that when she sees the amount of work that must be done, she will waken up (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 40, Neil Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 8 Aug 1902).

Despite the principal’s negative initial perception, McLeod carried out the duties of seamstress for five years (CSP 1908, AR DIA Yr Ended June 30th, 1907, Report by John Semmens, p. 322).

**McLeod, Matilda (Tillie)**

Tillie McLeod devoted close to twenty years of her life to working at the Birtle Boarding School. She was appointed assistant matron in January 1893 (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 6, Baird to Hamilton Cassels, 9 Jan 1893). Although a great deal was expected of her, McLeod was not one to object to the work bestowed upon her. One church official, Dr. Baird, acknowledged this when he offered her a few weeks of rest: “We recognize that your work is heavy and that your services have been willingly and ungrudgingly given, and both for your own sake and for the sake of our reputation, we do not want to allow you to go on until you break down on account of over exertion” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1941, [Baird] to Miss McLeod, 8 Oct 1897). The DIA inspector also noted some of Miss McLeod’s positive qualities: “She is an amiable sweet dispositioned woman, beloved by the pupils. She attends to the kitchen and dining room work, there is no waste in her department (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5, File 70, S. R. Marlatt to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Feb 1905).

Miss McLeod tendered her resignation in January 1912. However, this was not the first time she considered quitting. In late 1897, she argued that improvements to the school building should be a fiscal priority over payment of salaries. The basement in which Miss McLeod spent most of her working day was considered to be unsafe. For the sake of her health, she considered resigning. The principal was understanding of Miss McLeod’s predicament: “I sympathize with her because I would not I fear submit myself to the danger down in the basement” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1963-1964, W. J. Small to Baird, 13 Oct 1897). Then, in 1902, the principal had heard from “reliable sources” that Miss McLeod was thinking of leaving in order to train as a nurse (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, W. McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902). This of course did not materialize and Miss McLeod retired after almost two decades of continuous, faithful service.

**McWhinney, Rev. William**

William McWhinney began his career with the Presbyterian church missions as principal of the Birtle school in 1902. He was an experienced teacher from Ontario, however he had not previously instructed Aboriginal children. He was pleasantly surprised with the children’s appearance and ability to learn (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 34, W. McWhinney to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 5 Feb 1902). McWhinney had much to learn about managing an Aboriginal boarding school and he
seemed most comfortable in the classroom: “I have had three visits from the Indian Agent and each time he has expressed much satisfaction with affairs in the school-room. That is one part of my domain where I have reason to feel well pleased with what I have accomplished” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 30 File 36, W. McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 4 Apr 1902).

A specific request was made of McWhinney to make an effort to maintain amicable relations with other staff members. Despite his patience and discretion, he insisted that the work “atmosphere has been decidedly chilly.” Had he not enjoyed his work, his time at Birtle would have been “rather a dreary existence” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 39, W. McWhinney to Mr. Mackay, 14 Jul 1902). Less than a year later, Mr. McWhinney was transferred to the Crowstand Boarding School, where he found the staff to be much more cordial than at Birtle (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 4 File 48, McWhinney to Dr. Mackay, 8 Apr 1903). Unlike at Birtle, missionary duties were added to his responsibilities.

Shortly after his arrival at Crowstand, Mr. McWhinney was ordained by the Presbytery of Minnedosa (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, p. 96). He also took a leave of absence in order to get married (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1902-03, p. 113). There is no evidence that Mrs. McWhinney took any active part in the work of the boarding school.

Mr. McWhinney was able to improve the financial standing of the school (CSP 1913, AR DIA Yr Ended March 31st, 1912, Report by Mr. Blewett, p. 367). Despite this, throughout his tenure at the Crowstand Boarding School, McWhinney faced numerous challenges and problems. For example, a number of incidents of male students making late night visits to the girls’ dormitory are recorded in the Church and DIA correspondence (see, for example: UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 6 File 99, Copy - Wm McWhinney to Dr. Farquharson, 8 Jul 1907 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, W. McWhinney to Secretary of the Indian Department, 17 May 1915). Truancy of male students was also a common difficulty (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, J. D. McLean to R. P. Mackay, 18 Jul 1907).

Such occurrences had a detrimental effect on the opinion the people of the Coté reserve held of McWhinney. Several times Chief Coté and his people demanded that he be replaced (see, for example: NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Glen Campbell to Secretary of the DIA, 2 Oct 1912 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, W. M. Graham to Duncan C. Scott, 5 Sep 1914).

Members of the DIA were also adamant that a change in the school’s management was necessary (for example: NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, J. D. McLean to R. P. Mackay, 18 Jul 1907 and NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Mr. Blewett to Secretary of DIA, 21 May 1913).

While the people of Coté’s reserve were clearly dissatisfied with Mr. McWhinney’s management of the school, many were supportive of his plan to close the boarding school in favour of a semi-boarding/day school. In 1912, McWhinney corresponded with the Church, urging the development of a day school and the reduction of the number of boarders (Minutes, FMC, WD, PCC, 1911-12, pp.108, 143). In April 1915, Mr. McWhinney’s proposal was finally approved by the DIA; the boarding school was closed.
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and replaced with an improved day school. Mr. McWhinney expressed cautious optimism: "...the opening of the new school in 1916 will bring other changes, other difficulties and other problems to solve, but we go forward hopefully..." (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, p. 94).

With the backing of the Church, McWhinney endured through numerous controversies and remained principal and missionary at the Coté Reserve at least well into the 1920's (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, pt. 1, Copy - W. McWhinney to Duncan C. Scott, 17 Jun 1926).

Menzies, Rev A. D.

Mr. Menzies undertook the administration of the Cecilia Jeffrey school for a couple of years in the early 1920's. Menzies was well known in Church circles and formerly had ministered at Wiseton, Saskatchewan. The secretary of home missions stated that Mr. Menzies had "been successful in all his undertakings" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Duncan C. Scott, 25 Oct 1923). He entered into his duties in November 1923.

Mr. Menzies proved successful at fiscal management, having a balance at the end of the year (Eleventh AR, WMS, PCC, 1924, p. 80). His weakness was his relationship with the Aboriginal people. During his first few months, he had neglected to visit the Reserves. The local Indian agent thus requested him to visit periodically, to which Mr. Menzies agreed (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-5, part 2, Frank Edwards to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 9 Feb 1924). Problems continued though, as was evident by frequent runaways (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Extract from Agency Report for Month of April [1924] from Frank Edwards, Kenora, Ont).

Menzies, Mrs.

Mrs. Menzies accompanied her husband to the Cecilia Jeffrey school. She had some previous institutional experience and thus the Church did not hesitate to appoint her matron (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to Duncan C. Scott, 25 Oct 1923). Unfortunately she was not adapting well to the work: "[She] apparently does not care for Indians and has very little sympathy with them, and she is not liked by the staff, but no doubt that after a little time she may get along better" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-5, part 2, Frank Edwards to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 9 Feb 1924). The Superintendent of Indian Education concurred: "[Mrs. Menzies] has no sympathy for the work and I believe is the actual head of the institution. She is not the proper type for institutional life, is matron but cannot handle the staff" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Memorandum, by Russell T. Ferrier, 19 Sep 1924).

Millar, Rev. J. L. (B. A) and Mrs.

Mr. Millar had been in charge of the Ahousaht mission, but found that the dampness of the west coast was adversely affecting his throat. One church official considered his work
there to be exemplary: "... Mr. Millar has brought the work at Ahousaht to a higher level possibly, than any other man we could have sent. He has left everything in good shape for his successor. The day school in particular has made great progress since Mr. Millar came into the work" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt 1, R. P. MacKay to Mr. S. Stewart, 1909). Mr. Millar and Miss MacKay, the teacher at Ahousaht, were married and soon after, the two were transferred to the Portage la Prairie school to act as principal and matron. After two years, the couple was required to resign due to Mrs. Millar being seriously ill (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 9 Nov 1911). Dr. MacKay of the FMC conveyed his regret at the prospect of losing two able and dedicated workers: "I am particularly sorry about this, inasmuch as it is due to sickness. Mrs. Millar and yourself have been so long in connection with the work and so manifestly suited for it, and successful in it, that we shall not only miss you but sympathize with you in the separation" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 F 141, R. P. MacKay to Mr. Millar, 15 Dec 1911). In 1919, they were back working at the boarding school in Ahousaht (A&P, PCC, 1919, App. p. 52).

Murchison, Bessie

From 1913 to 1915, Bessie Murchison worked as the assistant matron responsible for the kitchen work at the Birtle school. She had graduated from the short course in domestic science at the Guelph Agricultural College. She reportedly was "doing excellent work" (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 17 Nov 1913).

Murkin, B

The principal of the Cecilia Jeffrey school hired Irish-Canadian, Mr. Murkin as farmer in February 1905. Mr. Murkin's was considered "a real help about the school and farm work." There were some concern because Murkin had been raised as a Roman Catholic, but the principal argued that "he has long ago lost faith in the R. C. Church and leans towards Protestantism" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). As was common, farmer Murkin left the school within a year.

Nicoll, Maggie

Prior to her arrival at the Cecilia Jeffrey school, Miss Nicoll had spent much of her adulthood as a school teacher. As well, she had spent a number of years as the teacher at the Regina Industrial School (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 30, N. Gilmour to Dr. MacKay, 7 Oct 1901). When the missionary at the Lake of the Woods received the news that the seasoned Miss Nicoll would be acting as the school's matron, he was elated: "I felt like one who has suddenly become rich" (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 32, A. G. McKitrick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 17 Dec 1901).

The missionary would not have imagined Nicoll having trouble establishing a favourable bond with the neighbouring Aboriginal peoples. The principal explained that Miss Nicoll's lack of appreciation for the differences between an established school like
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Regina and a new school like the Cecilia Jeffrey school, in addition to her refusal to follow recommendations offered by the missionary, created problems (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 35, J. C. Gandier to Rev. R. P. McKay, 6 Mar 1902). For a time it seemed her relationship with the Ojibwa people of Lake of the Woods was improving, but once again the situation took a downward turn.

At this time of increased discontent on the part of the Aboriginal people, Miss Nicoll notified the FMC of her desire to leave the school the following spring. The isolation of the school and her parents’ request to have her home were indicated as reasons for her decision. As well, she felt a married couple working as principal and matron would prove to be more successful (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 41, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 23 Sep 1902).

Some of the chiefs and councillors placed increased pressure on Miss Nicoll to resign and the missionary believed that Miss Nicoll’s continued presence at the school would have a detrimental effect on the school’s enrolment and general progress (122/14, Box 3 File 41, Austin G. McIntick to Rev. R. P. MacKay, 23 Sep 1902). Miss Nicoll acquiesced to the pressure: “… upon further consideration I am convinced that the work itself will profit nothing by change being delayed…” (122/14, B 3 F 42, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. Mackay, 13 Oct 1902). She now stated she would like to withdraw her services at the end of the year.

Miss Nicoll often spoke of the school children in complimentary terms. Thus it was not surprising when she stated that she would miss interacting with the students: “it was one of the hardest things of my life to come away and leave them” (122/14, B 4 F 45, Maggie Nicoll to Dr. MacKay, 5 Jan 1903). She was able to secure a temporary position teaching in a small school where she would be making more than double of what she received at the Jeffrey school.

**Petch, Josephine**

With an Ontario second class certificate and training at the Toronto Normal School, Miss Petch landed a teaching position at the Crowstand school (CSP 1898, AR DIA for Yr Ending June 1897, Report by Alex Mc Gibbon, p. 332). The principal was pleased with Petch’s instructing ability, but was concerned about her health; she had previously been required to quit teaching in Ontario for a time because she was not physically strong (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 269-271, Neil Gilmour to Baird, 26 Jan 1898). He also had misgivings about her inability to play the school’s organ and her lack in involvement with the religious exercises (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 358-359, Neil Gilmour to Rev. Baird, 2 Feb 1898). Miss Petch did, however, conduct sewing classes with the women on the reserve. She enjoyed these meetings and her class room work very much (FMT, WFMS, PCC, May 1899, Volume 3 Number 1, letter by Miss Petch dated 9 Mar 1899, p. 28).

Miss Petch tendered her resignation in April 1901. The principal, who was sorry that she was leaving, commented that she was “an excellent school teacher” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, N. Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 30 Apr 1901). She returned to her home in Crosshill, Ontario (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 32,
Josephine Petch to Dr. MacKay, 18 Dec 1901). She later rejoined the Crowstand staff, but resigned in January 1904 on account of ill health (UCA-Wpg, The Minutes of the 22nd Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the PCC, 1904, by Thomas Hart, p. 28).

**Perry, William**

The decision to hire Irish-born William Perry as farm instructor of the Birtle school was not a difficult one. He had been raised on a farm, employed by farmers and also farmed on his own in Manitoba for a number of years. He had construction experience with expertise in stone masonry. Some of his previous employment endeavours included supervision and management responsibilities. The school’s principal highlighted Perry’s strong personality and physical strength in order to stress his suitability for the position (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, David Iverach to Sec DIA, 14 Dec 1914). Perry’s duties at Birtle also included assisting the principal in discipline and management of the boys.

In 1916, Mr. Perry was married and thus moved out of the school into a rented house (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Superintendent of the Board of Home Missions PCC, 27 Jun 1916). The move did not impair his usefulness at the school and he continued to receive praise from the Indian agent (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 22 Jan 1918). Mr. Perry left the school in 1920.

**Pitts, Rev. F.**

University educated Rev. F. Pitts managed the Birtle school for a few years in the early 1920’s. After one year under Rev. Pitts, the school had achieved a substantial financial surplus and progress had been made in all departments of school work (Ninth AR WMS, WD, PCC, 1922, p. 93). He later worked at the Cecilia Jeffreys school (Bush, 2000: 102).

**Pitts, Mrs**

For a portion of the time that her husband was the principal, Mrs. Pitts was involved in the work at the Birtle school as assistant matron (Tenth AR WMS WD PCC, 1923, p. 98).

**Reid, Alberta C**

Alberta Reid already had nine years experience in nursing when she was assigned to work at the Cecilia Jeffrey School in April 1919 (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to J. D. McLean, 9 Apr 1919). She was a graduate of the Nursing-at-Home Mission Hospital in Toronto. The secretary of Indian Work for the WMS opined that such graduates were well qualified for missionary work amongst Aboriginal people (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Adelaide Clark to Dr. Edmison, 18 Apr 1923). Miss Reid’s work was demanding: “... their hospital has not been empty since early last November and that means many months of
broken sleep and never off duty. She says the responsibility of seventy pupils and the Indians on the Reserve so many miles from a Doctor is hard work and she does not think she can go on another yr without a rest“ (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Frank Edwards to Asst Deputy and Secretary DIA, 14 Jun 1922). Her services were greatly appreciated by the Indian agent and principal: “I may say that Nurse Reid was thought a great deal of by the late Agent, and is also well spoken of by the Principal of the School, and she holds the position of Nurse at the School from a purely Missionary spirit” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Frank Edwards to Asst Deputy and Secretary DIA, 25 Apr 1923). Reid left the school in early 1925 due to heart trouble (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1 pt 1, Frank Edwards to Secretary DIA, 5 Jan 1925).

Reid, G

Miss Reid had attended university and graduated with a bachelor of arts degree. She taught at the Portage la Prairie school in 1915-1916. The school’s administrator characterized her as “a good teacher and disciplinarian” (Second AR, WMS, PCC, 1915, by Rev. Hendry, p. 90).

Ross, Rev. John T.

In 1905, Rev. John Ross was stationed at Dodge’s Cove, British Columbia (A&P, PCC, 1905, App., p. 179). In 1909, he was working at the Presbyterian mission in Ucluelet, British Columbia. He and Miss McNeil, the matron at the Ahousaht school, got married and thus the western committee of the FMC transferred Mr. Ross to Ahousaht (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt 1, R. P. MacKay to Mr. S. Stewart, 19 Oct 1909). Mr. Ross resigned from his work at Ahousaht in the spring of 1916 (NAC, RG 10, SF, C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Andrew S. Grant to J. D. McLean, 14 Jan 1916).

In July 1920, Mr. Ross, accompanied by his wife, proceeded to the Cecilia Jeffrey school in order to engage in the duties of principal and matron (Seventh AR, WMS, WD, PCC 1920, p. 28). In after just a few weeks at the school, Mr. Ross found it an impossibility to run the school on the government grant allotted to the school: “I am anxious that some thing should be done to ease the present situation in regard to the maintenance of our schools. The grant per capita is not sufficient to meet our needs in buying food for the children. Considering also that we have very little land under cultivation to raise even roots and vegetables, we are not in a position to help out the extreme high cost of living very much. ... It is absurd to imagine that an Indian child can be properly fed on 40 cents per day, leaving clothing out of the question” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8152, Vol. 6039, File 160-1, Pt 1, Copy - John T. Ross to Rev. C. Brouillet, 21 Jul 1920). In addition to this, the school’s sanitation was inadequate and the school building was in desperate need of repair. In fact the Indian agent stated that “the whole of the interior of the building is out of place, and may colaps [sic] at any time.” The Indian agent concluded that, while Mr. Ross was a capable principal, these challenges were too great even for an such an experienced man: “I think Mr. Ross, is a first class man and
understands his business thoroughly, but he finds it impossible to carry on as it is just now” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Volume 6187, File 461-1 pt 2, R. S. McKenzie to Asst Deputy and Sec DIA, 11 Oct 1922).

Mr. and Mrs. Ross left the school before the end of the year (Eighth AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1921, p. 29).

Ross, Mrs. (Miss McNeil)

Miss McNeil spent many years as teacher and matron of the Ahousaht boarding school (A&P, PCC, 1905, App., p. 179). She and Mr. Ross were married in late 1909, and even though it was common for women to disengage from such work upon marriage, she remained the matron at Ahousaht. Rather than transferring Mrs. Ross to Ucluelet, Mr. Ross was moved to Ahousaht. The importance of Mrs. Ross at this mission was the impetus behind this decision: “[She] has proved herself indispensable, not only because of her ability as the matron of the home, but because of her work in the village amongst the people” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C 8661, Vol. 6273, File 583-1, pt 1, R. P. MacKay to Mr. S. Stewart, 19 Oct 1909).

In 1920, the Ross’s assumed the management of the Cecilia Jeffrey school (Seventh AR, WMS, WD, PCC, 1920, p. 28). It was only a matter of months before they resigned from their respective positions.

Scott, Rebecca. R.

During a portion of 1894, Miss Scott called the Crowstand school her home, as she was employed as matron (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 599, Presbyterian Church in Canada. Annual Report for Crowstand, Kamsack - Mar 31, 1894 by C. W. Whyte). A co-worker briefly described her hectic routine: “Miss Scott’s life is a very busy one. She makes the children’s interests her own, and is attending to their wants from morning till night. It is no small task to dress all their sores every day” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, Jul 1894, Volume 11, Number 3, letter by Miss Gillespie, dated 30 Apr 1894, p. 75). According to the principal, she took on such arduous duties “without a word of complaint” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1034-1038, C. W. Whyte to Rev. Prof. Baird, 22 Mar 1895). Miss Scott resigned due to her upcoming marriage (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 1596-1597, Report on the Crowstand Mission by C. W. Whyte [n. d.]).

Small, William J.

As a young man, Mr. Small studied at the Manitoba College and graduated from university with an honours degree in arts. He also had normal school training as a teacher. He later became known by the Church for his excellent work as a missionary in the home missions field (UCA-Wpg, Minutes of the 13th Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1895). Based on these qualifications, Mr. Small was offered the principalship at the Birtle school in late 1895.

For the first few years, the administration of the school ran quite smoothly. For example, under Mr. Small, there was no problem with filling the school with the allowable number of pupils. In fact, from time to time, Mr. Small noted that they were refusing
children and requested that the building be enlarged in order to accommodate more students (for example, see UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 489, Report of the School at Birtle for the Quarter Ending June 30 1896 by Wm. J. Small and UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 80-83, W. J. Small to Prof. Baird, 22 Nov 1897).

Mr. Small was married in 1900 and he and his wife had a child the following year. Soon after his marriage, discord between Small and the matron, surfaced. Mr. Small’s brother provided his view on the source of this friction:

The fact is, and I wonder that the Committee has not seen it, that Miss McLaren has always been in reality the principal and the matron of that school. And I know that often my brother gave in to her rather than have trouble ... and she was thus the boss of the establishment. This went on for years .... But a wife went to Birtle to live who soon saw through things. Under her influence, my brother has asserted his rights as principal; hence the visit of Miss McLaren to Professor Harts’ in February &c, &c (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2, File 24, J. L. Small to Dr. Mackay, 18 Apr 1901).

The local Presbyterian minister agreed: “Mr. Small has been forced to resign by the underhand working of the matron Miss McLaren - not for any default of duty but because he declines to be now what he was when he first came here - a tool in her hands.” He also expressed his support for Mr. Small: “I will only state that I have had much to do with him - I find him a cultured Christian gentleman of easy peaceful temper, desirous to do good and in my judgement efficiently doing his work” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, H. T. Murray to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 6 May 1901). The previous principal at Birtle drew similar conclusions in regards to the situation (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. McKay, 18 May 1901).

The various Presbyterian church bodies responsible for Aboriginal missions received allegations of mismanagement, at least some which originated from the matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 24, Annie McLaren to Mrs. Shortreed, 24 Apr 1901). As mentioned, Mr. Small tendered his resignation, which was promptly accepted by the Winnipeg division of the FMC. Yet, he argued that his resignation was not a result of these accusations: “But I did not resign because of the reports, which I knew were being scattered broadcast against me. Had I been a single man I would have fought the matter to the bitter-end. My dismissal would no doubt have come but then I would have be [sic] in a position to have demanded an investigation, and probably the matter would have been cleared up” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 2 File 25, W. J. Small to Rev. R. P. McKay, 8 May 1901). Instead, he claimed that his main reason for resigning was the accommodations available at the school. He and his family did not have their own home, but rather were required to reside in the school building. Mr. Small was replaced at the end of the year.

Snyder, J. H.

Mr. Snyder took on the duties of Birtle school’s farm instructor and assistant principal for a part of 1910. He was born in New York State and raised on a farm there. He had graduated from Columbia University with degrees in arts and law. After this, he
completed two years at the Manitoba Agricultural College. Even though Mr. Snyder had no previous direct experience, the principal saw a promising future for Snyder in Aboriginal mission work and expressed his hope that he would be able secure Snyder’s services at Birtle:

He desires to devote himself to industrial mission work. ... and is rapidly accommodating his knowledge and theory to the practical needs of Indian work. I think he will become an instructor hard to excel - being able and willing to teach the boys farming from a reasonable scientific standpoint and yet enable them to do so with the limited resources usually at their disposal when setting up for themselves. He is taking splendidly with the boys and seems to know how to get the best out of them. He also takes a personal interest in everything that tends to the welfare of the pupils and of the sch as that if the salary necessary to retain him is forthcoming, he will probably become a permanent member of our staff (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Apr 1910).

Mr. Snyder acted as substitute principal when Mr. McLaren was granted four months leave of absence (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 20 Apr 1910).

Stewart, H.

Miss Stewart was transferred from the Cecilia Jeffrey school to the Birtle school in July 1912. She was the assistant matron, initially in charge of the kitchen (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Jul 1912). She was later to be moved to the laundry department. However the Indian agent reported that a more competent person was needed: “... I would advise her retiring altogether, as she is not in my opinion qualified to teach anyone, as she has very little knowledge of housework, and no control over her temper, and is in this way a bad example to the children” (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Extract- Report of Mr. Agent Wheatley on the Birtle Boarding School dated October 29, 1913). Based on this agent’s assessment, the secretary of the DIA strongly encouraged the principal to dispense of her services (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, J. D. McLean to Rev David Iverach, 7 Nov 1913). Following this correspondence, Stewart offered her resignation (NAC. RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1, pt 1, Rev David Iverach to Secretary of the DIA, 17 Nov 1913).

Stratton, Lyla

A trained nurse, Miss Stratton worked as the nurse of the Cecilia Jeffrey School in 1915-1916 (CSP 1916, AR DIA for Yr Ended March 31st 1915, Report of Martin Benson, Supt of Indian Education, p. 147). A DIA inspector objected to a pay decrease for Stratton, because he feared that the school would lose her efficient services (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, Extract, Report of Inspector J. Semmens on the Cecilia Jeffrey Bdg, dated 22 Aug 1916). She resigned after receiving this reduction in salary, but officially she did not cite that as her reason. Instead she noted that her mother
required her assistance (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C7922, Vol. 6187, File 461-1, pt 1, J. A. Edmison to Mr. J. D. McLean, 4 Aug 1916).

Tansley, W

For five years, Miss Tansley was employed as the assistant matron at Birtle. She resigned due to her impending marriage (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, W. W. McLaren to J. D. McLean, 22 Jul 1912).

Thomlinson, Reba

Miss Thomlinson assisted the matron at the Portage school between 1913 and 1915 (First AR, WMS, PCC, 1914-1915, p. 56). Mr. Hendry, the school’s principal, saw potential in her: “[She] has proven herself a very faithful worker, capable and economic officer” (Thirty-eighth AR, WFMS WD, PCC, 1913-1914, by Mr. Hendry, p. 55).

Tindale, Annie E.

Annie Tindale studied and gained practical experience at the Nursing-at-Home Mission in Toronto. She then broadened her knowledge by taking a course at the Dominion School of nursing. Following this, she spent some time private nursing in Toronto. This training and experience led her to four years employment as nurse at the Brandon Industrial School. Next, she accepted an offer to work as field matron and nurse for the DIA in Skidegate village, British Columbia. In the fall of 1917, Miss Tindale was employed as nurse at the Birtle School (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Vol. 6251, File 575-1 pt 1, J. H. Edmison to D. C. Scott, 8 Sep 1917). Her position seems to have been temporary, as her name does not appear on the staff list the following January (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8645, Volume 6251, File 575-1 Pt 1, G. H. Wheatley to Assistant Deputy and Secretary of the DIA, 22 Jan 1918).

Walker, Bessie

Little information was located regarding Miss Walker previous to her employment at the Portage la Prairie school. She was from Chatham, Ontario and the daughter of a Rev. Walker (Thirteenth AR, WFMS, WD, PCC, 1888-1889, p. 28). When Miss Walker began her work at the Portage school in fall of 1888, she alone was responsible for the school. A few months later, some of the strain and pressure on Miss Walker was alleviated when a permanent assistant was appointed.

In a letter written for a WFMS publication, Walker commented on her feelings about the work. According to her, the rewards counteracted the frustrations and discouragements: “It is easy to feel cast down in the work among the Indians. Some days and even weeks, we feel as if we were doing little; then again we seem to lose what hold we thought we had, and often wonder if any others feel as down-hearted as we do about the little we do about the little we do among the Indians. ... But in spite of many difficulties and much that is unpleasant, there is a bright side to look at, and there is pleasure enough to cover all that is hard to bear” (MLL, WFMS, PCC, WD, May 1889, Volume 6 Number 1, letter by Miss Walker, dated 5 Mar 1889, pp. 5-6).
In the summer of 1891, the principal of the then new Regina Industrial School requested acquiring the services of Miss Walker as matron for the school: “She has the musical and character qualities that fit her, ... admirably for the position” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1175-1180, A. J. McLeod to Prof. Baird, [Jul] 1891). Miss Walker accepted the offer and started at Regina in November. Close to one year later, she resigned. She declared that she valued the time spent at the schools and indicated family responsibilities as the reason for her decision:

When I made up my mind to come to Regina, it was done with a promise to go home this winter, if Mother felt she needed me - this promise is to be kept and I hope to spend some time at home. It has been hard to give up the work, although the fight was partly over when I gave up the work at the Portage - the years I have been allowed to spend in this work have been happy ones and in spite of all that was hard, I have enjoyed the four years service very much ... (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1889-1891, Bessie Walker to Prof. Baird, 27 Sep 1892).

Furthermore, she expressed her unwillingness, for personal reasons, to return to this line of work. In this regard, she proved herself wrong.

It is true that later on she did not undertake full time work, yet the Church often counted on her to temporarily replace staff members who were deserving of a holiday. When she left Regina, she went directly to Portage in order to fill in for the matron. When permanently employed at Portage, Miss Walker had been actively involved with the religious services of the Aboriginal adults in the area (see, for example UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1165, School Report of Portage dated 30 Jun 1891 by Bessie Walker), and when she returned she was inundated with requests for visitations from many of these people: “... my friends have showered me with invitations to spend a little time with them, and in trying to accept every invitation, there is not much time left for writing. It seems so good to be back with these friends again, and it is hard to bid them good-bye. Why it is, I cannot tell, but it is hard to leave the Indians here. I feel as if I belonged to them” (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, March 1893, Volume 9, Number 11, letter by Miss Walker dated 19 Dec 1892, p. 270).

She did return to Chatham, Ontario in order to assist her mother. Yet, she was not forgotten. When a position came available at the Crowstand school in April 1896, it was offered to Miss Walker (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Miss Walker, 8 Apr 1896). She declined this appointment for sewing instructress because of ill health (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 283, [Baird?] to Mrs. Harvie, 29 Apr 1896). Miss Walker acted as a substitute at Portage again in the summer of 1898 (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 599, [Baird?] to Sara Laidlaw, 5 May 1898). Her name was suggested when a permanent position came up at Portage, but there was an expressed concern regarding her health (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 885-886, [Baird?] to Miss Fraser, 5 Oct 1898). She was also asked to temporarily replace the matron at Birtle (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 902-910, C. M. Jeffreys to Dr. Baird, 22 Nov 1898).

It seems that by some unidentified act, Miss Walker had disappointed the WFMS. The secretary of Indian work conveyed her dismay: “I am surprised at Miss Walker. I thought she had better judgement. I hear she is very anxious to return to the Indian work but hope
it will not be in any of our Schools” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, H 1298-1301, C. M. Jeffrey to Prof. Baird, 8 May 1899). No further mention was made of Miss Walker.

**Whyte, Rev. C. W.**

Rev. Whyte had graduated from McGill University with a bachelor of arts and also had attended the Presbyterian College in Montreal. After receiving an education, he became involved in the Church’s home mission field. His success in this field paved the way to an appointment as principal of the Crowstand Boarding School and local missionary. Mr. and Mrs. Whyte made the move from Killarney, Manitoba to the Crowstand school in March 1892 (Sixteenth AR, WFMS, PCC, WD, p. 32). According to one staff member, the first impressions held by the local Aboriginal people of Mr. Whyte were positive: “The Indians are highly pleased with their new missionary. I am afraid Mr. Whyte is going to get ahead of the rest of us in learning the language. He knows a number of words already” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, E 1745-1746, Florence McLean to Rev. Baird, 28 Apr 1892).

After a year, staff relations began to become strained. The farm/trades instructor faulted Mr. Whyte for imparting inconsistent orders (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 233, Mr. Wright to Prof. Baird, 22 May 1893). He also blamed a low school attendance on Mr. Whyte, arguing that Mr. Whyte was not fulfilling his obligations as missionary and, furthermore, contended that Mr. Whyte had a negative opinion of Aboriginal people (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 267-269, Mr. Wright to Prof Baird, 20 Jun 1893). In reply, Mr. Whyte attributed low attendance to pupils’ absence due to sickness and also to the Indian Agent’s lack in promoting the school (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 319-326, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 25 Jul 1893). The general want of harmony between Mr. Whyte and his staff continued, and FMC officials decided to grant Mr. Whyte a second chance and thus transferred three staff members to other schools (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267). The church continued to back Mr. Whyte throughout his tenure at Crowstand.

Mr. Whyte offered his resignation in March 1897, stating that on account of his wife’s health, it would not be safe to continue to reside in the school building. On numerous occasions, Mr. and Mrs. Whyte requested that a house be built for their family, but to no avail. He was adamant that it was not disdain for the work that prompted the resignation: “I regret having to take this step because of the love which I have for this work and the pleasure which I have had in it during the past five years. I assure you we have become much attached to both people and children and will be very sorry to say our farewell, and we shall always have a very deep interest in the Indian race and especially in the Crowstand Mission” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1214-1218, C. W. Whyte to Baird, 12 Mar 1897).

His resignation was accepted, and it was later indicated that this prompt acceptance was in part due to Mr. Whyte’s questionable practice of trading with the Aboriginal people at a substantial profit to himself (UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 1800-1805, [Baird] to Mr. Gilmour, 18 Aug 1897). After leaving Crowstand, Mr. Whyte returned to the home mission field (UCA-Wpg, Minutes of the 15th Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest
Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1897, p. 22).

**Whyte, Mrs.**

For a number of months during the time her husband was principal, Mrs. Whyte assisted in the work at the Crowstand school as the matron. At least one fellow staff member was of the opinion that Mrs. Whyte was not suitable for this position. In a letter, the boys’ instructor implied that Mrs. Whyte was not doing her job properly when he inquired whether there was in fact a matron at the school: “I have one question to ask you, and that is, who is matron if any, and if not, will it be possible [sic] for us to have one appointed soon, as the children are so much harder to manage, ... Mr. Whyte has it down that Mrs. Whyte is matron, but from what Prof Hart told me it is not so, and I know that the sooner Mrs. Whyte takes no active part in the school any more than the Missionary’s wife the better for the School” (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 233, M. J. Wright to Prof. Baird, 22 May 1893). Prof. Baird of the FMC replied that the present arrangement would remain as he had “found it impossible to appoint an outsider as matron whose authority might clash with that of Mrs. Whyte.” He added that when the school attendance increased, a re-arrangement of the staff would be warranted and a matron would be hired (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4, [Baird] to Mr. Wright, 19 Jul 1893). In early 1894, a matron was hired (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 599, Annual Report of the School at Crowstand, 31 Mar 1894, by C. W. Whyte). Occasionally, when the school was short staffed, Mrs. Whyte would take on various duties (see UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 180-186, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 26 Mar 1896; and UCA-Wpg, ABP, G 362-369, C. W. Whyte to Prof. Baird, 22 May 1896). For the sake of Mrs. Whyte’s health, Mr. Whyte resigned from his position at Crowstand.

**Whyte, John. S.**

John Whyte, brother of C. W. Whyte (above), was employed at the Crowstand school as farm instructor for over a year. During his youth, he had been trained in farming. He later had acquired the trade of machinist. Thus, he was considered to be competent to teach the boys farming and he also spent a portion of his time showing the boys the proper use of tools (NAC, RG 10, SF, Reel C8147, Vol. 6027, File 117-1-1, part 1, Andrew B. Baird to Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, 6 Apr 1894).

**Wight, Jeanie**

Miss Wight, from Galt, Ontario, was placed in charge of the Portage school in January 1887. Before this she had taught in a public school in Ontario for four years. It took some time before permanent boarders were secured. Nevertheless, it was not easy work as Miss Wight was required to be principal, matron, teacher, cook, nurse, housekeeper as well as missionary (Murray, [1936]: 31). She was replaced in the fall of 1888. She later married Rev. W. S. Moore, who had much experience in Aboriginal missions. In the early 1890’s, Mr. and Mrs. Moore were stationed at the Lakes End mission (MLL, WFMS, WD, PCC, March 1893, Volume 9, Number 11, p. 273) and in the late 1890's they worked amongst the Mistawasis band (CSP 1899, DIA AR Year Ended June 30th 1898,
Report by W. J. Chisholm).

Windel, S. A.
Miss Windel began working as the seamstress at the Crowstand school in the fall of 1911 (CSP 1913, AR DIA, For Year Ended March 31, 1912, report by Mr. Blewett, p. 366). She remained there for about five years (First AR, WMS, PCC, 1914-1915, p. 56).

Wintersgill, Miss
For approximately one year, Miss Wintersgill was responsible for imparting academic instruction to the children of the Cecilia Jeffrey Boarding School. While the school’s principal considered her an able teacher, he did find it necessary to give her some advice on teaching Aboriginal children: “There are details of the work that Miss W. has to learn; a boarding school amongst Indians is not just the same as a room in a big graded school in Toronto. It is different to be as a mother to little ones, from only having them in the school room.” As well, he felt that his own children were not receiving the quality of education that would be provided at a public school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 70, Austin G. McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 7 Feb 1905). Also, a degree of hostility had developed between Miss Wintersgill and the school’s matron (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 5 File 72, Austin McKitrick to Dr. MacKay, 3 Apr 1905). Possibly for these reasons, Miss Wintersgill resigned in July 1905 (UCW-Wpg, Minutes of the 23rd Synod of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1905, p. 32).

Wright, Miss
Based on first impressions, the principal of the Crowstand Boarding School believed Miss Wright to have a number of shortcomings. She was hired as matron and started in July 1901. The principal regarded Miss Wright to be “lacking in energy, and decision and not the person one would select to be the mother to some 20 girls.” He also conveyed apprehension about her physical strength as she was previously required to give up nursing because she was not strong enough. Added to these weaknesses, it was the principal’s opinion that she was “already appalled by the work, ...” (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 27, Neil Gilmour to Rev. R. P. Mackay, 11 Jul 1901). More problems with Miss Wright arose. Her and another staff member were not on speaking terms. As well, Miss Wright was said to be quite temperament and she complained about the amount of work that was required of her (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3, File 29, N. Gilmour to Dr. Mackay, 4 Sep 1901). Miss Wright resigned after only three months at the school (UCA, PCC, BFM, MAPMNW, Box 3 File 29, N. Gilmour to Mackay, 19 Sep 1901).

Wright, M. J.
Mr. Wright was employed at the Crowstand Boarding School for a few years in the early 1890’s. The FMC required a man to act as farm manager and mechanical instructor. Also, additional industrial training and supervision of the boys would be included in his duties:
We would like to add a little carpentering and blacksmithing so as to train them to be useful citizens able to use their hands. They are not bad boys but when Mr. Laird is away visiting reserves or at Presbyterian meetings for two or three days at a time they can get to be very noisy and difficult for the women to manage - a man on the premise is just what they need (UCA- Wpg, ABP, Letterbook, Baird to Mr. Wright, 14 Aug 1891, pp. 414-415).

Mr. Wright was a student of theology at Manitoba College when the FMC offered him the position (Sixteenth AR, WFMS, WD, PCC, 1891-92, p. 32). While working at Crowstand school, Mr. Wright met his wife, Miss Mattie Armstrong.

Due to a disruptive working relationship between himself and the principal, Mr. Whyte, he was transferred to the school at Rolling River (UCA-Wpg, ABP, Letterbook 4 Baird to Miss E. M. Armstrong, 30 Oct 1893, pp. 266-267). Officially, this transfer was considered a promotion (UCA-Wpg, ABP, F 521, Hayter Reed to Baird, 3 February 1894). In 1898, Mr. Wright was still stationed at Rolling River, and according to an inspector of the DIA, he was getting along well with the people there: “They look at him as their friend and go to him for advice in any of their little troubles” (CSP 1899, DIA AR Year Ended June 30th 1898, by Alex McGibbon, p. 190).