

Clarence Karr

The Atlantic Provinces and the Development of the Canadian Historiographical Tradition

An earlier version of this paper was presented to the conference on the Political Economy of the Atlantic Provinces held at Saint Mary's University, March 8-9, 1974.

In a state of disillusionment with Canadian nationalism after the collapse of the Canada First movement, Goldwin Smith confessed to Professor George Wrong that it was impossible to write a decent history of Canada because of "the difficulty of running the histories of several Provinces abreast and imparting anything like unity to the whole."¹ Although Canada has acquired many more attributes of a nation-state since that time, Smith's observation continues to be an accurate assessment of the primary deficiency as well as the primary challenge of Canadian historical studies.

Unlike Smith, far too few Canadian intellectuals have fully recognized the complexity of their country and have preferred glossing over this in favour of more simplistic national visions. Despite the many philosophies and approaches that have characterized our history there has remained a constant thread of a centralist mentality which some critics have labelled 'Ontario Imperialism'.² And of all the hinterland regions that have suffered at the expense of this national image, the Atlantic provinces have a position at the top of the list, especially in post-confederation studies. Frank Underhill echoed the sentiments of the majority of our professional historians when he told his C.B.C. audience during the Massey Lectures for 1963 that "as for the Maritime provinces, nothing, of course, ever happens down there".³ Not only had this part of British North America moved from a primary position of 'New England's Outpost' through British Colonial status to Canadian Colonial status, it had become a colony of so little importance that it could be ignored or, in some cases one suspects, forgotten. There is a

tradition in Canadian historiography that suggests that central Canadian imperialism has been a relatively recent phenomenon.⁴ In spite of this, the roots of centralism are obvious as far back as the last two decades of the nineteenth century. This period has been characterized in Canadian history as an age in which provincial rights successfully asserted themselves, racial antagonism flourished, and the dream of the Fathers of Confederation of a strong, united, centralized country slowly vanished.

In the words of one historian it was in these two decades that nation building was "at about the lowest point which it has ever reached."⁵ Perhaps this interpretation has been too dependent upon narrow, partisan political research with eyes and pens focused on Ottawa and the provincial capitals. For while premiers Mowat and Fielding were gloating over their secessionist threats and court actions which had won new autonomy and power for the provinces, their ministers of Education were meeting in Montreal in 1892 to establish the Dominion Education Association in an effort to effect a unified program of study for all Canadians in order to subdue provincial differences. The very next year the Association offered a \$2,000 prize in a Dominion History Competition to stimulate the writing of a history text to achieve that goal.⁶ This was only one indication of a growing nationalist movement in the country as individuals from many professions consciously joined together in their associations and their writing to concentrate on Canada the historical nation rather than on its component parts. The emphasis was heavily biographical and constitutional, and it stressed the role of only those who through their whiggish eyes had made a significant contribution to the evolution of a unified and great Canada. It was a phenomenon in which Maritimers willingly participated.

Like so many other Canadians at this time, these men were beginning to sense an actual possibility of greatness for their nation and the need for a well-defined historical heritage on which to construct the future. This sentiment suggested that "a people that is unmindful of its past can have no future."⁷ It was an age of industrial growth, rapid technological advancement, the lure and excitement of the last best west and a railway building boom. Gradually permeating almost everything was the type of optimism that enticed Sir Wilfrid Laurier into dedicating the new century to Canada. It was an age of cooperation and consolidation in which the country acquired the attributes of a nation and in which national sentiment became for many Canadians as important as partisan

politics. Among those engaged in defining the new Canada were Conservatives and Liberals, free traders and protectionists, imperialists, and members of the Round Table movement. What mattered was not so much the avenue or the shape of the new greatness but the greatness itself.

Much of the stimulus for this conscious effort to foster national unity was derived from concern and even fear that the difficulties that the Dominion was experiencing and the divisions within its borders in the form of excessive provincialism, ethnic problems and racism might combine to prevent the glorious nation from evolving. A clearly defined Canadian tradition was as necessary for a native population which remained ignorant of its heritage as for the many European immigrants that were beginning to stream into the country.⁸ Financial depression, the Jesuit Estates and Manitoba School Controversies, continued depopulation to the United States and the annexationist propaganda of Goldwin Smith and others caused great anxiety. It was also at this time that there was an upsurge of fear that American popular culture would obliterate that which was distinctly Canadian. Because the Maritimes received fewer railways, fewer immigrants, less industrial growth and remained largely on the periphery of the racial strife that threatened to split the nation, from the beginning they were not a central part of our historiographical tradition. The exciting development was the westward thrust that left the eastern seaboard far behind. But wherever the eyes of the nation might focus, Ontario with its preeminence in industrialization, urbanization, finance, publishing and intellectual activity remained as the centre of reference.

The Canada First movement had been largely an Ontario phenomenon and, although the new nationalism was firmly rooted in the present, it owed something to this earlier association. Because of partisan politics and an inability of its members to define the Canadian nation state, the Canada First movement floundered, but the national spirit lived on. Unlike the visionaries of the late 1860's, however, the nationalists of the eighties and nineties sought not only to define Canadianisms but also to provide the country with the attributes and the institutions of a nation. Henry J. Morgan survived to produce *Canadian Life in Town and Country* with L.J. Burpee in 1895, and *Canadian Men and Women of the Time* in 1898. W.S. Wallace who was both an inspiration for and editor of the *Canadian Historical Review* for nineteen years laboured under the obvious influence of D'Arcy McGee and

Canada First.⁹ The ingredients of the nationalism of the period also included other movements. Part of the inspiration was the new imperialism with the Imperial Federation League and the more popular Diamond Jubilee and Imperial Conference of 1897, which, in the words of G.W. Brown, "were among the signs indicating that the dominions were about to play a part more distinctive and on a larger scale than in the past."¹⁰ Ontario was the main centre of this Canadian surge of imperialist fervour. It was also the colony that had experienced the full force of the threat of American manifest destiny which led to the glorification of survival in the centenary activities of the arrival of the Loyalists and the War of 1812. It was in this period that the Ontario-based Confederation poets began to write poetry with a distinctly Canadian idiom and nationalist sentiment.

This was also the time of a great international advancement in the growth of scientific knowledge and research methods in the western world. Although designed to fulfill a Canadian need, the Royal Society of Canada was created with an awareness of a similar society in London.¹¹ The Canadian Historical Association and journal owed something to the appearance of the *English Historical Review* in 1896.¹² The Dominion Education Association was similar to the National Education Association of the United States,¹³ and the Champlain Society was created with a consciousness of the Hakluyt, Prince and Surtees societies.¹⁴

The clubs, associations and journals established at this time as well as the many books published on Canada served both as attributes of an autonomous state and as coalescing forces which brought experts in various fields as well as the exponents of the new nationalism into contact with each other. Generally, the creative centre was Toronto, with some activity in Ottawa and Montreal. Such organizations as the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (1896) and the Canadian Forestry Institute (1897) indicated a new industrial growth. Other groups such as the Canadian Club movement (1893) and the Pioneer Association of Ontario (1891), which became the Ontario Historical Society in 1893, demonstrated the need for a patriotism and a national heritage. Among the journals the *Week* (1883), *The Canadian Magazine* (1893) and *Maclean's* (1896), all based in Toronto, were devoted to fostering Canadian writers and a spirited debate on Canadianism. An explosion in publishing also began in the late 1880's and culminated with the appearance of three cooperative historical series between 1903 and 1917. There were writers able and eager to write, and publishers like Morang, Briggs, Copp Clark and Westminster that were all too willing to publish.

In historical pursuits it was, above all, an age of amateurism, as archivists like R.E. Gosnell of British Columbia and A.G. Doughty of Ottawa, journalists like A.H.U. Colquhoun and T.G. Marquis, librarians like A.D. DeCelles, lawyers like W.D. Lighthall and J.H. Coyne, judges like W.R. Riddell and J.W. Longley, civil servants like R.H. Coats and Sir Joseph Pope, and private citizens like William C. Wood and Agnes Laut combined in cooperative enterprises to foster a Canadian heritage. Representatives of the world of business and finance were also absorbed by the spirit of the times. One of the contributors to George Wrong's *The Federation of Canada* (Toronto 1919) was Zebulon Lash. Lord Shaughnessy and Lord Strathcona supported J. Castell Hopkins in the founding of the *Canadian Annual Review*, which first appeared in 1902. It was in the board room of the Canadian Bank of Commerce with B. Edmund Walker, its General Manager as the prime mover, that the Champlain Society came into being in 1905. Also during these years the University of Toronto History Club met on occasion in Walker's St. George Street home.¹⁵ The majority of the first academics to be associated with the movement were to be found in departments other than history. Pelham Edgar, A.G. Bradley and Archibald MacMechan were all professors of English. Only later did the bright young professors of history and political economy, notably George Wrong, O.D. Skelton, Stephen Leacock and W.B. Munro, become involved with more than token support. There is even some suggestion that the popular national movement actually enticed these professionals into studying Canada and forced their universities into scheduling courses with a Canadian content.¹⁶

The background, training and professional migration of the leading participants of the movement also reflected a growing centralist mentality.¹⁷ The largest portion of them was born in Upper Canada or English Quebec in the late 1850's or 1860's, and they were thus the first generation to grow up in a national rather than a provincial society. A few like L.J. Burpee, Andrew Macphail and T.G. Marquis were native Maritimers who migrated from the hinterland to the centre of activity in Toronto, Ottawa or Montreal. Even those born in Quebec tended to migrate in later life to Toronto or Ottawa. Although the largest percentage lacked university training of any kind, those who had the benefit of higher education generally attended the University of Toronto with a few from McGill and Queen's and an occasional individual from Dalhousie, New Brunswick, Acadia and Mount Allison.

Indication of the desire for national intellectual interaction came first with the appearance of the Royal Society of Canada in 1881, a product of the inspired mind of the Governor General, the Marquess of Lorne. He was "extremely sensitive to the trends which might lead to national disintegration" and saw the need of some moral glue to foster unity and patriotism.¹⁸ The appearance of the Society would be of major significance for historians not only because of its interest in history but because the Canadian Historical Association evolved from the Historic Landmarks Association of Canada, a committee of the Royal Society, and retained a close relationship with the parent association for a decade after its inauguration. In the 1890's there followed the production by J. Castell Hopkins of his *Canada: An Encyclopaedia of the Country*. (5 volumes, Toronto, 1897-1900), the first major cooperative enterprise of Canadian intellectuals.¹⁹ "That a country should require an Encyclopaedia," wrote another Governor General, Lord Aberdeen, in the introduction to the first volume, "implies that it has a future and a history". In his own preface, Hopkins expressed the hope that this material would make the people in these "northern and vigorous latitudes" less ignorant of their heritage and that the volumes would foster pride in the hearts of all Canadians.

With support from Sir John Willison, journalist, and George Morang, publisher, the promoter Hopkins was also instrumental in creating the first cooperative series, *The Makers of Canada*, which appeared between 1903 and 1911 under the editorship of poet and civil servant, Duncan Campbell Scott, and Professor of English at Victoria College, Pelham Edgar, with some editorial assistance from a retired civil servant, W.D. Le Sueur. Two other series quickly followed the first. Similar to the original effort but designed for a more popular audience was the *Chronicles of Canada* edited by University of Toronto historian, George M. Wrong and the university's librarian, H.H. Langton. These two gentlemen had earlier established an annual *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada* in 1896. The third series was *Canada and Its Provinces* edited by Adam Shortt, a former Queen's professor who was then Civil Service Commissioner in Ottawa and A.G. Doughty, who had been recently appointed Dominion Archivist. These two series received a valuable promoter in the person of Robert Glasgow who established his own publishing firm, Glasgow, Brook and Company, to publish the fifty-five volumes between 1913 and 1917.²⁰ The large majority of the contributors had already previously published in

the general or specific field of their contribution.

In an era when Canadian studies were new and the material available to the teacher and student limited these prodigious if premature seventy-six volumes provided much of the focus of attention for all those interested in Canada. The approach was predominantly biographical; the tone whiggish and liberal; and the production and most of the writing was undertaken in Central Canada in an atmosphere of nationalist sentiment that sought to minimize provincial and regional differences. Through subscription sales the *Makers of Canada* had reached 3,500 homes by 1910 and was still selling at a rate of forty sets a week.²¹ Under the guidance of Oxford University Press and new editor, W.L. Grant, a slightly revised edition appeared in 1926 and in the 1960's the University of Toronto Press reissued the volumes on Champlain, Frontenac, Wolfe and Montcalm and Sir Guy Carleton. *Canada and Its Provinces* also remained long at the core of Canadian studies. As late as 1941 Gustave Lanctot could tell the assembled members of the Canadian Historical Association that in spite of a few deficiencies the series "reste le *maximum opus* de l'histoire canadienne."²²

Cooperative centralism reached a new level fifty years later under the complete care of professional historians with the planning and production of the *Centennial History of Canada*. In general, with some important exceptions, it became a restatement of old ideas between new covers and a monument to the centralist mentality of its editors. The Maritimes received the same separate coverage as the obscure and inconsequential non-French voyages of discovery up to 1632 despite the fact that, as S.F. Wise noted in 1967, "Nova Scotia alone for much of the period was in many respects a more important colony than Upper Canada."²³

With the advent of scientific professionalism in the writing of Canadian History in the early twentieth century, there were no significant alterations in the trend established in the previous two decades. The nationalism remained as an indication of the continuing struggle for political and diplomatic separation from Great Britain either within or outside the imperial framework. Whiggism continued as an expression of the pride with which Canadians viewed their British heritage and the manner in which they had manipulated this superior form of government to fulfill the requirements of the colonial experience. Whiggism was also an indication of the racial conflict between French and English Canadians which was rooted in Anglo-Saxon racism and intensified by the Riel episodes, the debates over school rights, imperialism and war.

What followed was a preoccupation with responsible government and the evolution of dominion status and a fascination with Quebec, especially in its first colonial period. At this time a few professional historians, a closely-knit club devoted primarily to a centralist philosophy, established the historical tradition within the history departments of the universities. From the very beginning the emphasis was on the Canadian nation and its builders. Because of their power, their interaction and their longevity, much of the philosophy continues until the present time.²⁴

From the time that W.H.P. Clement's *The History of the Dominion of Canada* won the Dominion history competition in the late 1890's and was adopted by all but three provinces as the official text, subsequent texts and readings have skillfully veiled the smoke and fire of our past boredom of historical compromise in order to present versions of our history that were acceptable to all ethnic groups and all regions. Generally written and produced in Central Canada from the vantage point of a central Canadian consciousness these books more often than not refer to the Atlantic provinces only in a conscious effort to round out the story. In post-confederation studies even this attempt disappears. W.P.M. Kennedy's *The Constitution of Canada* makes few references to the Eastern region. Arthur Lower's references to our forest-born democracy are derived from an Upper Canadian and Western, not a Maritime consciousness. Hereward Senior's *Orangeism: The Canadian Phase* almost totally ignores analysis of the Atlantic region. Even the much heralded *Canada: Unity in Diversity*, which William Kilbourn described in 1967 as a new focus "on the diverse regions and cultures that have made up our rich and varied history",²⁵ appears primarily concerned with redressing the French-Canadian grievances and tends to refer to the post-1873 Maritimes only in their drive for 'better terms' or their lack of economic development. To be fair several scholars have apologized for the absence of Maritime material in their writings,²⁶ but this is not, as it often alleged, because of a deficiency of primary source material or because nothing of consequence ever happens down there but rather to the lack of obvious secondary studies and to a pervasive central Canadian consciousness at all levels of thought and writing.

In this process of centralism the background and the training of our intellectuals has been of fundamental importance. Until recently the great majority of the historians who have shaped and guided Canada's historical tradition were products of a small-town or rural environment

where they absorbed a local consciousness that many then devoted much of their lives trying to escape.²⁷ In the conservative confines of Eastern Ontario, George Wilson waited not too patiently for the day when he could escape his narrow Scottish-Presbyterian background.²⁸ A shy Arthur Lower in the possibly even more conservative Central Ontario knew no other environment until after the age of eighteen²⁹, and an apprehensive young Harold Innis left his father's farm at Otterville to enter the vastly different world of McMaster University which was then located in Toronto.³⁰ As young, intelligent, impressionable adults they and many others were consciously or unconsciously anxious to leave their country-boy heritage behind and migrate to the metropolis in search of further education. Lacking any firmly implanted historical philosophy until that time, they became most susceptible to the ideas and philosophy of their university professors. The most significant fact, however, is that the metropolis in question at some stage of the training was usually Toronto or Kingston, the location of the two universities which have exerted the greatest influence on the evolving Canadian historical tradition. Professionally, at least, when the native Maritimer journeyed to Central Canada in pursuit of further education, he eventually left his eastern heritage behind and became a part of the centralist tradition.

I stress the undergraduate training in particular because if the student then departed for Britain or the United States for graduate study the approach to Canadian history employed in the dissertation was more often than not acquired during the Canadian experience.³¹ And frequently the subject of the thesis guided the research interests of the individual during the entire lifetime. In England, Canada was primarily regarded as an imperial phenomenon; in America there were usually three choices available: to duplicate the British experience with courses that treated Canada only as a part of the British Empire, to engage in a dissertation based on the suggestion of a previous Canadian contact, or to study under some expatriated Canadian.³² Another aspect of centralism has been the migration of academics from the hinterland to the metropolis. In many cases this was a homecoming from a distasteful regional experience that left no permanent mark on the individual's approach to history. In other cases as with Chester Martin and Frank Underhill in the West, the time spent in the hinterland left a lasting imprint but not one significant enough to subdue centralist tendencies.³³ What is probably even more important is that no historian wanted to be

an expert on a subject that might label him as antiquarian and thus prevent his eventual migration to the metropolis.

Towards the middle of the twentieth century the approaches and concepts employed in the writing of Canadian history diversified, but ironically with this also came an intensification of the centralist orientation. Frederick Jackson Turner's environmentalism might have provided an avenue for the incorporation of the Canadian region into the mainstream, but as an American import it was too suspect, too unadaptable to the Canadian experience and, by then, the centralist dominance was already too pronounced to permit any serious intellectual debate of regionalism and environmentalism. Besides, as a part of the westward thrust, the frontier left the Atlantic provinces far behind. Following closely behind the experimentation with frontierism was Laurentianism, the product of Harold A. Innis and Donald Creighton, two Ontario-born gentlemen who received their Canadian education at the University of Toronto. Although they provided Canadian history with its most uniquely Canadian approach and raised the stature of the discipline to an unsurpassed degree of excellence, their centralist position prompted serious criticism of the trend for the first time.³⁴ No criticism can detract from the legitimacy of Laurentianism as an accurate summation of the mainstream of Canadian development, but its continued preeminence has led to serious implications for the evolution of a Canadian history with which all regions, all classes and all ethnic groups can identify and even serious implications for the future development of the country itself.³⁵

The current vogue is metropolitanism which has existed as a concept at least since the 1920's but which has been thrust into prominence by J.M.S. Careless only during the past decade. Careless is another Toronto-born and Toronto-educated individual but one who has attempted to bring the regional cities into his philosophy. But by its very nature any study of metropolitanism in the Canadian context must lead back to the foremost metropolitan centres and from there to the major cultural and finance capitals of the world. One must ask, however, the extent to which this concept can be a vehicle for a successful study of regionalism. Careless has stated that "much of what is often called regionalism may be better expressed in terms of metropolitan relations and activities."³⁶ For the Maritimes this would appear to mean merely an extension of Laurentianism whereby one would study the effects of Central Canadian imperialism in such areas as government, finance,

publishing, industrialization, communications, and sport. It would not alter the existing image of the Maritimes in Canadian historical studies as an exploited and depressed area nor would it give Maritime intellectuals what is most required at the present time — a regional pride and identification that could be equated with that of Ontario. Metropolitanism cannot provide an avenue to an appreciation of the Atlantic region as a unique region or series of regions with characters of their own.

Implicit throughout this paper has been the suggestion that the phenomenon of centralism in the development of the Canadian historical tradition has involved more than historians and their visions of Canada. Centralism, which is an aspect of metropolitanism, has become a part of the Canadian tradition through books, journals, the newspapers and the media. It has, in fact, become a way of thinking for the majority of Canadian citizens. In her recently published poem 'Spring', Miriam Waddington speaks of this "complex province-torn country".³⁷ As a small boy growing up on Ontario I remember the phrase used to inform a playmate that you did not want him or her around anymore was 'Go to Halifax'. It was obviously so far away that the person in question would never come back.

What has been created is a Canadian normalcy or straightjacket based on centralism. In this there are no party politics, for the centralist orientation of Sir John A. Macdonald and his political and academic successors have shared equally with a Liberal legacy that suggests that Laurier and King provided the country with unified and stable if uninteresting government. The depression culminating with the Rowell-Sirois Report, the disturbing implications of Pearson's cooperative federalism, the appearance of Trudeau as national leader, and the October crisis of 1970 have all pointed to the evils inherent in excessive provincial power or identification. Federalism has always been defined in Canada as power to the central government, not a sharing of power as the word itself implies. Many Canadians are pro-federal because they are anti-Quebec for both religious and ethnic reasons. Others, from as far back as the early colonial period, have regarded the weak American federal system as a plague to be avoided at all costs. Conversely, in more recent times many have been jealous of the grandiose and unified spirit of the United States. For all, the heroes have been those who have fostered economic and political nationalism and unity while blurring regional identification.

Part of this normalcy has suggested that our parliamentary system only functions efficiently with two parties and a majority government, something that our political system has often lacked since 1921.³⁸ At first Social Credit was a joke; then it became a dangerous joke. Duplessis was a fascist while George Drew with a not dissimilar philosophy was normal enough to become federal leader of his party. Our socialists were idealists who were possibly even more dangerous than their fascist counterparts. Once it became evident, however, that these were not passing phenomena Central Canadian journalists and academics flocked to study these abnormalities at the expense of the traditional parties and more traditional events. In this way Alan Cairns has suggested, analysts have "seriously prejudiced our understanding of the Canadian political system and its history."³⁹ Rather than approach the provinces of Quebec or Alberta as an integral part of Canadian society, our investigators have approached them almost in a vacuum and have consciously sought abnormalities not similarities. If only the reverse had been true we might by now have discovered many more common denominators in the Canadian experience that we currently have.

Meanwhile the poor, backward Atlantic provinces remained so seemingly peripheral and normal that they were unworthy of serious investigation. This was the context in which Frank Underhill was speaking when he said nothing ever happens down there. To most Central and Western Canadians the Eastern provinces remain poor and backward, a nice place to visit, but not a nice place to live. Many intellectuals raised in the region have avoided the parochial as inferior and have opted for paths that would eventually lead to the larger metropolis. Professor George Rawlyk has suggested that there might be a direct relationship between the scholar's acute sense of his own region's inferiority in the Canadian context and his historical sense of inferiority.⁴⁰ Until recently, very few scholars have had the courage to study the Maritimes as an entity in their own right for fear of being labelled antiquarian. Hence in the Maritimes as in other regions in the hinterland, teachers and students have had to rely on relatively few interpreters of the regional experience.

Canadian historical writing now appears to be at a major watershed in its development. In a country with a huge land area, a small population and an even proportionately smaller intellectual community, it was perhaps inevitable that a few individuals with even fewer philosophies

should have achieved overwhelming control over the development of our historical tradition. Today, however, as these personalities disappear from the scene, Canadian historiography is mature enough to accommodate many approaches and many conceptual frameworks. If it is an obligation of history to give direction to a Canadian consciousness, then the challenge that lies ahead in revealing the complexity and the regional diversity of this nation is immense. Now, more than ever before, there exists the opportunity to rid the Canadian historical tradition of its clichés, its narrowness, its conception of the parochial, its obsession with the abnormal and its limited definition of federalism. It is time to apply more fully Canadian concepts and Canadian terminology to the Canadian experience. One of the most important aspects of this transformation must be an alteration of the typically Ontario image of the Maritimers as "a strange folk, who, when not fishing or lumbering, are insistently clamouring for aid from the federal government."⁴¹ To date, the new histories of the last two decades have demonstrated little inclination in this direction.

One means of achieving the desired effect is to have more regional studies. Perhaps the time has come to heed Ramsay Cook's plea to "understand and explain the regional, ethnic and class identities that we do have",⁴² and through this, discover at least the 'limited identities' with which the majority of Canadians identify. For the regionalist this should include both a consideration of the distinctiveness of the region and its variation as well as the similarity and the interaction with the country as a whole. For the Ontario-based scholar this should mean the end of any consideration of belief that the province is the Canadian nation and a recognition of a regional identity for Ontario separate from that of Canada.

We need more studies to follow up on D.C. Harvey's preliminary investigation of the sea as a lifeline, escape valve and determining factor in the Maritime consciousness;⁴³ further consideration of A.G. Bailey's cultural distinctiveness of the region;⁴⁴ more investigation of George Rawlyk's inference that the golden age of wooden ships and iron men has served as a romantic escapism for Maritimers that was not dissimilar to Quebec's previously false conception of its French colonial period.⁴⁵ Too often in generalizing Canadian historians forget the importance of time, distance and geography as factors in explaining the nature and development of Canadian society. The Gaspé, the Laurentian shield in Ontario and the Rockies remain psychological barriers that continue to separate

Canadian regions despite modern communications and even the recently popularized Canadian Pacific Railway. It is difficult for a British Columbian, primarily the product of an ever-present twentieth century frontier, to comprehend the antiquity of the Atlantic provinces.⁴⁶ Not only are the Maritimes largely the product of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but because of an insignificant flow of immigrants into the region since 1873, there has been much less opportunity for alteration of the local identity than in the other regions of the country.⁴⁷ Although Carleton, Loyola, McGill and Ottawa universities now offer undergraduate courses on the Maritimes, it is unlikely that these will expand across the Dominion in sufficient numbers to provide a cross-section of Canadians with an understanding and appreciation of this region. One alternative would be to have more courses on regionalism that incorporate all sections of the country.

Studies in social, cultural and intellectual history are particularly adaptable to the regional experience.⁴⁸ Father M.M. Coady and the Antigonish movement are as deserving of incorporation into the general study of the cooperative and adult education movement as Alphonse Desjardins or various grain growers associations. The early novels of Hugh MacLennan, the prose of Ernest Buckler and the prose and poetry of Alden Nowlan, which so painfully reveals the hostility between the creative artist and his remote hinterland origins as well as the artist's inability to escape from those origins, are all worthy of serious study by historians. So too is the art of the Magic Realists: Alex Colville and his former students, Christopher Pratt and Tom Forrestall. All regional artists by their own admission, these men are actively involved in their society and have participated in such diverse events as the Allied landing during World War II, designing the centennial coins and McCain's Foods Limited packages, and the overthrow of Joey Smallwood. Any study of Canadian philosophies or movements must at some point provide a detailed analysis of how the Maritimes fit into any general pattern before one can make any sound assessment of what a Canadian attitude is. There is also no reason why the concepts of regionalism themselves cannot provide a fruitful area for the intellectual historian.

Finally there is the question of incorporating the Atlantic provinces into the mainstream of Canadian studies at the level of the text and the thematic study. Far too often in the past, Canadian historians have constructed generalizations from a Central Canadian consciousness and research experience or from the most dramatic examples available to

them. Now, young Maritime scholars are beginning to challenge many of these assumptions. E.R. Forbes criticizes Professor Richard Allen's treatment of the social gospel in the Maritimes.⁴⁹ John Little adds another spectrum to the Manitoba Schools' Question by revealing its influence in New Brunswick.⁵⁰ Others have noted the existence of a farmer-labour movement in Nova Scotia and the role of the Fishermen's Protective Union in Newfoundland.⁵¹ Many of these preliminary studies suggest that there are many more common denominators in the Canadian experience than have hitherto been implied. Certainly all Canadians from all regions deserve a general history with which they can identify. Further studies may indicate that Social Credit, Duplessis and W.A.C. Bennett are not part of the abnormality of Canadian development but an essential if not, central part of it. The list of necessary qualifications and extensions to the generalizations found in history surveys is endless. Did the Maritime reaction to Riel differ in nature from that of Ontario? The 1885 militia response would seem to indicate some similarity. Was the rush for enlistment in 1914 different in degree or nature from those areas which had a conscription and what was its basis? Can the claim that the Maritimers suffered less during the depression because "economic stringency was not unfamiliar"⁵² be justified in light of the emphasis placed on Toronto's Cabbagetown and Montreal's East end?

It is up to those scholars working in Maritime history to encourage others into the field and to saturate Canadian studies with the Maritime regional experience to the extent that even the most ardent centralist cannot ignore the region. The problem is not as Frank Underhill suspected that the Maritimes are in themselves uninteresting. It is that the Canadian consciousness has ignored what has happened. The situation will not be corrected until Canadians from the historians to the journalists become aware of the complexity of Canadian regionalism.

NOTES

1. Quoted in Kenneth N. Windsor, "Historical Writing in Canada in 1920", in Carl F. Klinck, ed., *Literary History of Canada. Canadian Literature in English*, Toronto, 1965, p. 233. This paper deals only with the English-Canadian historical tradition.
2. 'Ontario imperialism' is an inaccurate description of the phenomenon for it implies a regional or provincial imprint on a national image. Centralism suggests rather that individuals working in Ontario (or Montreal) as journalists, writers, publishers, etc. have created a national image which focusses outward from the centre and ignores both local provincial history and the contributions of the hinterland regions to the national experience.
3. Frank H. Underhill, *The Image of Confederation*. Toronto, 1964, p. 63.

4. See W.L. Morton, "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History", *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. XV, no. 3 (April 1946).
5. Underhill, *Image of Confederation*, p. 214. See also W.L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, Toronto, 1972, p. 62 and Vincent Massey, *Speaking of Canada*, Toronto, 1959, pp. 2, 8.
6. See J.A. Cooper's review of W.H.P. Clement, *The History of the Dominion of Canada*, Toronto, 1897, in G.M. Wrong and H.H. Langton, *Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada, 1897*, Toronto, 1898, pp. 23-26.
7. Archibald MacMechan, *Headwaters of Canadian Literature*, Toronto, 1924, p. 199. See also J. Castell Fopkins, *Canada. An Encyclopaedia of the Country*, vol. 1, Toronto, 1897, p. 10.
8. One strong supporter of this view was the Rev. James Robertson, Superintendent of Missions for the Presbyterian Church in Western Canada. For him the future unity and homogeneity of the nation rested in the public schools and the church. See C.W. Gordon, *The Life of James Robertson, D.D.*, Toronto, 1908, p. 324. This was also a sentiment frequently expressed in the novels of Ralph Connor.
9. W.S. Wallace, "The Growth of Canadian National Feeling", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 1, no. 2 (June 1920), pp. 136-65.
10. G.W. Brown, "Editorial Comment", *C.H.R.*, vol. xvii, no. 1 (March 1936), p. 2.
11. R.H. Hubbard, "Viceregal Influences on Canadian Society", in W.L. Morton, ed., *The Shield of Achilles. Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*, Toronto, 1968, p. 264.
12. G.M. Wrong, "The Beginning of Historical Criticism in Canada: A Retrospect, 1896-1936", *C.H.R.*, vol. xvii, no. 1, (March 1936), p. 5.
13. W.S. Wallace, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Canada*, vol. 1, Toronto, 1948, p. 359.
14. Windsor, "Historical Writing in Canada", p. 237.
15. A.R.M. Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years*, Toronto, 1967, p. 48.
16. The publishing splurge in Canadians began in the mid-1880's but it was not until 1896 that George Wrong introduced some Canadian history at the University of Toronto. McGill introduced some Canadian content into political and economic studies from 1900 and W.L. Grant held the first chair of Canadian and Colonial history at Queen's from 1910.
17. This section is based on a detailed analysis of sixty-five of the leading participants from 1880 to 1914.
18. W.S. MacNutt, *Days of Lorne*, Fredericton, 1955, p. 125ff. Among the founding members of the Royal Society who made an important historical contribution were Golden Smith, J.G. Bourinot, Abbé Casgrain, Charles Lindsay and G.M. Grant.
19. Important contributors who would participate in later series included James Hannay, George Bryce, A.H.U. Colquhoun, N.E. Dionne, R.E. Gosnell, G.M. Grant, J.G. Bourinot and J.W. Longley.
20. L.J. Burpee, A.G. Doughty, and A. DeCelles were associated with all three series. Thomas Chapais, R.H. Coats, A.H.U. Colquhoun, R.E. Gosnell, W.L. Grant, Stephen Leacock, John Lewis, A. MacMechan, T.G. Marquis, W.B. Munro, Sir Joseph Pope, D.C. Scott, A. Shortt, O.D. Skelton, W.S. Wallace, W.C. Wood and G.M. Wrong contributed to two of the series.
21. Windsor "Historical Writing in Canada", p. 228.
22. Gustave Lanctot, "Les Historiens D'Hier et L'Histoire D'Aujourd'hui", *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report*, Presidential Address, 1941, p. 11.
23. Review of W.S. MacNutt, *The Atlantic Provinces*, in *C.H.R.*, vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (March 1967), p. 67. For an analysis of W.L. Morton's conversion to centralism, see Ramsay Cook, *The Maple Leaf Forever. Essays in Nationalism and Politics in Canada*, (Toronto, 1971), pp. 158-62.
24. The influence of the earlier British-oriented amateurs such as J.C. Dent, William Kingsford and Robert Christie was short lived in a philosophic sense. Note the joint authorship involving George Wrong, A.G. Doughty, Adam Shortt, R.G. Trotter, A.R.M. Lower and Chester Martin. G.E. Wilson taught at Dalhousie for forty-three years; R.G. Trotter taught at Queen's from 1924 to 1951; A.G. Doughty was at Queen's from 1885 to 1908 and was Dominion Archivist from 1913 to 1931; O.D. Skelton was at Queen's from 1908 to 1925 and carried his philosophy to Ottawa as Undersecretary of State from 1925 to 1941; Adam Shortt was at Queen's from 1885 to 1908 before joining the civil service and later the Board of Historical Publications from 1908 to 1931. This approach also became the basic philosophy of the primary and secondary schools' curriculum.

25. Paul Cornell, et. al., *Canada: Unity in Diversity*, Toronto, 1967, p. vii.
26. As an example see H. Blair Neatby, *The Politics of Chaos. Canada in the Thirties*, Toronto, 1972, p. 2.
27. Included in this background are James Hannay, Archibald MacMechan, Adam Shortt, O.D. Skelton, Chester Martin, G.E. Wilson, H.A. Innis, A.L. Burt, D.C. Harvey, W.B. Munro, W.S. Wallace, F.H. Underhill, D.C. Masters, A.R.M. Lower, W.L. Morton, and Ramsay Cook, J.M.S. Careless, D.G. Creighton and William Kilbourn were born in Toronto.
28. G.E. Wilson, "Have I Anything to Declare?", *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Third Series, vol. LVI (part 2), 1962, p. 83.
29. A.R.M. Lower, *My First Seventy-five Years*, pp. 31ff.
30. D.G. Creighton, *Harold Adam Innis. Portrait of a Scholar*, Toronto, 1957, pp. 7, 21-25.
25. The trend assumes even greater significance when one notes the degree to which Canadian history has been dependent on published dissertations until very recently.
32. There are of course, many exceptions to this general pattern. Note the influence of Thorstein Veblen on H.A. Innis at Chicago. A.R.M. Lower came successively under the spell of Adam Shortt, George Wrong and Frederick Merk.
33. For those who went to Winnipeg, the Daffoe group influence actually intensified the national and international concern at the expense of the regional.
34. See, W.L. Morton, "Clio in Canada: The Interpretation of Canadian History", *University of Toronto Quarterly*, vol. XV, no. 3 (April 1946).
35. In "Some Thoughts on the Understanding of Canadian History", *Acadiensis*, vol. II, no. 2 (Spring 1972) W.L. Morton credits Laurentianism with equating local history with local grievances, ignoring the grounds for confederation in other regions and a neglect of the post-confederation history of Ontario and Quebec. While this is to a large extent true, the causation is also more complex and found further back in time.
36. J.M.S. Careless, "Aspects of Metropolitanism in Atlantic Canada", in Mason Wade ed., *Regionalism in the Canadian Community, 1867-1967*, Toronto, 1969, p. 117.
37. *Saturday Night*, Feb. 1974, p. 8.
38. Coverage of the 1972 federal election is still fresh in our minds. For the 1963 election see John T. McLeod, "Living in a House of Minorities", *Canadian Forum*, June 1963 as an example. See also K. McNaught's condemnation of using American terminology to describe the Canadian political scene in L. Lapierre, ed., *Essays on the left. Essays in Honour of T.C. Douglas*, Toronto, 1971, pp. 43-49.
39. Alan C. Cairns, "The Study of the Provinces: A Review Article", *BC Studies*, No. 14 (summer 1972), p. 75.
40. George A. Rawlyk, "A New Golden Age of Maritime Historiography", *Queen's Quarterly*, vol. LXXXVI, no. 1 (spring 1969), p. 58.
41. A.P. Paterson, *The True Story of Confederation*, Saint John, 1926, p. 10.
42. G.R. Cook, "Canadian Centennial Celebrations", *International Journal*, vol. XXII (autumn 1967), p. 663.
43. D.C. Harvey, "The Heritage of the Maritimes", *Dalhousie Review*, vol. XIV no. 1 (April 1934).
44. A.G. Bailey, *Culture and Nationality*, Toronto, 1972, pp. 44ff.
45. G.A. Rawlyk, "A New Golden Age of Maritime Historiography", p. 58.
46. A good example of this error appears in H.L. Stewart, "The Maritimes as 'Melting Pot' ", *Public Affairs*, vol. 2, no. 1 (August 1938), pp. 10-12, in which the author compares the assimilation of ethnic settlement in the Maritimes and the recently settled Canadian West.
47. See J.W. Grant, "Population Shifts in the Maritime Provinces", *Dalhousie Review*, vol. 17, no. 3 (October 1937), pp. 282-94, and W.S. MacNutt, "The Maritime Background: A Contest of Parochialism", *Public Affairs*, vol. X, no. 2 (March 1946), pp. 75-79.
48. To date the *Social History of Canada* series of the University of Toronto Press has concentrated on central and western Canada at the expense of the far north and the east.
49. E.R. Forbes, "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia", *Acadiensis*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Autumn 1971), pp. 18-36.
50. John I. Little, "New Brunswick Reaction to the Manitoba School's Question", *Acadiensis*, vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1972), pp. 43-58.
51. G.A. Rawlyk, "The Farmer-Labour Movement and the Failure of Socialism in Nova Scotia", in Lapierre, *Essays on the Left: S.J. R. Noel, Politics in Newfoundland*, Toronto, 1971, pp. 134ff.
52. P.W. Fox, "Regionalism and Confederation", in Mason Wade, ed., *Regionalism in the Canadian Community*, p. 8.