

Jewish Education in Canada

Jerome Kutnick

Canadian Jewry has established an impressive array of institutions and organizations to educate its youth. Jewish education receives substantial financial assistance from the government and local federations, and the community has given it broad support. Nevertheless Jewish education is contentious for Canadian Jewry because it deals with issues that expose the ambivalent nature of Canadian Jewry's relationship to Judaism and Jewish culture in a post-traditional society. This chapter will examine the structure and accomplishments of Jewish education in Canada in the context of these issues.

The Societal Context of Jewish Education

The American Influence

Canadian Jewry maintains close ties with the American Jewish community. Jewish education reflects this special relationship and is heavily influenced by developments in both America and Canada. Although Canada's Jews have their own institutions and organizations, including educational ones, they have nonetheless, with some element of truth, been perceived as part of a greater North American Jewish community. This situation is not unique to Canadian Jewish education alone but has its parallel in the broader Canadian society. Indeed, in an effort to contain American influence, the Canadian government has adopted policies designed to promote Canadian uniqueness. The Canadian Jewish community, despite similar desires to maintain its own distinctiveness, places importance on its close relationship with American Jewry. While Canada is somewhat apprehensive of its neigh-

bor to the South, Canadian Jewry is also concerned with the assimilating forces of the non-Jewish society within which it dwells. For the Jews in Canada, the mere proximity of an older Jewish community twenty times its size and with whom it feels a strong sense of kinship, serves as a bulwark against assimilation and acts as an instrument for survival.

Jewish education in Canada is therefore partially integrated into the American Jewish educational structure. Many of its leaders were either born in the United States, studied there or received prior educational-administrative experience there. Canada's Jewish educational institutions, schools, professional organizations, and even central communal agencies, affiliate with American-based umbrella organizations. Indeed cognizant of this close relationship, the New York based roof organization of American Jewish educational agencies, the former American Association for Jewish Education (AAJE) in 1981 changed its name to the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA).

Compared with America, the resources made available to Jewish education in Canada are more substantial and the conditions appear more favorable. However Canadian Jewish education is confronted with the same dilemma as its counterpart in the United States. The Jews in Canada seek to integrate into general society while concurrently maintaining their Jewishness. In many post-emancipation communities, it is the perceived task of Jewish education to help achieve the particularly 'Jewish' component of these dual, and in certain ways, contradictory objectives. Jewish education in Canada may resemble that of other communities not because its institutions affiliate with non-Canadian ones or because its leadership derives its training and experience in America but rather because the values and attitudes of the Jews in all the Diaspora - including Canada - may in fact be quite similar.

Internal Political and Cultural Factors

Canada was settled by two European nations, the French and the English; the cultures of both have taken root in Canada. Although the French comprise only about 20% of the population, they have maintained their status as one of the founding nations. Their numerical preponderance in the second most populous province (they comprise over 80% of the population in Quebec), along with the decentralized nature of the Canadian Confederation, in which much power is entrusted to the provinces, has helped forge a society in which neither the English nor the French culture can completely dominate. The influence of a non-homogeneous culture on Canadian national identity has led to a more tolerant attitude towards ethnic and religious diversity. Such a conception of society, often referred to as the 'Canadian Mosaic', has

helped create an environment more conducive to ethnic religious education.

Religious Schools and the States

Some religious schools in Canada receive government financial support; others do not. Although Canada does not have a legally established Church, neither does it maintain a tradition of separation of Church and State. The founding document of the Canadian Confederation, the British North American Act (BNA), unlike the United States Constitution, does not sharply limit the Government's relations with religious bodies.

In 1867 when the BNA was enacted and education was regarded as a function of the Church, there were less than two thousand Jews in Canada. The BNA did not relate to the educational needs of the Jewish population nor did it discuss the possibility of providing non-denominational education. It maintained that education was an area reserved to the provinces and made it incumbent upon each province to guarantee access to the existing Catholic and Protestant schools.

The religious school clause of the BNA led to provincial funding of Catholic and Protestant schools. In some places these allocations for schooling were later expanded to include Jewish schools.

Since the early 1900s Jews have negotiated with provincial governments concerning the eligibility of Jewish schools for government funding. These negotiations proved contentious within the Jewish community. The possibility of establishing a government-funded Jewish school board, similar to the Protestant and Catholic ones, raised the thorny issue of Jewish identity and of the Jews' perception of themselves as Jews and as Canadians.

Presently four of the five provinces in which there are Jewish day schools provide government funds, although in three of these the issue is currently being re-examined. In Ontario, the one province where Jewish day schools do not receive provincial funding, the Toronto Board of Jewish Education, the central educational agency of the largest Ontario Jewish community, has been negotiating for such assistance.

Recency of Canadian Jewish History

The recency of Jewish immigration to Canada also affects Jewish education. Although the beginning of Jewish settlement in Canada can be traced back to the British occupation in the mid-eighteenth century, as an organized community Canadian Jewry has its origins in a much later East-European immigration which began in the 1880s and gained momentum in the 1900s.

Most Canadian Jews are second or third generation Canadians. The school-age population consists mainly of the children or grandchildren of immigrants. These children, even those from non-observant homes, are likely to retain memories of some members of their family observing holidays or Jewish traditions, and may even have a sense of living according to halacha (religious law). The potential clientele of the Jewish schools is composed of children who, even if they do not practice Jewish tradition themselves, are not entirely disconnected from it.

In addition, those immigrants who came to Canada after World War II greatly augmented the Orthodox element of the community. These Jews, who regard Jewish education as a religious imperative, established a number of yeshivoth and Orthodox day schools.

Demographic and Geographic Background

The vast size of Canada and the distribution of its Jewish population are important factors in determining the type and variety of Jewish institutions servicing a community. The decennial Canadian census provides a considerable amount of data on the Jews in Canada.¹

According to the 1981 census there were 296,000 Jews by religion. Another 16,000 people reported no religious preference and a Jewish ethnic origin – either as their only choice or as one in a multi-choice answer on ethnicity – bringing the total to 312,000. More than 74% of the Jewish population live in the two largest metropolitan areas of Canada. The 129,000 Jews who live in metropolitan Toronto form the largest Jewish community in Canada followed by Montreal with 103,000 Jews. The next two largest Jewish communities, Winnipeg, with 16,000, and Vancouver, with 15,000, are each only 15% the size of the Montreal community. Six other cities, Ottawa, Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton, London and Windsor have Jewish populations greater than 2,000.

Although these ten communities include more than 90% of Canadian Jewry, most Jewish communities are quite small. Given the vast size of Canada many of the people living in these places feel they are quite isolated from the other Canadian Jewish communities.

The type of Jewish education available to Jews is to a great extent dependent upon the size of the community in which they live. The two largest communities are able to provide a broad spectrum of Jewish schools with different ideological and religious orientations. At times it may seem that the educational structures are over-organized. In contrast, some small Jewish communities find it difficult to maintain even one small afternoon school.

The Structure of Jewish Education

Jewish education consists of an array of educational institutions and organizations among which are schools, professional associations, educational resource centers, central education agencies, school committees, etc. The larger the community, the more diversified are its educational institutions and the more complex is the structure of the educational system. The major component of this system, regardless of size, is the school. It is there that learning takes place and the goals of Jewish education are achieved. All other Jewish educational institutions are in a sense auxiliary, and their function is to assist in providing education rather than providing it themselves.

National Organizations

Canadian Jewry's two major national organizations, the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC) and Canadian Zionist Federation (CZF) serve the educational structure mainly by creating national forums where educational issues can be discussed and projects can be coordinated. In the past, the CJC and CZF were more directly involved with specific educational institutions; the CJC, for instance, maintained teacher training institutes in both Montreal and Toronto, while the CZF ran a Hebrew-speaking camp in Quebec.

Currently the CZF supports two national councils of professional educators and lay leaders, the National Pedagogic Council and National Educational Council. These councils, which meet four times a year alternately in Montreal and Toronto conduct an annual National Bible Contest and arrange summer Jewish studies courses for Canadian Jewish school teachers at two Israeli universities.

The CJC and CZF jointly convene the National Jewish Education Conference which meets once every three years either in Montreal or Toronto. The Conference does not seek to decide upon a policy for the whole country, but rather strives to enrich the overall quality of Jewish education, and facilitate its provision by the local communities. It does this by providing a forum in which scholars can address Canadian Jewish educators and where administrators, laymen and teachers from different sections of the country can meet and discuss mutual concerns.

The 1983 Montreal conference heard major addresses by Nathan Rotenstreich of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, on 'Judaism and Modernity', and by Shimon Frost of JESNA on 'New Educational Structures for the American Jewish Community'. The Conference divided into sub-committees where topics such as funding, teacher training and the teaching of Zionism and Israel were discussed.

Schools

The Jewish community generally categorizes schools as either 'supplementary' or 'day'. Supplementary schools hold sessions either in the afternoon or on weekends. They provide Jewish education to pupils who receive their general education in non-Jewish institutions. The Jewish supplementary school does not replace or compete with the non-Jewish public or private school. Rather it seeks to 'supplement' – as its name implies – the Jewish child's general education with a Jewish one. At one time in Canada, as is still the case in the United States, these schools were commonly referred to as 'afternoon' or 'Sunday' schools, depending on the day and time in which sessions were held.

Although there are no hard and fast rules, in the United States such schools are usually congregational. The afternoon school is more often affiliated with the Conservative movement and the Sunday school with the Reform, but there is much overlap and the Orthodox maintain such schools as well.

Canadian synagogues are affiliated either with the Orthodox, Conservative and Reform movements. But in Canada, where there are few Reform synagogues and where the Conservative movement is much less of a presence, the schools are less defined by denominations. Whether a supplementary school meets once or several times a week is more dependent on other factors, such as school budget and the school's perception of how much it can demand of its students. In small communities, meeting once or several times a week is sometimes due to the availability of people to staff the school.

The Day School

The day school assumes a much greater role in Canada than it does in the United States. Here children are taught both Jewish and general studies. The day school is the only educational institution the child attends, and therefore it holds sessions throughout the day.

Both the day and supplementary schools have their roots in the immigrant experience. The East-European Jews who came to Canada at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century provided Jewish schooling for their children in the fashion to which they were accustomed in Europe. Parents sent their son to *heder* (a one-room classroom) where he was taught by a *Melamed* (teacher or tutor). In Europe this system helped attain nearly universal Jewish literacy for males and few parents felt a need to supplement their child's education by sending him to a non-Jewish school. Indeed the Jews resisted attempts to enroll their children in government schools. In Canada, however, while nearly all Jewish children attended public school, only some of them went to *heder* and then only after public school hours. The *heder* of the immigrant community has not survived, but the decision on the

part of Jewish immigrants to give priority to general studies continues to influence Jewish education.

The Talmud Torah also had its origins in Eastern Europe where it was a charitable institution intended to provide schooling for the poor. The decision to accept all the children of the Jewish community and charge tuition only of those who could afford it changed the Talmud Torah's image and made enrollment in the school more acceptable. In Canada, where philanthropy and voluntarism became important avenues of Jewish association and identification, the Talmud Torah took on the characteristics of a communal enterprise. Many of these schools evolved into day schools and in time they became the major Jewish educational institutions in the country. The largest Jewish schools and school systems of the eight major Jewish communities (the United Talmud Torahs of Montreal, Associated Hebrew Day Schools in Toronto, the Winnipeg Hebrew School – Talmud Torah, Ottawa Talmud Torah and Hillel Academy Day School, the Vancouver Talmud Torah, the Calgary Hebrew School, the Hebrew Academy in Hamilton, and Edmonton Talmud Torah) all trace their origins to the small local Talmudei Torah of the immigrant community.

These schools are communal in the sense that they see their constituency as the entire Jewish community. However, with one exception in Winnipeg, these schools are not formally under the auspices of the organized Jewish community; indeed, two of them, in Calgary and Edmonton, are affiliated with the local government's board of education. The other five are organized as independent schools and have their own school boards to which they are responsible.

In a 1982 survey conducted by JESNA, Canadian Jewish schools were asked to report their affiliations as Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or other. Six of the eight Talmud Torah day schools responded; two checked off 'Orthodox' and four did not answer the question. Of the four, the principal of one was the rabbi of the community's only Orthodox synagogue. The principal of another school had just accepted a new position as headmaster of a yeshiva day school in the United States. A third school principal described his school's philosophy as having "three major thrusts: traditional Judaism... nationalism...(and) a curriculum designed to teach Hebrew as a living language". The fourth school was somewhat of an exception. Whereas it did not issue a formal statement concerning its orientation, its own recruitment literature refers to 'Hebrew education' rather than 'religious' or 'Jewish' education. Thus, while none of the eight day schools which evolved from communal Talmudei Torah designated themselves as either Conservative or Reform, four either declared themselves Orthodox and/or had principals who served as heads of Orthodox institutions.

A school with a different kind of orientation, the secular Yiddish school also has its roots in the immigrant community. This school was a product of

the second wave of immigration (1903–1914) which saw the arrival in Canada of Jews who had been influenced by revolutionary politics and Jewish national and cultural ideologies. Like the Talmud Torah, these schools recognized the supplementary nature of Jewish education in Canada and started out conducting their classes in the afternoon, after public school hours. These schools have modified their non-religious stance and teach Hebrew as well as Yiddish. They no longer teach a secular and radical curriculum. Nor do they expect to halt the attrition of Yiddish. In general, these schools define themselves as ‘cultural’ and ‘nationalist’ rather than ‘Orthodox’, ‘Conservative’ or ‘Reform’. Five of these schools have become day schools, and of these, two made the transition as early as the 1920s. In the four communities where they are located, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Calgary, they have provided an alternative to the Talmud Torah day school.

According to the principal of one of these schools, “though this institution is a non-synagogue oriented school, it does familiarize its students with the Siddur...and religious practices are taught.” The recruitment pamphlet of a second former secular Yiddish school describes the school’s goal “to effect a positive attitude...and degree of intimacy with Jewish...holidays, customs, ceremonies and traditions”.

Since these schools seek to serve all segments of the community they cannot afford to vary too much from what they perceive to be the norms in Jewish education. Just as the Talmud Torah schools which define their orientation as Orthodox feel pressure to accommodate pupils who come from a non-observant background, so these former secular schools find themselves under subtle pressures to demonstrate their loyalty to Jewish tradition and appreciation of Jewish ritual observance.

There is a third type of day school with a very different approach to the community’s norms. These schools, yeshivoth and some Orthodox day schools, are located in the five largest Jewish communities in Canada. They do not seek to minimize religious differences between them and other groups, and they limit enrollment to children of Orthodox families. Their curriculum emphasizes the practical application of Jewish studies to the daily observance of halacha.

There are other day schools as well, especially in Toronto and Montreal. In Calgary, where the Talmud Torah described its educational program as ‘Hebraic’ rather than ‘religious’, a new Orthodox day school was recently established. This school belongs to an organization of Orthodox day schools, *Torah U’Mesorah*, and only employs Jewish studies teachers who observe halacha, but its student body consists mainly of non-Orthodox children. Perhaps, where the orientation of the school is concerned, the distinction should not be made as to whether the school affiliates with the Orthodox, Conservative or Reform movement, but rather whether the school seeks to serve the

whole Jewish community or only that segment which shares its religious-ideological position.

Those schools which regard themselves as Orthodox but accept non-Orthodox pupils face the sensitive problem of the conflict between family and school. The child may resent the school for fostering beliefs and religious obligations which his parents do not accept. Conversely, the school may cause the child to reject his parents' approach to Judaism, thereby creating conflict in the home. The potential for discontinuity between home and school may be especially high in communities that have only one day school to serve the entire community. Indeed, three such communities have a history of strife over precisely this issue. In one of them the local federation intervened and negotiated a change in the school committee representation to allow greater parental input. As Charles Liebman has noted, Jews define "Judaism as a religion but fill...(it) with ethnic or communal content." The policy of accepting non-Orthodox children to Orthodox schools is not merely a means to increase registration but may relate to a religious desire to serve the community.

Given the general propensity of Canadian Jews to regard themselves as both a religious and ethnic group,² the issue that distinguishes between schools' orientations may no longer be the secular or religious approach of the curricula, but rather the actual observance or non-observance of religious practices in the school. Yet it is possible that we have too easily dismissed the ideological differences between schools which may be more than just vestiges of the past. A suggestion by the executive director of one of the central Jewish educational agencies that a high school which was once a radical Yiddish secular school merge with a Talmud Torah high school was immediately dismissed by both parties, at least partially because of ideological differences. On the other hand, a merger did take place between two such elementary day schools in Winnipeg. But this merger, which was economically advantageous to both schools as well as to the community as a whole, took nearly a decade to effect.

The Supplementary School

Supplementary schools do not assume the major responsibility for educating the Jewish child. Unlike the day school which must meet government regulations concerning at least the general studies aspect of the curriculum, the supplementary school is under no compulsion to heed any standards but its own self-imposed ones. Most supplementary schools in Canada are congregational. Final authority for the conduct of these schools rests with the congregation which usually acts through an appointed school committee. Enrollment is not restricted but some schools charge higher tuition to children of non-members. In small communities (those with a Jewish population of less

than 1,000), the congregation is often the only Jewish institution and thus the congregational school constitutes a communal school as well.

Canada also has ten supplementary Yiddish schools in its communities. These schools were founded in a much earlier period when the community was mainly Yiddish-speaking,³ and when the Jewish labor movement was a much stronger force in the community. Just as the Yiddish day schools dropped their radical stance, these schools stress culture and history, and teach Hebrew as well as Yiddish. They often suffer low enrollments and are perceived by their opponents to be teaching a curriculum that is no longer relevant. Even their supporters do not really expect them to succeed in keeping Yiddish alive but rather contend that the school's curriculum instills an understanding and a certain reverence for Yiddish and the society which spoke it.

In Canada with its vast land mass and sparse population many small Jewish communities are quite isolated from each other and must rely on their own resources for Jewish education. Whether they even have a school is often dependent upon the voluntary services of community members. The schools in these communities often constitute the only ongoing Jewish activity in the region. They serve as a focal point socially as well as educationally for the Jewish child.

Day vs. Supplementary Schools

In communities that have both supplementary and day schools, the question often arises as to how the organized community should deal with these two different structures. On one hand there is the opinion that all forms of Jewish education should be supported and, since the decision concerning type of Jewish education remains a parental one, the community should stay neutral and offer its support to all the schools. But many Jewish educators are critical of the quality of education which they believe the supplementary school is capable of offering and feel it is their responsibility to promote a better alternative. Moreover, the greater financial expense involved in maintaining day schools has led community leaders to mobilize the community on behalf of the day school, sometimes to the detriment of the supplementary school.

The competition between day schools and supplementary schools has other ramifications as well. Just as the choice of school in which to enroll one's child may be seen as a sign of ideological or religious orientation, so the decision as to whether one's child should attend a day school or a supplementary school has been perceived as a statement of the value one places on Jewish education. In some circles it is taken as a measure of one's commitment to Judaism.

The pro-supplementary school approach is perhaps more concerned with that part of the school age population that does not attend any Jewish school.

It emphasizes the role these schools can play in increasing the number of children who receive at least some Jewish education.

The three central Jewish education agencies in Canada all respond differently to this issue. One agency has hardly any contact with the supplementary schools and does not even have records of their enrollment figures. A second relates to the supplementary schools as it does to day schools and the third agency has just issued a report of what it contends is the tendency to treat the supplementary schools as 'step-children' of the community. In one of the large communities which is able to offer many options, the ambiguous attitude toward supplementary education has led to a plethora of new programs designed to interest Jewish students. Among these are Jewish clubs that meet once a week either in private homes, in public high schools after classes, or as lunch-hour activity programs in a non-Jewish elementary school in a Jewish neighborhood. Critics of these programs, however, have expressed concern with what these programs hope to accomplish and with the quality of the education they provide.

Enrollment Patterns⁴

There are at least 134 Jewish schools in Canada, of which 50 are day schools and 84 are supplementary. Only the three largest communities have Jewish day high schools, but all ten cities with a Jewish population of 2,000 or more have at least one day school, and some type of Jewish school is found in each of the seventeen largest communities in which 98% of Canada's Jews live. In addition there are schools in some of the very small communities as well. No community with less than 500 Jews maintains more than one supplementary school.

Toronto

There are 46 Jewish schools in the Toronto metropolitan area with a combined pupil enrollment of just over 13,200 pupils. 14 of these schools are day schools and 32 are supplementary. Some 7,200 pupils (55% of all Jewish school enrollment) attend the day schools. Five of the day schools accept students from all segments of the community. One limits its enrollment to children of families who are members of a synagogue and eight receive only children from Orthodox households.

Enrollment drops dramatically for high school. Less than 10% of elementary day school students continue in the day high school. Nearly 600 students attend four day high schools. Of these, more than half are enrolled in a communal school which is responsible directly to the Toronto Board of Jewish Education. The other four schools have restrictive enrollment policies and are maintained as independent Orthodox institutions.

The 32 supplementary schools include 20 schools affiliated or directly responsible to Orthodox, Conservative and Reform congregations, two schools which were once considered Yiddish-secular institutions and now define themselves as cultural and national schools, and ten other schools which are not formally affiliated. Approximately 6,000 pupils are enrolled in Toronto Jewish supplementary schools.

Montreal

The Montreal Jewish school directory listed 35 schools, 24 day and 11 supplementary schools with a combined enrollment of 8,800 pupils in 1983. About 80% of the pupils were in day schools. Of these, 5,200 (or 59% of all Jewish school enrollment) attended elementary day schools. Despite a wide variety of high schools reflecting a broad spectrum of orientations and approaches, substantially fewer students attended Jewish day high schools – about 2,000 in 1983.

Between 1978 and 1983 student enrollment steadily increased in the day high school from about 1,500 to 2,000. This change reflects both a greater number of children graduating the elementary day school – the feeder institution of day high schools – and a greater percentage of elementary school graduates choosing to attend Jewish day high schools (from 87 to 93% in six years).

A recent study of day school space requirements commissioned by the Montreal federation projected a continuing increase in local day high school enrollment despite a levelling off of elementary school graduates. It listed a number of reasons for this phenomenon – "a basic desire for Jewish education...dissatisfaction with the quality of public education...‘return to the roots’ during hard times...and a sense of belonging to a well-defined community..." – but warned that high school enrollment would probably peak during the next decade. The commission recommended that no new schools be established but that present institutions consider expanding their facilities. One high school is erecting a new building and a second one is adding an annex.

Nine of the eleven supplementary schools listed in the directory are congregational schools, one is a Yiddish school and one is affiliated with the Lubavitch movement. In 1981, 1,600 children were enrolled in these schools.

The enrollment patterns and participation rates of the two largest Canadian Jewish communities vary considerably. A smaller percentage of school-age children attend Jewish schools in Montreal than in Toronto but a greater percentage of these are enrolled in day schools – at both elementary and high school levels. This dissimilarity is at least partially a function of the different internal and external factors affecting the two communities.

The Toronto Board of Jewish Education, unlike the Jewish Education Council of Montreal, has long supported Jewish supplementary schools. The

Board allocates federation subsidies to the schools, regulates the licensing of their teachers and, to some extent, attempts to assure minimal curricular objectives. Whether the Toronto central educational agency's greater involvement in supplementary schools has made supplementary education more acceptable to the community or, vice-versa, whether a larger supplementary school enrollment has led the Board to devote more attention to this aspect of Jewish education is difficult to determine.

Until recently most national Jewish organizations maintained their central offices in Montreal. This situation, as Daniel Elazar has noted concerning New York, tends to make the local Jewish community more ideological and leads to a concentration of the cultural leadership. Today Montreal's pre-eminence is being challenged as some national Jewish organizations have moved and others are considering transferring their headquarters to Toronto. Nevertheless, the past concentration of the national cultural leadership may have been responsible for the founding of a broad and ideologically diverse network of Jewish day schools which still characterizes the city's Jewish educational structure.

In addition, certain political and cultural factors within the province of Quebec – the salience of the language question, the nationalist aspirations of many French-speaking residents as well as a tendency to send one's children to private rather than public school which is more normative and widespread in Quebec than in Ontario – may also account for the larger day school enrollment in Montreal.

Economic factors should also be considered. Although Ontario has not provided Toronto schools with large per-child grants, the schools, through communal support and by other means have been able to fix tuition fees at rates that are comparable to those in Montreal. Likewise both communities offer tuition assistance to children of needy families. Nonetheless Toronto spends less money per enrolled child (\$2,885 Canadian) than Montreal (\$3,186) on day school education. The effect of this \$301 differential on the quality of education and on enrollment patterns is arguable but does not appear to be very significant.

Winnipeg and Vancouver

The educational structure and enrollment patterns of the two largest of Canada's medium-sized communities are also dissimilar.

In Winnipeg three elementary day schools and one day high school amalgamated into a day school system. This system is run by the Winnipeg Board of Jewish Education and is open to all Jewish children of the city. Furthermore, the Winnipeg public school system has a Hebrew language heritage program whose curriculum parallels the Jewish day school's in many ways. Winnipeg also has an independent Orthodox day school whose enrollment is

limited to children of observant families. Four supplementary schools also serve the Winnipeg community. These, like the independent Orthodox day school, do not receive federation funds and are neither part of nor affiliated with the Winnipeg Board of Jewish Education.

Vancouver has two day schools, one communal with traditional orientation which receives a community subsidy and accepts all segments of the Jewish school-age population and an Orthodox one, which is affiliated with the Lubavitch movement and receives no communal funds. Vancouver also has six supplementary schools.

The Vancouver community has more Jewish children of school-age than does Winnipeg, but more children and a greater percentage of school-age children attend Jewish schools in Winnipeg than in Vancouver. The different enrollment pattern is especially pronounced in the day schools. Indeed, more children and a greater percentage of the school-age population attended day schools in Winnipeg in 1981 than attended day and supplementary schools combined in Vancouver.

The wide differences in enrollment and educational structure suggests that the number of pupils and types of schools in a given place depends not only on the size of the community. Nor do economic factors offer sufficient explanation: Winnipeg day schools receive provincial grants of \$480 per pupil and Vancouver nearly twice that amount (\$912).

Winnipeg Jewry regards itself as unique and considers itself a very Jewishly committed community (indeed, a Winnipeg Jewish community leader boasted to this writer that Winnipeg has the greatest per-capita aliyah rate in North America). The large number of day schools in Winnipeg, the functioning of a day high school and the largest per-child federation grant to Jewish education in North America all point to the important role Jewish education occupies in the concerns and priorities of this community.

By contrast, Vancouver has a more recently developed community. Many of its members moved to this city from other parts of Canada rather than directly from the more traditional society of Eastern Europe as did the Jews in Winnipeg. It is possible that such factors at least partially account for differences in enrollment and apparent commitment to Jewish education in the two communities.

Other Medium and Small Size Communities

Both Ottawa and Calgary maintain more than one day school apiece, and four other communities each have one day school. The eight medium size communities are served by 19 supplementary schools, most of which are affiliated with congregations.

Although the participation rates vary widely from community to community, the overall rate is similar to the situation in Montreal and Toronto. Yet,

very few of the Jewish high school age population are receiving a Jewish education.

Many of the smaller communities lack the economic and human resources to establish a Jewish school. Nevertheless, at least 21 of them provide their children with some sort of formal Jewish education on a regular basis. According to reports sent to JESNA and the Canadian Jewish Congress, 876 pupils attended 23 schools in small communities in 1981-82. There is a dire need for qualified Jewish studies teachers in these communities, but many factors mitigate against the community meeting these needs.

A typical Jewish school in such a community consists of a small number of children divided into one or two classes which meet a few hours a week. Such a school is unable to offer full-time employment to Jewish teachers. Some communities seek individuals who can serve as Rabbi and cantor, as well as Jewish studies teacher. Very few people meet all these qualifications, and in many cases those that do are reluctant to go to small communities that are distant from the main Jewish centers.

On the other hand, the very smallness of such communities necessitates the participation of a large proportion of the Jewish population, and in some places, all or nearly all Jewish children attend the community school. These schools are often the only places where Jewish children can meet on a regular basis, and they serve a social as well as an educational function. Communities view the school not only as a means of teaching their children Hebrew or making them more knowledgeable about Judaism, but also as a mechanism to buttress their Jewishness and act as a bulwark against assimilation.

The size of the small community is a major factor determining the amount and extent of Jewish education a community can provide. Jewish schools in the small communities are all supplementary.⁵ The seven 'largest' small communities, those with Jewish populations between 500 and 2,000 (in order by size): Kitchener, Halifax, Saint-Catherines, Kingston, Regina, Victoria and Saskatoon), all maintain Sunday or afternoon schools which meet in a communal building, usually a synagogue. In contrast, some of the smaller communities, such as the twenty-five families in Prince Edward Island, the ten families in Bridgewater, Nova Scotia, or the nine families which comprise the Antigonish Jewish community, meet on a monthly or bi-monthly basis in private homes. The Jewish educational program for these communities often consists of study groups led on a voluntary basis by an adult member of the community. In several of these communities, parents as well as children participate in the sessions, and the teachers or discussion leaders are frequently self-taught.

The existence of any Jewish educational format in many of these communities is due solely to the motivation and concern of their members. The success or failure of that program is often dependent upon the willingness and

capability of one or two members of the community. Here, too, as in the case of the larger and medium size communities, the Jewish educational structure in the end is dependent upon the values and concerns of the community itself.

Financing Jewish Education

Jewish education is a multimillion dollar enterprise and is thus one of the more expensive endeavors of the organized Canadian Jewish community, too expensive to be borne by one source alone. Canadian Jewish educational institutions receive their revenue from four major sources – government, federation, tuition and private fundraising. These sources not only enable the community to educate its children, but also influence the type and nature of Jewish education the community can provide.

The two largest communities, Toronto and Montreal, together with Winnipeg and Ottawa, spend \$51 million (Canadian) or \$194 per person on Jewish education. The largest part of that sum, \$43 million, goes for day school education. In these communities, 15,300 children attend day schools, the average cost being \$2,800 per pupil.

These four communities depend upon all the major sources of financing to meet the costs of Jewish education. The amount of money each of these sources raises varies considerably and is to a large extent a function of different provincial government support schemes for private education. Montreal day schools receive \$2,198 per high school and \$1,538 per elementary school pupil from the Quebec government, compared to \$480 per pupil in Winnipeg and no provincial grants per pupil in Toronto and Ottawa.

Jewish federation allocations appear to be inversely proportional to government grants in at least three of these four communities. Jewish education in Montreal received 53% of its \$24.1 million budget from government (federal and provincial), and only 4% from the local federation, compared to a mere 2% of the combined \$24.3 million Toronto and Ottawa budgets from government and 21% from federations. The ratio of government-federation support differed for Winnipeg where government provided 10% and federation 40% of the community's educational budget. As mentioned before, the Winnipeg federation allocation (more than one-million dollars) constitutes the largest per-child communal allocation to Jewish education in North America.

The percentage raised by day school tuition was less in Montreal (38%) than in the other three communities (an average of 58%), probably a result of the much larger per-child provincial grant enjoyed by Montreal.

Government Support

One issue affecting Jewish education today over which the community has only limited control is that of government support for the Jewish schools. Paradoxically the fact that a provincial government is financing Jewish education is a mixed blessing. In general those schools which have attained government support have been able to both raise teachers' salaries as well as lower pupils' tuition. However, in some provinces the prerequisites for government support could be met only by changing the curriculum and restructuring the school. These changes were not acceptable to all members of the community, and sometimes the consequences involved the community in issues not directly related to education which they had assiduously tried to avoid.

Quebec

In 1982 the Quebec government granted \$11 million to the Jewish day schools. This sum constituted 46% of the money spent on all forms of Jewish education in Quebec and was indeed greater than the Montreal federation's combined expenditures on local needs for that year.

However, in order to receive these grants, the Jewish schools were forced to comply with two basic conditions. The first required an increase in the number of hours of French instruction per week to fourteen. The second prevented Jewish schools from accepting all Jewish children who wished to attend.

In 1976, in order to ensure the predominance of French language and culture in Quebec, the government had enacted new language legislation, Bill 101, limiting immigrants' access to schools in which the language of instruction and the student body were not French. Jewish schools were soon compelled to exclude from their rolls any Jewish child whose parents had not studied in an English language school in Quebec before 1977. Under Bill 101 Jewish families moving to Montreal from Toronto or from the United States could not send their children to most Jewish day schools. This injustice placed the community in the difficult position of having to refuse to allow parents to send their children to the Jewish school of their choice; it also made it difficult for the Jewish community to attract new members. While the community was united in its opposition to the new government conditions, it was divided over how it should respond. Suggestions varied from objection and rejection to mild protest and quiet accommodation. Editorial opinion in the general English and Jewish press accused the government of sacrificing the educational well-being of pupils to party ideology. The organized Jewish community, however, was less vociferous. It sought to deal with the problem through established channels.

The Association of Jewish Day Schools (AJDS), an organization composed of representatives of Jewish day schools and responsible directly to them, had been established earlier to represent the schools before the government on educational matters. At first, the AJDS, which operates by unanimous consent, found it difficult to agree upon a proper response. However, when one of its member schools, faced with the probability that two of its pupils would be declared ineligible, decided to retain these children even if it meant rejecting provincial assistance, the matter came to a head. Not only did other members of the AJDS worry that such action might endanger government assistance to their schools and to Jewish day school education in general, but certain federation leaders let it be known that schools rejecting government assistance would not receive extra funding from the federation. In the end the government's interpretation of the status of the two children permitted them to remain in their school, but other children facing a similar situation are now excluded. Today the once recalcitrant school receives federation funding and is a member of the AJDS which still operates by unanimous consent and the government continues to fund the Jewish day schools.

Government support for Jewish education has meant not only the exclusion of some children from the Jewish school of their choice, but has led to rifts within the community over difficult questions concerning politics (e.g., the right to dissent, what tactics to use, how to protest effectively), or language and culture (e.g., English instruction versus Jewish studies in Hebrew and Yiddish).

Bill 40, legislation on educational reform which the provincial government recently introduced raises both new opportunities for Jewish education as well as new concerns for Quebec Jewry. Bill 40 would restructure the present denominational school system (Catholic and Protestant boards) and replace it with a structure that would permit each school to decide on its orientation. Theoretically, it would be possible under such a bill for the parents of children in a school that had once been part of the Protestant board, but whose pupils were mainly Jewish, to vote that their school would be a Jewish school. Such a school, according to Bill 40, would be both a government school and a Jewish one. The potential effects of the bill on Jewish education in Quebec are far reaching. Religious and moral education would be mandatory subjects, but parents could form a committee that would decide on the school's approach in accordance with their orientation. There would no longer be questions of how much the government would assist Jewish education for in a sense providing Jewish education would no longer depend on voluntarism and philanthropy but would, if the parents so willed it, become a government responsibility.

However, the bill also raises difficult questions concerning a Jew's right not to seek a Jewish education. Heretofore, Jewish education in Quebec was voluntary. Jewish leaders may have occasionally pressured, perhaps even

cajoled other Jews into sending their children to Jewish schools, but there was no question that the amount and type of Jewish education one gave one's children was a private matter. Moreover there were always some Jews, until recently perhaps the majority, who wished to educate their children in local non-Jewish schools where their children could be exempted from religious education. Under the new bill, however, such exemptions would no longer be granted, as the religious and moral education taught in the school supposedly reflects the orientation of the children's parents.

Bill 40 also threatens to end the Protestant School Board, a Board that was regarded as a bastion of the English language. This too, troubles the Jews. Bill 40 raises difficult questions for the community. Should the Jews regard it as a blessing, an opportunity to make Jewish day school education in Quebec nearly universal, or as a threat to the equilibrium the Jews have tried to achieve between being Jewish as well as a member of the general society? Once more Jewish education has become a contentious issue for the community.

Other Provinces

In other provinces Jews are grappling with different problems in their dealings with the provincial government. In Alberta, Jewish day schools in Calgary and Edmonton negotiated a contract whereby their schools joined the Calgary and Edmonton public school system. They became alternative schools that any resident in Calgary or Edmonton could attend; as a result, a small number of non-Jews do attend these schools. Parents still have to pay tuition for certain aspects of the school that differ from the others, such as salaries during Jewish holidays, expenses concerning specifically Jewish studies, etc. But all other aspects are covered by the government. In Calgary, the Jewish Day Talmud Torah had to redefine itself as a Hebrew cultural rather than religious school, but the Board recognized that religion was part of the curriculum.

Then, in November 1983, a newly elected Calgary school board which was ideologically opposed to religious schools voted not to renew its contract with the Jewish school. In June 1984, two Jewish day schools lost their public school status. The future status of these schools is quite uncertain. No one yet knows how much the tuition will be raised or how many children will leave because of that hike. What services will be reduced? Nor is it clear what will happen to the teachers (including those who teach Jewish studies) who have tenure and have accrued seniority within the public school system. At the time of this writing the public school board in Edmonton has raised no such problems and the contract between them and the Edmonton Talmud Torah remains valid.

In Manitoba, the Winnipeg Board of Education opened a special Hebrew language heritage program in two of its schools that provides Hebrew lan-

guage and culture, where culture has been defined to include a religious dimension, and the curriculum includes teaching of siddur, celebration of holidays, etc. Parents now have the option of sending their children to a public school, where Hebrew and Jewish studies are taught, and paying no tuition or sending them to a Jewish day school and paying several thousand dollars. The resultant loss to the Jewish schools may have caused the Yiddishist Peretz school to merge with the religiously oriented Talmud Torah. The Peretz School building now has a kosher kitchen and its male students must cover their heads during Jewish studies classes in Hebrew but not in Yiddish.

The Manitoba government's new policy to promote Jewish education not only helped affect a merger between two schools with long histories of ideological disagreement but also encouraged the Board of Jewish Education to try to negotiate a new agreement whereby its day schools would become part of the Winnipeg School system. The Jewish community in Winnipeg was divided over these negotiations. The community experienced a 20% decrease in population over ten years, and Federation leaders worried that their campaign (which provided about one-million dollars to Jewish education, or \$1,000 per child) might no longer be able to support their day schools. They hoped to solve their fiscal problem by means of an agreement with the School Board. On the other hand, two very divergent groups opposed the negotiations. The more assimilated segment of the Jewish community which supported a public school system joined forces with Orthodox members of the community who feared that government funding would lead to non-Jewish tampering with Jewish education.

In British Columbia, the Vancouver Talmud Torah receives grants made available to independent private schools which meet the general requirements concerning secular studies. The government grant enables the school to reduce the average tuition cost of each pupil by nearly \$1,000.

Ontario, the only province whose government does not fund Jewish day schools is the home of half the Jews in Canada. The seemingly skyrocketing cost of Jewish education has led to both increase in tuition and to greater federation allocations. The Toronto federation allocates four-million dollars, five times the allocation of the Montreal federation for almost the same number of day school pupils. Ontario day schools are experiencing the high cost of the absence of government support.

Federation Funding of Jewish Education

In Canada as in the United States, the Jewish community is organized on a federal basis. In both countries local federations serve central fundraising and coordinating functions in all but the smallest of Jewish communities. It

is through these federations that most Canadian Jewish day schools and some supplementary schools receive their communal funding.

In the past, Canadian and American federations related quite differently to the Jewish educational needs of their communities. In the early years of their development most Canadian but few federations in the United States allocated funds to Jewish educational institutions. Since the 1960s, as American federations assumed greater financial responsibilities for Jewish education, these differences have begun to diminish. However, Canadian communities still tend to allocate more federation funds to education than do their counterparts in the United States.⁶

The disparity between the percentage allocations of United States and Canadian federations for Jewish education reflects certain historical differences between the two North American Jewish communities. The federation movement in America traces its origin to American German-Jewish immigrants of the mid-nineteenth century and their children who founded and were the mainstays of federations in the early 20th century. These Jews looked askance at Jewish day school education, and believed that it would impede their Jewish children's integration into American society. Canadian federations, however, were founded by East-European Jews who came from a milieu in which Jewish separatism from general society was widely accepted. These Jews also sought to integrate into the general society, but were less fearful of the separatist influence of Jewish day schools.

Greater communal support of Canadian day schools may also be due to the pressure parents of day school pupils have been able to exert on their local federations. Since, in some Canadian communities, the parents of day school children constitute a large segment of the community from which the federation seeks to raise its funds, the parent body is sometimes able to influence federation allocations. In Montreal, for instance, the federation did not provide financial assistance until the mid-1970s when day school parents threatened withdrawal of support.

A well organized or large enough parent-body may also influence the arrangements between the United Israel Appeal (UIA) and local federation over the division of communal funds for local and overseas needs. In 1981 when the hardships of the recession made it necessary for many more Montreal parents to seek tuition scholarships for their children's day school education, the local federation demanded and received an additional \$400,000 of its annual campaign receipts for local needs. In 1983, the Winnipeg federation negotiated a non-interest bearing loan from the UIA that would allow the federation to liquidate its local indebtedness most of which was due to expenditure on Jewish education.

Although federation policies towards education may differ from community to community, on certain issues there is no disagreement. All eleven federations (Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Ottawa, Hamilton, Cal-

gary, Edmonton, London, Windsor and Halifax) help finance Jewish education. All federations, as a pre-condition for financial support require that schools submit their annual budgets and enrollment data, and that the financial needs of parents requesting reductions in tuition be verified.

Although the constitutions of some federations provide them with a mandate to "enhance Jewish education...in all its aspects" federations for the most part have hesitated from intervening in non-economic matters and have steered clear of ideological controversy. Nonetheless federation funding of Jewish education has forced the community to relate to its own educational needs and to give thought to the relative value it places on Jewish education.

Communal Support in Non-Federated Communities

In communities that are too small to maintain federations the situation is somewhat different. In some of the smaller congregational communities, the funding of Jewish education is a communal responsibility. Not all Jewish residents are necessarily members of the community in the area, and membership in the congregational community is a voluntary matter as it is in the federation. But once people join the organized community, they and their families are entitled to all the community's services, including Jewish education.

Tuition Fees

Tuition comprises the parents' major financial obligation towards the day school. The determination of tuition fees and the actual amount charged is often a function of government policy, as the size of the government grant helps determine how much the schools must raise in tuition. But government's influence on school tuition policy, although substantial, is usually indirect. Generally, in Quebec and Alberta, where government grants are largest, school tuition rates are lowest.

Federations are more concerned than governments with how much schools charge their parental body. Even in Quebec where the law limits tuition fees to 50% of government per-pupil grants, the government has not become involved in this matter since, theoretically at least, tuition pays for the school's religious education, an aspect of the curricula not covered by the law. In Winnipeg where the day schools are communally operated, tuition fees are determined by the Winnipeg Board of Jewish Education, an agency funded almost completely by the federation. In Toronto and Hamilton where schools are autonomous institutions, the federation has insisted that schools receiving its funding set tuition fees at least per pupil cost. In these communi-

ties, federation allocation to education is based mainly on the amount needed to cover tuition-fee reductions which, in turn, are granted according to established communal guidelines. Montreal, where each school follows its own criteria for determining tuition fees, is somewhat of an exception. The Montreal federation finds itself called upon to help parents pay tuition fees over which it has little control. This situation had led to the formation of a day school funding committee composed of representatives from both the schools and the federation. The committee has discussed the establishment of standardized criteria and has considered the idea of unified fees for different day schools.

In Alberta and Quebec where government grants have substantially reduced the amount of money needed from other sources, many schools have set tuition at higher than the actual cost per pupil after the government grant, yet seemingly low enough not to dissuade parents from enrolling their children. The fact that these fees were higher than cost has enabled the schools to make up most of the difference between the fee reductions offered to low income families and actual costs. The policy in some schools of charging more than per-pupil cost has led to complaints that high tuition rates unfairly force some parents to subsidize others. These parents contend that the responsibility of providing Jewish education for the less affluent should be borne by the community, and not by other day school parents.

In Calgary, Alberta, a new relationship between the schools and the board of education was expected to lead to substantially higher tuition fees. Because of reduced government support, actual per-pupil costs were expected to increase substantially. Higher tuition fees, however, were not expected to adequately meet the increased per-pupil costs.

Although people may disagree over how fee reductions should be financed, there is a general consensus that day school education should be available to all children of the community regardless of their parents' ability to pay tuition. But here too the community may be faced with a dilemma, especially when it has to decide between assisting needy parents or supporting other worthwhile causes.

When the 1981-82 recession led to a much greater demand for fee reductions, some school committees found themselves in the difficult position of having to act in a 'financially responsible manner' in terms of their schools' budget, and sometimes refused to admit children whose parents were unable to pay. Some of these schools confronted their federations, which because of the recession were also strapped for funds. Some federations, as already noted, negotiated with the United Israel Appeal extra funds for tuition fee reductions. Jewish educational needs and the tuition policies of the schools found themselves in conflict with financial support for Israel.

Little is known of the actual effects of tuition rates on day school enrollment. It is generally assumed that by charging tuition, even if fee reductions

are available, schools deter some of the less affluent of the community from enrolling their children in day schools. But other factors are also important. On the one hand, people who may not hesitate to take out a loan for a car or pay thousands of dollars annually for day-care or perhaps much more for a university education might be reluctant to pay or borrow similar amounts for Jewish day school education. On the other hand, studies of the American Jewish community have noted the importance of investing in the associational process, to develop "formal or lasting Jewish attachments" (Elazar, 1976). In Canada where the community is also organized on a federal basis and where philanthropy serves as a major source of communal revenue, the situation is probably the same. There too, enrolling one's child in a Jewish day school is one way of establishing "formal or lasting Jewish attachments".

Tuition policy deals with much more than with the dollars and cents issues of who is to pay how much for Jewish education. This policy affects the very availability of Jewish education. It also reflects the manner in which the community is organized – the relationship of financial expenditure to communal participation – as well as the priority Canadian Jews place on their children's Jewish education and the schools' and community's assessment of that priority and the commitment it implies.

Private Fundraising

In an earlier period when government grants, federation allocations and tuition fees provided a smaller share of school budgets, day schools were much more dependent upon private fundraising. Yiddish and national-cultural schools relied on fraternal and labor-Zionist organizations for support, and Talmud Torah schools sought out wealthy lay leaders to join their school boards. Today, the membership of the organizations supporting Yiddish and national-cultural schools has greatly declined and is no longer able to provide much economic assistance. Likewise, the lay-boards of the Talmud Torah schools, which are composed mainly of parents, also lack the resources for major fundraising projects.

These developments hold implications regarding the type of education the school will provide. Indeed, greater parental representation on the board may help rectify the problem of discontinuity between home and school. In the realm of funding, however, it presents difficult problems. Such problems may be especially acute when schools decide to embark upon capital expansion which involves expenditures not usually funded by governments and federations.

Staffing Jewish Schools

Teachers

Teachers in Jewish schools in Canada are often categorized according to the type of school in which they are employed. This division reflects the different conditions and needs of day and supplementary schools. However, many teachers teach in both types of schools and there is much overlap between the two categories.

Supplementary School Teachers

In all but one community there are no formal binding rules regarding qualifications for teaching Jewish subjects in supplementary schools, and the schools are free to determine their own criteria for hiring teachers. Only in Toronto, where federation funded schools are required to engage certified teachers, has the organized community attempted to regulate the qualifications of its supplementary school teachers.

There are few institutions in Canada where one can train to become a supplementary school teacher. Again, Toronto is an exception. One Toronto synagogue maintains its own teacher training program for the teen-age graduates of its supplementary school, and the Toronto Jewish Teachers' Seminary conducts a summer institute to train teachers for the supplementary schools. In addition, some students majoring in Jewish education at York University in Toronto and McGill University in Montreal teach part-time in supplementary schools while preparing to become day school teachers.

Many supplementary school teachers gained their expertise in Jewish education from sources other than Jewish teacher training programs. The teaching staff of supplementary schools often includes university students who are majoring or have taken courses in Jewish studies, ordained rabbis or their wives, immigrants whose knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish studies is derived from their education in their country of origin (usually Israel, or Poland before World War II) or Canadian Jews who have lived in Israel and acquired a knowledge of Hebrew.

The limited number of hours in which the supplementary school holds sessions makes full-time employment difficult to attain. In order to work full-time one must somehow find teaching positions in schools which hold sessions at different times. Some teachers teach at more than one supplementary school, while others teach in a day school in the morning and a supplementary school in the afternoon. When supplementary schools, which hold classes in the afternoon after public school sessions are concluded, were first established, one of the pioneers of these institutions, Samson Benderly, hoped to make them "so interesting and so stimulating as to get response even of tired children." But even experienced and qualified teachers find it

difficult to “interest” and “stimulate...tired” children when they themselves arrive already fatigued from teaching in the day school. The supplementary school, however, is dependent upon such teachers. Indeed, many principals of these schools prefer teachers who work full-time in Jewish education and regard teaching as their career, to others who perhaps relate to supplementary Jewish education as a means of complementing their spouses’ income with a few hours of afternoon or weekend teaching.

Most supplementary schools pay their teachers an hourly rate. The central agencies of the two largest communities have issued guidelines on these rates, which, however, are not binding. These wage-rates are not easily comparable as the Montreal scale is based on weekly hours while the Toronto one is concerned with annual hourly income. Nonetheless they may give an idea of how much the supplementary school teacher can earn in the large communities in Canada.

According to the Montreal scale, a beginning teacher with a B.A. with or without certification, should receive \$11 (Canadian) an hour. The same teacher, with five years experience, should receive \$17 an hour. Since full-time employment at a supplementary school which meets two hours a day for five days a week provides 10 hours of instruction, a full-time beginning teacher, and a teacher with five years experience would earn \$110 and \$170 a week respectively, or \$4,400 and \$6,800 for a 40 week school year.

The Toronto wage-guideline which does not differentiate between the hourly wages earned by teachers in supplementary and day schools recommends higher rates than does its counterpart in Montreal. In both cases a beginning teacher with a B.A. and teacher’s certificate would earn \$653 per hour per school year. A teacher with the same academic qualifications and five years teachers’ experience would earn \$889 per hour per school year. Ten hours of weekly instruction, according to this suggested scale would provide \$6,532 and \$8,888 annually, respectively.

Since Statistics Canada (the Canadian Central Bureau of Statistics) defined the poverty level of a family in a large city for the year 1981 as \$19,751 (\$17,183 U.S.) such teachers are barely eking out a living, and supplementary school teaching can hardly be considered a viable profession.

The woeful lack of academic and professional standards for supplementary school teachers and the poor remuneration offered them cause serious problems for a community seeking to attract qualified supplementary school teachers.

Day School Teachers

Most day schools pay higher salaries and offer greater opportunity for full employment than do supplementary schools. They also maintain more rigorous standards concerning the academic and pedagogic training of the teachers they hire.

In four of the five provinces in which day schools are located and which are provided with government funding, Jewish studies day school teachers must meet government certification requirements. When the Manitoba provincial government began providing per-child grants to the day schools in Winnipeg, it required that non-certified teachers already employed in the Jewish schools begin studying towards a Bachelor of Education degree at a minimum rate of six credits per year.

In Alberta, where Jewish day schools are part of the local public school system, the local school board rather than the Jewish school hires the teachers and determines whether they have the proper credentials. Here too, special arrangements have had to be made concerning both the teachers who were working in the day school before it joined the public school system and the Israeli *shlihim*. Since the *shlihim* teach in Canada for only a limited time, the Alberta government classified them as exchange teachers and provided them with a special waiver allowing them to teach up to two years without certification.

The impact of provincial government requirements on the quality of Jewish studies teachers and their teaching is difficult to assess. One assumes that even without government regulations, day schools would seek to hire the more qualified Jewish studies teachers available. Nevertheless, provincial regulations compelling Jewish studies teachers to attain an undergraduate university degree in education may have a salutary effect on the Jewish studies teaching profession.

The effect of provincial regulations is also a function of government enforcement and interpretation. Whereas the Quebec government has been more concerned over the certification of general studies teachers than of Jewish studies teachers in Montreal day schools, the Vancouver Talmud Torah in British Columbia has been given a wide latitude over the interpretation of the Jewish studies teachers' qualifications. The Province of Ontario requires that the general studies teachers in the day schools hold an Ontario Ministry of Education Certification, but has not set conditions concerning Jewish studies teachers. Instead, each of the five communities which maintain day schools is free to determine its own standards. The Toronto Jewish federation has insisted that the schools it subsidizes hire only teachers who are certified and whose certification is recognized by the Toronto Jewish Board of License and Review.

In general, day school teaching salaries are commensurate, or nearly so, with those of the public sector. This holds true not only for Alberta where as already noted, the Jewish day schools are part of the public school system and Montreal where the Jewish teachers' union negotiated an agreement attaining parity with the salary scale of the Protestant School Board but in other places as well. In Winnipeg, Vancouver and Ottawa day school salaries are slightly below those of the largest public school boards but are equal to

those paid by some of the boards in the suburbs. In Toronto where no linkage exists, the Board of Jewish Education has drawn up a wage-scale guideline for the various day schools and it has been able to assert some influence on wage-scale agreement.

Salaries in Canadian Jewish day schools, which are comparable to local public-school salaries are generally higher than those paid by most Jewish day schools in the United States. But public school teachers in Canada as in the United States usually receive smaller remuneration than that received by other professionals with similar years of academic training. The feminization of the teaching profession in both Jewish and non-Jewish schools in both countries is at least partially due to such economic factors.

Recruitment and Training of Jewish Studies Teachers

In many day schools the Jewish studies teaching staff consists primarily of teachers educated outside of Canada, mainly in Israel. A study of Montreal Jewish studies teachers in the early 1970s found that less than 25% of these teachers were born or educated in Canada, while about 75% came from Europe and Israel. A study of Jewish studies teachers in Toronto, also conducted in the early 1970s, found that only 29 of the 168 day school Jewish studies teachers responding to the survey were born in either Canada or the United States. Moreover, according to these surveys the Jewish teacher training institutions at that time (1970s) seemed unable to affect the compositions of the teaching staff in even the schools of these two communities themselves. The *Midrasha L'Morim* in Toronto and the United Teachers Seminary in Montreal consisted mainly of Israeli Jewish women, and only the orthodox *Beth Jacob* Seminary for Girls of Montreal was able to attract Canadian-educated Jewish teachers. The same surveys claimed that "children would have a more positive attitude toward their Jewish studies if Canadian young men and women could be induced to serve as teachers and as educational models", and recommended that "the *Beth Jacob* Seminary be granted a subsidy (by the Federation)" and that new "Jewish teacher training programs be university based." These recommendations led to the development of Jewish education programs at McGill (Montreal) and York (Toronto) universities. Recently the University of Manitoba announced the formation of a third Canadian university program in Jewish education.

The decision to create Jewish educational programs in non-Jewish institutions was in certain respects quite radical. Traditionally Canadian Jews have viewed Jewish education as a means of strengthening and reinforcing their Jewishness. Jewish educational institutions may differ in their understanding of Judaism and their concept of the Jewish people, but they generally agree

on the broad purpose of Jewish education, i.e. that it should contribute to the continued existence of the Jewish people and Judaism. Such a goal would cause the Jewish community to develop its own institutions to train Jewish studies teachers rather than depend upon non-Jewish sources.

In Canada with its ethnic diversity and conscious awareness of language and cultural differences, the goals of Jewish education appear less threatened by the general society and more capable of achievement in non-Jewish institutions than in, for instance, the United States. Perhaps for that reason, the three largest Jewish communities in Canada felt secure enough to negotiate the establishment of Jewish teacher training programs in local non-Jewish academic institutions.

The success and failings of these programs help shed light on Canadian Jewry's attitudes toward Jewish education. The university's and the organized community's approach to Jewish education are juxtaposed. Jewish education in the Jewish schools serves a communal function; it is supposed to help maintain Judaism and the Jewish people by inculcating a behavior code, a set of values or a sense of commitment. It is the function of a university education, however, to question accepted values and challenge commitments. A university education does not seek to reinforce what is known but rather teaches the known in order to develop the capacity to discover the unknown. Indeed, when one considers the divergent functions of a university and a Jewish school, the Jewish community's reliance on university trained teachers to imbue its children with a loyalty to Judaism and the Jewish people is difficult to comprehend.

The apparent success of the program at least in terms of alumni placement (43 of the 46 graduates of the McGill program have been employed in the field of Jewish education) suggests that the orientation of a university trained program has not created the problems anticipated. Perhaps it reflects the community's acceptance of the university approach toward the study of Judaism as well as of general studies and its desire to integrate general knowledge with Jewish knowledge – one of the declared goals of day school education.

On the other hand, although over 15,000 pupils are enrolled in Jewish day schools in the three communities which have university based Jewish education programs and about 580 students graduate from the Jewish day high schools each year, very few of these go on to major in Jewish education. Of the 46 students who completed the McGill program, only three had graduated from the Jewish day high school.

The McGill, York and University of Manitoba programs have not graduated enough students to meet the recruitment needs of the Jewish schools and have not greatly affected the composition of the Jewish studies teaching staff which is still mainly non-Canadian. Indeed, only in the *Beth Jacob* and perhaps the one-day a week schools, where the language of instruction is English,

are most of the Jewish studies teachers Canadian-born or educated. Indeed, Jewish schools in Canada – like those in the United States – have had to rely on Israeli immigrants and on the employment of Israeli *shihim* to teach their classes. This dependence on Israeli *shihim*, whom the educational director of one of the largest Canadian day schools often describes as the ‘backbone’ of his school, reflects the community’s inability to meet its own educational needs. If, as the Montreal and Toronto surveys contend, Canadian youth find it difficult to model themselves after foreign educated teachers, then the practice of hiring mainly Israeli Jewish studies teachers is self-defeating. While Jewish day schools provide competent instruction in Hebrew and in Jewish studies largely because of their Israeli teachers, the origins and educational background of these teachers subtly signal to their students that only someone born or educated in Israel can master Hebrew and Jewish studies. This may be among the factors that deter Canadian students from starting a career in Jewish studies and Jewish education – along with other factors, such as the perceived lower-middle class status of teaching and pursuit of more highly paid careers.

The professional standards and certification requirements of the Jewish studies day school teachers, full-time employment opportunities, and salary scale commensurate with the public sector’s, constitute impressive achievements for Canadian Jewry’s education system, especially when compared with the situation prevailing in the United States. In addition, the community’s role in developing university Jewish education programs testify to its concern for Jewish education and demonstrate its determination to seek out new solutions.

However, the continued reliance on *shihim* as teachers and the lack of success in persuading graduates of the system to pursue careers in Jewish education, are difficult problems with which Canadian Jewish education must still contend.

Curriculum Development and Research

Canadian Jewry’s close ties with the American Jewish community are aptly illustrated in the area of curriculum development. Canadian educational institutions are affiliated with American-based umbrella organizations which develop curricula for schools in both Canada and the United States. The Reform movement’s Joint Commission on Jewish Education; the Melton Resource Center and the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, under Conservative movement auspices; *Torah Umesorah* Publications which serve Orthodox schools, as well as the Central Organization for Jewish Education of the Lubavitch Hassidic movement, all publish curricula employed in Canadian schools.

A major exception, the Canadian developed *Tel-Sela* curriculum, merely confirms the strong linkage between North American Jewish institutions in matters of curriculum. The impetus for *Tel-Sela* (a spiral bound Hebrew language curriculum package for grades 2–6, produced by the Jewish Education Council of Montreal and funded by the Canadian government) stemmed from the perceived curricula needs of Jewish day schools in Quebec. Nevertheless, both the government's and the Jewish community's decision to support the project was at least partially based on the program's marketability in the United States.

Few studies on Canadian Jewish education have been published in the academic educational press and Jewish education in Canada suffers from a dearth of serious research. Indeed, a 1983 computerized search through ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) disclosed only four publications on Canadian Jewish Education in the more than 250 academic and professional journals indexed in that system.

Despite the great efforts expended to provide Jewish education in Canada, difficulties in defining educational goals have hindered the capacity to assess achievements and what has been learned. Educational goals are but derivatives of educational philosophies. Canadian Jewish educational institutions, and perhaps Canadian Jewry, need to clearly articulate their philosophies of Jewish education. While the community has learned to handle problems of how to provide Jewish education, it must begin to ask itself why it deems education to be important.

The urgent desire for improvements promotes a search for quick, sometimes hastily conceived, solutions. Research has been designed and reports have been written in order to meet immediate needs of the educational structure, e.g., the report of *Space Needs of Jewish Day Schools* commissioned by the Montreal Jewish community in order to decide whether to build a new school. Along with such research, studies should also be conducted on the less action-directed aspects of Jewish education. The community, however, does not yet seem to recognize the importance of such studies.

Likewise, the central Jewish educational agencies of Montreal and Winnipeg have employed the 1981 Canadian census data in order to project Jewish school enrollment. But, by the time of this writing, such data for all of Canada have not been utilized.

People interested in improving Jewish education must be patient enough to first examine the underlying issues and foundations upon which the current state of education rests. Canadian Jewry might develop instruments to promote and enhance this type of Jewish educational research. Perhaps a national data gathering and central depository for data and studies on Jewish education could be established. Just as in the 1970s communities sought the help of universities to train Jewish studies teachers, so now they might also

turn to the universities for help in developing and promoting research on Jewish education.

Conclusion

Canadian Jewish education like other aspects of Canadian Jewish life is affected by developments in the older, much larger Jewish community in the United States. In general, Canadian Jewish institutions are more influenced by their American counterparts than the opposite. However, Canadian Jewry's success in establishing a viable educational structure along with the difficulties it encounters in maintaining that structure has important implications for the United States' as well as its own Jewish community.

The development in Canada of a wide array of Jewish educational institutions and a variety of educational options testify to the importance of Jewish education for Canadian Jewry. Moreover, the day school with its greater demands on the community, parents, and pupils, occupies a central place in Jewish education in Canada. But while the establishment of this educational system is largely due to the support and concern of the well-organized Canadian Jewish community, the difficulties confronting it also reflect the problems of the community it serves.

Our examination of Canadian Jewry's handling of ostensibly financial matters (government grants, federation allocations, tuition fees and scholarship assistance) has revealed disputes over communal and parental responsibility for Jewish education and controversies concerning the type and extent of Jewish education the community should help provide. Likewise, the community's difficulty in persuading young Canadian Jews to enter the Jewish teaching profession – despite day-school salaries commensurate with those in the public schools – and notwithstanding academic Jewish education programs the problems besetting Jewish education in Canada are more complex than mere fulfillment of the financial and personnel needs of the educational system.

Canadian Jewry, like other Diaspora communities in the post-traditional era, seeks to integrate into general society while maintaining its Jewishness. The difficulties and ambiguity involved in pursuing these divergent and sometimes conflicting objectives as well as in educating one's children towards achieving them cannot help but affect Canadian Jewish education. Thus, the success of the impressive Jewish educational structure in Canada is tempered by the basic conflict within Canadian Jewry over its relationship to the organized Jewish community, to local and national government, and to the non-Jewish society.

Acknowledgements

Much of the research for this study is based on information provided by individuals and institutions who requested that they not be identified. However, I would like to single out a few of the many North American educators whose insights contributed substantially to this study: Rabbi Meyer Krentzman, Betty Niktin, George Pollak, Baruch Rand, Bernard Shoub, Richard Wagner and Rabbi Irwin Witty. We would also like to thank Harold M. Waller, the project director of the Studies on Canadian Jewish Communities for making those studies available to our research prior to their publication.

Notes

1. Since the Canadian census asks residents of Canada to state their religion and ethnicity, the category 'Jews by ethnicity' includes some Canadians who regard themselves as Jews by ethnicity, but Christians by religion. The organized Jewish community does not relate to these people as Jews.
2. This is implied, for instance, in the community's request for census data that do not include as Jews people who profess another religion.
3. In 1931, when there were 156,000 Jews in Canada, 149,000 Canadians declared Yiddish their mother tongue.
4. Enrollment figures for the years 1981–82 are based on data provided by the Department of Research and Educational Information of the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA). 1983 enrollment figures were made available to this study by the Jewish central educational agencies in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, the Jewish Educational Resource Centre in Vancouver, and individual schools in other communities.
5. There has been some talk of building a residential Jewish day school in the Maritime provinces, where about 1,000 Jewish school-age children live. The concept of a residential day school for outlying areas was broached at the 1983 Canadian National Education Conference but it was not considered viable. Most discussants felt that few parents would send their children to such a school since most Jews with sufficient commitment and concern for their children's Jewish education choose to reside in larger communities.
6. In a recent Council of Jewish Federations study of allocations to Jewish education, the local budgets of 101 federations (including five Canadian), were examined: 43.9 of 169.1 million United States dollars (26%) of local allocations went to Jewish education, compared to 6.8 of 15.8 million (44%) for the five Canadian federations. In 1982 the 16 large cities surveyed allocated 33.4 of 129.3 million (26%) of their local budget to Jewish education, compared to Toronto which allocated 4.6 of 6.1 million dollars (75%) of its local budget for Jewish education. The

only federation providing more money for Jewish education than Toronto was New York City which spent 6.8 of 38.6 million dollars (18%) of federation funds for local Jewish education. The highest percentage allocation in the United States was in Philadelphia where 2.5 of 5.7 million dollars (44%) of the budget went to Jewish education. Likewise, among intermediate size federations which together allocated 6.5 of 25.3 million dollars (26%), Winnipeg allocated both the largest amount, 1 million, and the largest percentage (64%) for Jewish education (Council of Jewish Federations, 1983).

Bibliographical Note

There have been very few attempts to examine Jewish education in Canada on a country-wide basis. Two exceptions are: David Norman Zweig, *Jewish Education in Canada*, unpublished MA thesis, McGill University, Montreal (1949) and Yaakov Glickman, "Jewish Education in Canada: Success or Failure?", in: Weinfeld, M., Shaffir, W. and Cotler, I., eds., *The Canadian Jewish Mosaic*, Wiley, Toronto (1981). Written thirty-nine years ago, Zweig's thesis describes the educational institutions of a primarily immigrant community. Glickman's study is more interpretive than descriptive. It culls the recent literature on Jewish education in various Canadian communities.

The Center for Jewish Community Studies has undertaken a number of studies on organized Jewish communities in Canada. While these studies are not primarily concerned with Jewish education, they examine and describe how educational institutions are integrated into the organized community.

In addition, much of the data (enrollment figures, teacher salary scales, school budgets, minutes of school committee meetings) employed in this chapter are based on current files of various educational institutions. While we have not been able to quote from these files directly, they have provided much of the empirical evidence for our findings.

B.G. Sack, *History of the Jews in Canada*, Harvest House, Montreal (1965); Stuart E. Rosenberg, *The Jewish Community in Canada* 2 vols., McClelland and Stewart, Toronto (1970); and more recently M. Weinfeld, W. Shaffir, and I. Cotler, eds., *The Canadian Jewish Mosaic* (1981) help place Canadian Jewish education in historical perspective. These works are particularly helpful in explaining both the differences and similarities between the Canadian and American Jewish experience. See also: Daniel J. Elazar, *Community and Polity: The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia (1976).

John Porter, "Ethnic Pluralism in Canadian Perspective", in: Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, eds. *Ethnicity, Theory and Experience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (1975); Cornaelius Joenus, "Mutilated Multi-culturalism", J. Donald Wilson, "Religion and Education, The Other Side of Pluralism", and Robert J. MacDonald, "Language Education and Society in Quebec", in: J. Donald Wilson, ed., *Canadian Education in the 80's* (1983), help explain the current Canadian context for many of the issues confronting Jewish education.

The impact of political developments on the Jews in Quebec and their implications for Jewish education is discussed by Daniel J. Elazar, "The Jews of Quebec and the Canadian Crisis," *Jerusalem Letter* (May, 1978), Morton Weinfield, "La Question Juive au Quebec", *Midstream*, Vol. 23 (October, 1977) and Ruth Wisse and Irwin Cotler, "Quebec Jews Caught in the Middle", *Commentary*, Vol. 64 (1977). *Education and Culture*, a journal published by the Toronto Board of Jewish Education, provides a forum for discussion on current educational issues in Toronto.

Jewish Education in Greater Montreal, A Survey of Jewish Education and Recommendations for its Enhancement in the Jewish Community, Montreal (1972) and *A Study on Jewish Education*, Prepared by the Study Committee on Jewish Education, United Jewish Welfare Fund, Toronto (1975) summarize the results of Montreal and Toronto study commissions in the early seventies. These reports have been supplemented by more recent, less comprehensive studies concerning certain specific educational policy issues. *Space Needs of the Day School*, Montreal (1982) and the *Study Committee on the Jewish Educational Council of Greater Montreal* (1983) are two examples of more recent studies undertaken to find answers for specific communal policy questions.

Jewish Education in Hamilton (June 1976) and *Winnipeg Report, Jewish Education in Winnipeg* (March 1981), two studies conducted by the present Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA) describe in detail some of the problems peculiar to middle-size communities.

The various reports of the Center for Jewish Community Studies place Jewish educational institutions within the framework of the middle-size organized communities. Among those communities examined are: *Calgary, Alberta*, by Harvey Rich; *Hamilton, Ontario*, by Louis Greenspan; *London, Ontario*, by Allen M. Cohen; *Ottawa*, by Zacharia Key; *Vancouver, British Columbia*, by Edna Oberman; *Windsor, Ontario* by Stephen Mandell; and *Winnipeg, Manitoba*, by Anna Gorer. These studies related to Jewish education from a communal standpoint. Baruch Rand, "Jewish Education under Communal Auspices," *Jewish Education*, Vol. 50 (Summer, 1982) describes the formation of the Winnipeg Board of Jewish Education. Michael Morgan, "Religious Pluralism in the Hebrew Day School," *Jewish Education*, Vol. 49 (Fall, 1981) based on the experiences of the Hebrew Day School in Edmonton discusses the problem of ideological orientation of day schools in middle size communities.

For evaluation of the financing of Jewish education we relied on: Council of Jewish Federations, *Federation Allocations to Jewish Education: A Five Year Analysis of Federation Support to the Field of Jewish Education*, New York (1983).

Tape recordings of proceedings of subcommittee on small communities at the National Canadian Jewish Education Conference (November 1983) provided data on Jewish education in small communities. In addition, personal interviews with some of the residents of those communities, data from JESNA and reports from the Canadian Jewish Congress section in small communities were also helpful.