Pensioned Professoriate
(大学教員の年金制度)

Nelson K. Joannette*

SUMMARY IN JAPANESE: 19世紀から20世紀初頭にかけて、官民を問わず多くの職業で年金制度が確立された。本稿では、北アメリカにおける大学教員を対象とした年金制度について論じる。

カナダとアメリカにおける大学教員を対象にした年金制度は、主としてアメリカの産業家、アンドリュー·カーネギーの主導のもと確立された。1906年、カーネギーによる1千万ドル($10,000,000)の寄付によって、アメリカ、カナダ、ニューファンドランド(当時連邦未加盟)の大学教員のための、年金制度の確立を目的とするカーネギー教育振興財団が設立された。年金制度導入に先立ち、退職した教員への恩給支払いをすでに実施していたドイツの年金制度に関する調査が行われた。

大学が財団から資金を受ける資格は、その教育水準や宗教との関係など一定の条件に基づいていた。財団は教育水準の向上を目的としていたため、特定の宗派に属する大学を支援することは効果的ではないと考えた。さらに、高度な能力を有する人材を教授職にとどめるだけでなく、年老いたが故に能力が低下した教員を年金生活に送り込むという点において、年金制度は大学の効率化をもたらすものと思われていた。当初、年金は65才を過ぎるか、あるいは25年間勤務した後に支払われた。

カーネギー基金は当初不安定な時期もあったが、やがてその機能も安定し、退職した教員への年金の給付も滞りなく行われるようになった。しかし、女性が男性と平等に扱われることはなく、女性の教員の配偶者にまで年金の給付対象を広げることはできなかった。また、1908年の規定変更により、未亡人にもようやく年金が支給されるようになったものの、夫

* Teaching at the University of Waterloo and the University of Windsor.

が受け取るべき額の半分に制限されていた。

カーネギー・プランは、年金が導入された他の職場と同様に、年老いたがゆえに能力が低下したと思われる人々を排除することにより、効率性を高めることを意図したものであった。19世紀の産物である高齢者を蔑視する風潮により、高齢の労働者は効率性を追及する上での障害として見なされたのである。

Introduction

During the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, superannuation funds were implemented in both private and public areas of large-scale employment: the federal government, namely the military, Civil Service and Mounted Police; the principal religious denominations; railways; banks and teaching at elementary and secondary schools and universities.[1]

What caused pension plans to come into being? A major incentive behind the formation of pensions was the enhancement of efficiency within the work place. Pensions were used as a way of attracting needed employees. Once an employee, because of old age, was no longer seen as being cost effective, a retirement scheme was viewed as a way of maintaining efficient operations.[2] Outside of the employers' objective of increasing efficiency there are a few illustrations of pension initiatives coming from employees, but these make up a very small percentage of the total number of pension schemes which were established. In addition, these initiatives came about only after there had been pension precedents in their particular field of employment.[3]

Actuarial instability was yet another feature of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century retirement plans.[4] When a pension plan is established there is no accumulation of pensioners to provide for and only a percentage of the workforce becomes pensionable each year. Therefore, the problems inherent with pension schemes which are not actuarially sound do not initially become apparent.[5] The actuarial difficulties experienced by larger employing bodies in maintaining pension funds make it understandable why small-scale operations, with fewer economic resources, would not have been early initiators of pension plans.[6]

The less valued lower grade employee often had no entitlements to retirement income which meant that most female workers were excluded from pension coverage. In many instances, the widow of a pensioner or would-be pensioner received only half of a husband's entitlement. It was also common practice to discontinue pension benefits to widows who remarried.[7]

The implementation of pension plans in Canada was not an isolated event, the Canadian schemes being modelled after foreign predecessors. In addition to external influences, domestic examples played a part in the pension history of Canada. The Baptists made reference to the pension plans of both the Civil Service and banks and the teachers of Ontario cited the military in regard to pension developments. It is understandable, therefore, why few examples of pension plan uniqueness existed within particular fields of employment.[8]

The focus of this paper is the pension system established for professors. Owing to the fact that there is greater parallelism than dissimilarity between the pension schemes of particular fields of employment a case study of the pension system established for professors provides a good representation of pension history in general.[9]

Pensions for the most part came to professors in both Canada and the United States because of an initiative of American industrialist Andrew Carnegie who expressed the following sentiment in the spring of 1905:

> I have reached the conclusion that the least rewarded of all the professions is that of the teacher in our higher educational institutions. New York City generously, and very wisely, provides retiring pensions for teachers in her public schools and also for her policemen. Very few, indeed, of our colleges are able to do so. The consequences are grievous. Able men hesitate to adopt teaching as a career, and many old professors whose places should be occupied by younger men, cannot be retired.[10]

Prior to this, the subject of pensions for professors had been brought to Carnegie's attention by Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Carnegie had initially been interested in giving assistance to colleges and universities where they needed it most and it was Pritchett who, when asked in 1904, replied that a pension scheme would be the best means of improving the college and university system.[11] Carnegie had also read the valedictory address given at Johns Hopkins, in February of 1905, by William Osler, physician-in-chief of the university's hospital. In his speech, Osler made analogies between the aging process and the health of academia and concluded that elderly professors must be retired.[12]

In 1906, the Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching was chartered by Congress after being endowed by Andrew Carnegie with $10,000,000 in 5% bonds of the United States Steel Corporation.[13] Henry Pritchett became first President of the Foundation, serving from 1906 to 1930.[14] The Foundation's purpose was to create a system of pensions for college and university teachers in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland.[15] These three nations were chosen in order to remedy the situation of being a professor in a relatively new country, that being self-sacrifice owing to inadequate wages.[16] The low scale of salaries in North American universities was partially explained by the number of institutions which had curriculums spanning an enormous range of subjects, but lacked the financial means of properly supporting the staff this required.[17] The low salaries paid to faculty members also reflected the priestly vow of poverty expected of professors. A life of genteel poverty also seemed appropriate for persons who had traditionally been thought of as not being able to make it in the real world and therefore had chosen academia.[18]

Preceding the installation of a pension plan by the Carnegie Foundation, it was deemed desirable to conduct research into other retirement schemes then in place, with attention focused on the professoriate of other nations. Germany stood out as the prime example where initiative had been taken in providing for retired professors. All the German universities were government institutions where professors held office as a freehold, a professor having complete freedom in arranging courses and lecture subjects. A faculty member's income was comprised of a salary attached to the professorship, along with all or part of the fees paid by students for the courses a professor taught.[19] Compared to the average professor in North America, the German counterpart was better paid; indeed, in Germany, a professor ranked among the highest paid in society, except for the nobility and the very successful businessmen.[20] The general custom in Germany was to permit professors to continue working as long as they desired, which resulted in a high percentage of professors at advanced years retaining employment. Once a professor because of old age did retire, generally the salary remained unchanged except for the loss of student fees. Since fees comprised a major portion of a professor's salary, often the institution concerned made a recompense to the individual. Rules varied somewhat between each of the German states, and this held true for the retirement provisions made available to the widows and children of professors, but usually a government organization was responsible for their financial security.[21]

The German system influenced the Carnegie Foundation in a general way, but the rules of the Foundation were more a reflection of coming to terms with circumstances peculiar to North America. The working philosophy of the Foundation was that pensions were to be given without regard to race, sex, creed, or colour.[22] The pensions were viewed in terms of a free gift in that monetarily the Foundation was to be the only financial contributor, but this did not mean that pensions were equated with an act of charity.[23] Instead, the Foundation stood behind the conviction that it was only right for professors to have the security of a retirement income.[24] In addition, it was felt that from a practical point of view, a pension system would increase the efficiency of universities, not only by rendering the career of a professor more attractive to those of the highest talent, but also by enabling universities to dispense with the services of professors whose abilities had declined through old age.[25]

Universities, Colleges and Technical Schools were eligible to receive monies from the Foundation, but this was dependent upon three conditions: the educational standards of the institution; the relationship of each institution to religious denominations; and the relationship of each institution to the state.[26]

Owing to the fact that the terms college and university had no fixed meaning in North America, it was not uncommon to find high schools using either one of these titles. The trustees of the Foundation, therefore, closely following the definition adopted by the State of New York, assigned the following denotation for college or university:

> An institution . . . must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission, not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the preacademic or grammar school studies.[27]

In order to define a secondary education, the Foundation relied upon a plan much used by college entrance examination boards whereby admission requirements were designated in terms of units. By unit was meant a course of five periods weekly throughout the academic year. Half units counted, but a total of

14 units were necessary in order to be interpreted as a secondary education. In addition to the aforementioned, a unit also had to be on a par, for each field of study, as qualitatively defined by the College Examination Board of the State of New York.[28]

It was determined that academies whose charters stated that they fell under the jurisdiction of a sect or required a majority of their trustees, governing bodies, officers or students to belong to a specified religious denomination or who imposed a theological test were ineligible for funding from the Foundation.[29] The following represents the Foundation's view of schools with a religious affiliation:

> A truly sectarian institution is one which either by narrowing the choice of its officers and teachers tends toward partial views of truth and narrowing influences in education, or else which by the teaching of strictly denominational tenets or doctrine tends toward the same narrowing effect.[30]

The Foundation saw as its purpose to raise standards and create greater unity amongst educational institutions, and therefore it was thought to be counterproductive to support sectarian academies.[31]

In the case of colleges or universities which had been established or mainly supported by the state, Carnegie had not presumed to include them for funding with the thought that they would prefer to keep their relations exclusively with the state. The Act of Incorporation under which the Foundation was conducted was framed along these lines and while state institutions were not included among those who were eligible for funding, they were not specifically excluded either.[32] This ambiguity led to requests by several academies and educational associations to include state operated schools for funding eligibility. One argument put forth was that it was unlikely that a state supported academy would create its own retiring fund for professors, owing to the fact that such action might raise the subject of pensions for all government officers. Another assertion made was that state-supported educational institutions would be at a great disadvantage compared to private colleges and universities if they could not avail themselves of the Carnegie pension scheme.[33] As a consequence of such appeals, Carnegie donated an additional $5,000,000 in 1908 in order that state academies could be specifically included within the Foundation's mandate.[34]

In addition to the aforementioned maxims, what were the operative rules for the granting of pensions? Pensions were provided upon retirement to professors at or after age 65 following 15 years of service or under age 65 after 25 years of service. The amount of pension was based upon the average salary the individual received during the last five years of employment: if retired at or after age 65, a pension of $1,000 was payable for an annual salary of $1,200; for salaries in excess of $1,200 a pension of $1,000 plus 50% of such excess was provided; no pension was to surpass $4,000 annually; with salaries under $1,200, pensions were not to go beyond 90% of the salary and if retired under age 65, after 25 years of service, the pension was lessened to approximately 4/5 the amount which would have been given if retirement had occurred at or after age 65. The rules also allowed for special consideration to be given to individual professors for merit or distinguished service, so that a pension might be received in instances where the institution to which a professor belonged had not qualified for funding from the Foundation. In addition, librarians, registrars, recorders, and administrative officers of long tenure whose salaries were classed with those of professors were included for pension eligibility.[35]

When making these rules, the Trustees of the Foundation reserved the right to make changes which might prove to be desirable or necessary. By 1908 this right was exercised by extending pensions to the widows of professors, as long as they remained widows, to an amount equal to one half of that to which their spouse had been entitled.[36] In 1909, a further change in the regulations came about, whereby a pension after 25 years service without having reached 65 was no longer permissible.[37]

At this point it is appropriate to comment on the exclusion of widowers of professors from pension coverage. In 1908, only 20% of faculty members at American universities were female[38] and in Canada the figures appear much lower.[39] In addition, the most prestigious universities did not have female professors[40] and it was these institutions which readily qualified for pensions under the Carnegie scheme. As pointed out by Alison Prentice, at the University of Toronto the largest percentage of females hired to teach during the first decade of the twentieth century were as Instructors, the lowest of grade levels[41] and one which was not eligible for pension coverage under the Carnegie plan. In addition, as pointed out by Patricia Graham writing about females and academia in the United States, 75% of women who received Ph.D.s between 1875 and 1924 never married.[42] When taking all these factors into account, it is easier to understand how such a small number of persons, that is, widowers of professors who had been at institutions recognized by the Carnegie Foundation, were ignored.

In 1905, according to the United States Bureau of Education, there were 615 institutions in the United States which could be described as a university, college or technical school. In Canada there were 12 such establishments[43] and in Newfoundland, even though there were five academies calling themselves colleges, their courses of study were only on a par with that of a grammar school. After soliciting the pertinent information from these North American institutions, 52 were recognized as being qualified for funding during the Foundation's first year of operation. Combined, these academies had 2,042 faculty members of which 257 met the necessary requirements for pension eligibility, and of this number, 46 actually took retiring allowances.[44] Outside of the accepted academies, seven professors, all of whom were associated with American schools, had retiring allowances conferred upon them.[45]

Of the 52 institutions which the Foundation had endorsed, almost half were located in the states of Massachusetts and New York. With three exceptions, one being in the far south, Tulane University, and two in Canada—Dalhousie and McGill Universities—all of the accepted institutions were located in the northern belt of the United States. This composition reflected two things in particular: the older and richer sections of North America had institutions which were the result of long development; throughout the southern United States and parts of the west, almost all private institutions of learning were under denominational control and in the south very few colleges and universities had entrance requirements which met the Foundation's criteria.[46] As noted earlier, it was not until 1908 that state-supported schools became acceptable to the Foundation and there were approximately 80 such establishments in North America at that time, of which almost half would meet the necessary educational requirements.[47] One of these was the University of Toronto. Dalhousie, McGill and the University of Toronto were the only Canadian institutions ever to be accepted by the Foundation and, in the case of Toronto, only those professors who belonged to departments free of denominational control were eligible for pension funding.[48]

A handful of academic institutions in the United States had retirement schemes in place prior to the advent of the Carnegie plan, the earliest being Columbia, which had an operative pension policy for faculty members by 1890. Other retirement allowances preceding that of the Carnegie Foundations include: Cornell University, Harvard University, Randolph-Macon Women's College, The University of California, and Yale University. A marked variance existed in the regulatory structure of the retirement plans amongst these institutions: from mandatory retirement to it being the option of a faculty member; retirement eligibility set at age 65 and in other cases age 70; pension rates based upon 1/3 of a professor's salary and in other institutions 2/3; pension funding being a university responsibility while in other academies the support was based upon a contributory system which faculty members partially financed.[49]

In Canada, two universities had established a system of retirement annuities before the Carnegie Foundation came into being. The University of Toronto had an early history of granting pensions on an ad hoc basis but it was not until 1891 that The Retirement Fund was created whereby a percentage was deducted from each faculty member's salary, with a graduated scale as incomes increased.[50] This "forced savings plan"[51] as the university described it, at best only provided annual retirement annuities of not more than $300 or $400.[52] McGill University, the other Canadian institution to have its own pension scheme, received $150,000 from three of its Trustees with the stipulation that the revenue accruing from this sum was to be used for retirement income for teachers in the Faculty of Arts and Applied Sciences. Each case was to be dealt with upon its own merits by the Board of Governors and subject to the approval of the three donors. By 1906, when the Carnegie Foundation had commenced operations, the McGill fund, owing to a low depletion rate of interest monies, had a capital sum which had been increased to $220,000 and at that time was providing two retirement allowances each for $3,500 per annum.[53]

Universities and colleges, even if they had no formal pension scheme, would sometimes make allowances in special cases. A late example of this was with Brandon College, Manitoba, when Dr. McKee, one of the institute's founding members, professor of classics, and College Bursar and Registrar for 30 years, retired in the 1920's. Provisions were made to provide McKee with a monthly allowance of $125, but because of the college's lack of financial resources, McKee was often put in the position of requesting back payment of his retirement allowance.[54]

By 1915, changed circumstances had resulted in a growing concern amongst the officers of the Foundation over certain weaknesses in the Carnegie pension scheme: in 1906 it had been estimated that there would be 3,000 teachers who would eventually qualify for a Carnegie pension, but by 1915 the estimated number had more than doubled; salaries had increased and since pension scales were based upon pay levels, the average retirement allowance had been raised from $1,246 in 1906 to $2,157 by 1915; teachers were living longer than the annuity tables used in setting up the Carnegie plan had indicated would be the case, and this was reflected in there being only 83 pensioners who had died by 1915 instead of the estimated 100; similarly, because of greater longevity, the number of pensions being paid to widows was larger than had been anticipated; there was also a lowering of the age at which teachers were retiring and taking advantage of their pensions, the average age of retirement being 71.98 in 1906 and 66.59 by 1915.[55]

Taking into account that pensions had not been granted to teachers who had retired prior to the establishment of the Fund, the pension list had been relatively small during the early years, but the list was steadily growing so that by 1915 pensions were being paid to 327 teachers and 118 widows with an annual pension load of close to $700,000. Owing to the fact that the yearly sum available for pension payments was around $755,000, it was estimated that pension allotments would soon exceed income, even if annuities were limited to teachers who were connected with institutions already associated with the Foundation.[56] The officers of the Foundation had taken steps to restrict its governing rules in order to cope with the financial strain, but these were insufficient to alleviate the problem. In 1910, when pensions already granted to individual professors outside the associated institutions totalled over $144,000 per annum, it was decided not to make any such additional appropriations; limitations were also placed on the number of academies being included in the list of associated institutions—73 had been admitted through 1910 including two of which had been dropped, but from 1910 to 1915 only two new academies were accepted, even though there were others that qualified.[57] In 1917 there were approximately 1,000 institutions of higher learning in the United States, and 70 in Canada. This meant that the 73 academies associated with the Foundation, three of which were in Canada, represented only about 7% of all universities and colleges in existence.[58]

It was apparent that major adjustments had to be made in the system of retiring allowances in order to cope with the changed conditions. The solution arrived at was two-fold: developing a new form of pension scheme for future generations, and concurrent with this, altering the rules of the Carnegie Foundation in order to continue both retirement allowances and the promise of retirement allowances to those already in the system. It would have been wiser had the Foundation at its inauguration agreed to finance the plan for a term of years on the condition that a permanent and sound pension scheme later be organized by the academies and their professoriate, but at that time, unstable actuarial pension funding was not uncommon.[59]

During the time of the Foundation's existence, not only was knowledge attained on how to finance pension plans, but also the social philosophy of pensions had undergone change. As with other sectors in government and private enterprise, retirement provisions were seen as the joint responsibility of the worker and employer, the two beneficiaries of the system: the employee profiting by having a secured retirement income, the employer by having an effective mechanism by which to turn over staff once they were considered to be less efficient.[60]

The new scheme, entitled the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association of America (TIAA), became operational in 1918 following a grant of $1,000,000 by Andrew Carnegie to cover overhead expenses. The TIAA offered contractual annuities whereby premiums were paid by a professor, the educational institution with which a professor was employed, or the two together.[61] Flexibility in the plan allowed for further variance in the rules from one academy to another. Regulations which became peculiar to individual schools included: either compulsory or voluntary participation by faculty members; limiting eligibility to instructors who had served for a minimum period of one to three years; a university contribution for all those of the rank of assistant professor or higher, but only for instructors after a specified service period. The annuity policies which were offered by the TIAA were deferred, meaning that they could not be surrendered for cash before retirement and therefore their sole function was that of providing pensions upon reaching age 65. If a professor moved from one institution to another, the policy was transferable because the annuity contract was between the professor and the Teachers' Association, not an academy. A widow of an annuitant professor was entitled to half the amount which her spouse had been in receipt of, but if her husband had died before reaching retirement age, she would only be eligible for a refund of premiums paid. In addition to annuities, the TIAA also offered life insurance which would expire at age 65 through 70 at the option of the insured. Insurance was offered as a means of protecting a wife in the event of a professor dying before being retired.[62]

The Carnegie Corporation, a general philanthropic organization set up by Andrew Carnegie in 1911, contributed, over a period of time, approximately $8,800,000 to the TIAA in order that annuities and life insurance might be offered at a lower cost than would otherwise have been possible. By the 1940's, the TIAA became entirely self-sustaining and had over 34,000 annuity contracts and more than 13,500 life insurance policies in force, with aggregated assets of $167,364,375. These figures not only demonstrated the success of the new plan, but also how impossible it would have been for the Carnegie Foundation to continue to provide free pensions for an ever-increasing eligible professoriate.[63]

When the TIAA was established, there were already over 6,500 professors connected with the institutions which had been recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for eligibility under the free pension system. It was decided that since these professors were expecting retirement income from the Foundation, the free system of pensions should be continued for their benefit. In order to sustain operations of the Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation gave the Foundation another $11,000,000, of which both the principal and income could be used, but even with this increase in capital it was necessary to change the rules by which the Foundation functioned.[64] New pensions granted on the basis of age or disability after the required time of service were restricted to professors who had become connected with an approved institution by November 17, 1915. Professors reaching age 65 on or before June 30, 1923 were unaffected, but if they turned 65 following this date, the age at which a pension was made available was increased: to age 66 for those becoming 65 between July 1, 1923 and June 30, 1925; to 67 for those turning 65 the following year; and so forth until age 70 for those reaching 65 after June 30, 1928. A reduced pension was made available for those categorized above if an individual opted for retirement at age 65. Other alterations in the rules included a 2/3 pension to unmarried teachers who became 65 after June 23, 1923. Widows' pensions continued subject to the rule changes already mentioned.[65]

Owing to actuarial projections, the Foundation altered its regulations once again in 1922, by reducing the maximum retiring allowance from the original $4,000 to $3,600 at age 70, or $2,400 at age 65. In 1929, pension amounts were once again modified to a maximum of $1,000 at 70 for those becoming age 65 during or after 1932, but the Foundation supplemented pension amounts by financing annuities which were administered through the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. In 1931, the Foundation closed its list of pensionables, which meant operations became limited to continuing pensions to those already retired.[66]

In addition to the monies donated to the TIAA by the Carnegie Corporation, annuity premiums were reduced further as a consequence of the terms of reference laid down in the TIAA's charter:

> To provide insurance and annuities for teachers . . . on terms as advantageous to its policyholders as shall be practicable; and to conduct its business without profit to the corporation or to its stockholders.[67]

Costs were also curtailed by the fact that the TIAA was held to be free of all Federal taxation because of its charitable nature.[68] Not all universities opted to contribute to the TIAA in support of faculty members' retirement. Instead, various alternatives came about, but basically these can be grouped into one of three categories: universities and colleges using retirement contracts through insurance companies; university-run contributory plans; and university-managed non-contributory schemes. The first category mentioned can be broken down further into contracts with a specified insurance company or with those which permitted professors to choose freely between life insurance companies.

Those academies which opted for association with a single insurance firm were Drexel Institute, Princeton University and Skidmore College, all of which offered retirement plans for faculty members during the 1920's. The rules and regulations varied amongst these three institutions, but a feature common to each was the contributory nature, meaning both faculty and the university shared in the payment of premiums. Bryn Mawr College and Vassar College each bore the costs with faculty of retirement annuities, but made the selection of an insurance company the choice of the individual professor.[69]

The system of joint contribution on the part of faculty and institution was one which had gained popularity in Britain just prior to it being embraced by America. It was through the British counterpart of the TIAA, the Federated British Universities, an organization dating back to 1909, that deferred annuities were offered to the professoriate in Britain.[70]

There were several educational institutions in America which operated faculty pension plans as an in-house activity rather than going through an insurance company. Most of these schemes came into effect during the 1920's as a consequence of the curtailment in the free pension system of the Carnegie Foundation. Many academies operated contributory programs, whereby the institution financed operations jointly with faculty. Those institutions of higher learning which can be grouped in this category include the University of California, Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Simons College, Wheaton College, and Yale. Most of these institutes asked for a 5% deduction in faculty members' salaries with an equal sum matched by the university. Special arrangements were made by some of these institutions, as in the case of both Harvard and Yale, to supplement the income of faculty who were in receipt of pensions from the Carnegie Foundation, once that organization began to scale down its operations in the 1920's. Both Harvard and Yale, as mentioned earlier, had their own pension apparatus in effect prior to the free pension system of the Carnegie Foundation, but had discontinued the plans in favour of that of the Foundation.[71]

Many non-contributory pension schemes, that is, plans financed solely by an academic institution without a faculty support component, also came into existence during the 1920's as a result of the Carnegie Foundation's lessening role: Austin, Centre, Heidelberg, Lafayette, and Otterbein Colleges, Howard and Ohio Wesleyan Universities along with the Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, and Nevada. The non-contributory plans, while frequently not stated in so many words, indicate the absence of a binding contract, expressing hopes, not promises. In many instances, the poverty of the institution was the determining factor behind these rather makeshift plans, but at times it was the result of not having a long-range view of responsibility. Even though the non-contributory schemes left a lot to be desired, they were still a step up from the 257 colleges and universities which, according to statistics gathered in 1934, had made no provision whatsoever for faculty pensions, including participation in the TIAA.[72] One last point which should be noted is that faculty members from 27 academic institutions had pension coverage provided through other means, such as state and municipal systems which applied to broad groups of employees.[73]

Those Canadian institutions which availed themselves of the deferred annuities offered through the TIAA, either at the time of its conception or shortly thereafter, include: Acadia, Dalhousie, McGill, Mount Allison and Queen's

University and the Universities of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Toronto. This left a number of academies with no retirement system in place for many years to come: the Universities of King's College, New Brunswick, Ottawa and Western Ontario and Laval, McMaster and St. Francis Xavier University.[74]

McGill was one of the few universities which came to the rescue of its senior faculty members when the Carnegie Foundation made significant changes in 1929. McGill paid $225,000 into the TIAA on behalf of those older professors who had lost their right to benefit from the Foundation. McGill also initiated a contributory contract with Sun Life Assurance Company in 1930 giving the professoriate the choice between using Sun Life as a supplement or an alternative to the TIAA.[75]

An interesting anecdote involving Queen's University and the Carnegie Foundation has its roots in Queen's applying for eligibility soon after the Foundation came into being. Queen's application was rejected on the basis of the denominational character of its constitution even though the University had expanded its Board of Trustees by five additional members, elected without regard to denomination. In 1906, following a visit with Carnegie in Scotland, the Chancellor of Queen's announced that Carnegie had placed the University on the Foundation's list of accepted institutions. Queen's, without hesitation, retired two of its senior faculty members only to learn soon after that Carnegie had incorrectly interpreted the rules of his own Foundation. Carnegie compensated for his error by paying pensions to the two faculty members from his personal monies, but Queen's remained off the pensionable list.[76]

Concerns arose over Queen's future because of increasing competition from McGill and Toronto, both better endowed and providing faculty pensions through the Carnegie Foundation. Queen's once again requested that it be accepted by the Foundation, but was instructed that eligibility could only be obtained if Queen's legally separated from the Presbyterian Church and dissolved all links with the theological faculty. In 1912, following much debate, Queen's took the necessary steps in separating from the Church, only to learn that the Foundation's funds were being totally utilized, but it was told exceptions might be made for individual cases of retiring faculty.[77] Queen's remained on a waiting list for the duration of the Carnegie Foundation's involvement in accepting additional universities for pension eligibility.[78] Pension arrangements finally came about for Queen's faculty in 1920 as a result of the formation of the

TIAA. In 1937, Queen's established a supplementary reserve fund to augment the TIAA pension rates and by 1939 Queen's made it compulsory that faculty members belong to the TIAA.[79]

What conclusions can be drawn about the development of pensions for professors in North America? Pensions were in place for other groups in society prior to retirement allowances being provided to the professoriate,[80] reflecting the presence of a central authority which was lacking amongst universities. Still, the Carnegie plan, as with other areas of employment where pensions were introduced, was meant to increase efficiency by removing old and presumably less capable people. Age denigration, a product of the nineteenth century, caused the older worker to be viewed as a hindrance to efficiency.[81] Indeed, in *The Fixed Period* (1882), a novel by Anthony Trollope, it is proposed that upon reaching age 60, retirement should take place allowing for a year of contemplation prior to being put to rest through the use of chloroform—this being a fitting end for the "worn out." [82]

Women were treated less equally than men in that a female professor could not extend pension benefits to her spouse. In addition, pension coverage was provided for widows in 1908 only as an afterthought and even then was restricted to half the husband's entitlement, presumably because there was only one person to support. Yet this situation was only somewhat close to being reversed in 1918 whereby pension levels were reduced to 2/3 for unmarried pensioned employees as a result of actuarial problems the retirement scheme was undergoing. Actuarial instability was a characteristic of the Carnegie plan during the early years, but as experience was acquired, the scheme became more sound in its operation, giving security to those in receipt of retirement benefits.

Notes

1 Nelson K. Joannette, *Worn Out: The Origins And Early Development Of Pensions In Canada* (University of Waterloo, 1993), pp. 14-15.

2 Joannette, *Worn Out: The Origins And Early Development Of Pensions In Canada*, p. 358.

3 Ibid., pp. 360-361.

4 F. Sanderson, "Superannuation and Pension Fund Schemes," *The Insurance Institute of Toronto, Proceedings* (Toronto: The Insurance Institute of Toronto, 1902-03), p. 96.

5 Abraham Epstein, *The Problems of Old Age Pensions in Industry* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Old Age Pension Commission, 1926), pp. 91, 93-94.

6 Joannette, *Worn Out: The Origins And Early Development Of Pensions In Canada*, p. 375.

7 lbid., pp. 360, 362-363.

8 lbid., pp. 356-358, 378.

9 lbid., p. 378.

10 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report* (New York: The Foundation, 1906), p. 7.

11 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules for the Granting of Retiring Allowances* (Boston: D. B. Updike, 1938), p. 13 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Early Papers of the Foundation* (Boston: D. B. Updike, 1935), p. 3.

12 William Graebner, *A History of Retirement* (New Haven, Conn. : Yale University Press, 1980), pp. 3-5, 8.

13 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement* (Boston: D. B. Updike, 1940), p. 3.

14 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules For The Granting of Retiring Allowances*, p. 13.

15 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement*, p. 3.

16 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report*, p. 11.

17 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "The Financial Status of the Professor in America and in Germany," *Bulletin Number Two* (New York: The Foundation, May 1908), p. VII.

18 Graebner, *A History of Retirement*, p. 760.

19 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "The Financial Status of the Professor in America and in Germany," pp. 63, 65, 68.

20 Ibid., p. 86.

21 Ibid., p. 87.

22 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Act of Incorporation, By-laws, Rules For The Granting of Retiring Allowances*, p. 1.

23 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Founded 1905* (Concord, N.H. : The Rumford Press, 1919), p. 1.

24 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report*, p. 37 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancment of Teaching, "Paper Relating to the Admission of State Institutions To The System of Retiring Allowances of The Carnegie Foundation," *Bulletin Number One* (New York: The Foundation, March 1907), p. 38.

25 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Papers Relating to the Admission of State Institutions To The System of Retiring Allowances of The Carnegie Foundation," p. 10.

26 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report*, pp. 8, 10.

27 Ibid., p. 38.

28 Ibid., pp. 38-39.

29 Ibid., p. 13.

30 Ibid., p. 49.

31 Ibid., p. 50.

32 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Papers Relating to the Admission of State Institutions To The System of Retiring Allowances of The Carnegie Foundation," p. 5.

33 Ibid., pp. 7-8.

34 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement*, p. 3.

35 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Rules For The Admission Of Institutions And for The Granting of Retiring Allowances* (New York: The Foundation, May 1908), pp. 11-12.

36 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement,* p. 41 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Founded 1905*, p. 5.

37 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Founded 1905*, p. 5.

38 Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Expansion and Inclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," *SIGNS, Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3, 4 (1978): 766.

39 Alison Prentice, "Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Early Employment at the University of Toronto," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 2 (1991): 238-240.

40 Graham, "Expansion and Inclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," p. 765.

41 Prentice, "Bluestockings, Feminists, or Women Workers? A Preliminary Look at Women's Early Employment at the University of Toronto," p. 240.

42 Graham, "Expansion and Inclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education," p. 771.

43 In Canada, post secondary education dates from the first half of the nineteenth century. The earliest institutions, many of which were religiously based, were founded in the Maritimes and what are now the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Moving from east to west, the province of Nova Scotia had two institutions of higher learning open in 1838: at Halifax, Dalhousie University (then named Dalhousie College); and at Wolfeville, the Baptist academy, Acadia College. Two Roman Catholic universities were also established early on, St. Francis Xavier at Antigonish, and St. Mary's at Halifax. In New Brunswick, the University of New Brunswick found its beginnings as a college in 1800, and the Methodist academy, Mount Allison University, opened in 1843. Through the generosity of the wealthy merchant James McGill, McGill University opened in Montreal in 1829 and Laval University came into being in 1852 at Quebec. The idea of post-secondary education in Upper Canada first arose in 1798 when approximately half of the 550,000 acres which had been set aside as school lands were designated as an endowment for a provincial university. A charter for the proposed institution, to be named King's College, was granted in 1827, but it was not until 1843 that its doors actually opened in Toronto. Meanwhile, anticipating that King's college would be under Anglican influence, Upper Canada Academy, a Methodist secondary school at Cobourg, received a Royal charter as Victoria University in 1841. Similarly, in 1842, the Presbyterians took steps to open Queen's College, later Queen's University, and the Roman Catholics Regiopolis College, both at Kingston. Consequently to University College, formerly King's College, being secularized, the Anglican-based University of Trinity College was opened in Toronto in 1852. As a result of a federation which dated back to 1887, the University of Toronto came into being in 1906, incorporating several colleges including both Victoria and Trinity Universities and University

College. See Joannette, *WORN OUT: The Origins And Early Development Of Pensions In Canada*, pp. 214-215.

44 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report*, p. 27.

45 Ibid., p. 24.

46 Ibid., pp. 24-25.

47 Ibid., p. 27.

48 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Papers Relating To The Admission of State Institutions To The System of Retiring Allowances Of The Foundation," p. 44.

49 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *First Annual Report*, pp. 32-34.

50 Ibid., p. 35.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid., pp. 34-35.

54 Brandon University Archives, R81-30 series I, Letters of June 19, 1929, Feb. 1, 1930, Feb. 26, 1930, March 29, 1930, April 1, 1930, May 28, 1930.

55 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement*, pp. 43-44.

56 Ibid., pp. 44-45.

57 Ibid.

58 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Founded 1905*, p. 7.

59 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Comprehensive Plan of Insurance and Annuities for College Teachers* (Boston: D. B. Updike, 1916), p. 43.

60 Ibid., pp. 20-21 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Founded 1905*, p. 16.

61 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Amending The Court Order of November 18, 1939* (New York: The Foundation, 1946), p. 48 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of A Century of Teachers Retirement*, p. 48 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Some Missapprehensions Touching Life Insurance," *Twelfth Annual Report*, Appendices to part II (New York: D. B. Updike, 1917), p. 76.

62 Rainard B. Robbins, *Retirement Plans for College Faculties* (New York: Teachers Insurance And Annuity Association of America, 1934), pp. 10-11 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Some Misapprehensions Touching Life Insurance," p. 76.

63 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Amending the Court Order of November 18, 1939*, pp. 11-12.

64 Ibid., p. 12.

65 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *A Third of a Century of Teachers Retirement*, pp. 48-49.

66 Ibid., p. 4.

67 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, "Some Misapprehensions Touching Life Insurance," *Twelfth Annual Report*, part II, p. 36.

68 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Progress of the Contractual Plan of Old Age*

Annuities (Boston: D. B. Updike, 1921), p. 10.

69 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Charters and Basic Laws of Selected American Universities and Colleges* (New York: The Foundation, 1934), pp. 12-17.

70 The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Progress of the Contractual Plan of Old Age Annuities*, p. 29 and The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching, *Twelfth Annual Report*, part I (New York: D. B. Updike, 1917), p. 53.

71 Robbins, *Retirement Plans for College Faculties*, pp. 17-30.

72 Ibid., pp. 31-39.

73 Ibid., p. 64.

74 Ibid., pp. 64, 67.

75 Stanley Price Frost, *McGill University For The Advancement of Learning*, vol. II (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984), p. 125.

76 Hilda Neatby, *Queen's University*, vol. I (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978), p. 258.

77 Ibid., pp. 259, 267, 282.

78 Frederick W. Gibson, *Queen's University*, vol. II (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983), p. 8.

79 Ibid., p. 452.

80 In Canada and/or the United States retirement plans were initiated during the nineteenth century for the military, federal government employees, ministers of various churches, school teachers and railway and bank employees, see Joannette, *WORN OUT: The Origins And Early Development Of Pensions In Canada.*

81 David Hackett Fischer and Andrew Achenbaum have each detailed the history of old age in the United States. Both of these historians see the tradition of age veneration changing during the nineteenth century. Fischer concludes that after 1820, a societal ideology of personal freedom and equality resulted in the elderly being viewed negatively. Age denigration, according to Achenbaum, does not appear until later in the nineteenth century with an important role played by medical science in equating aging with disease. See Andrew W. Achenbaum, *Old Age in the New Land* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978) and David Hackett Fischer, *Growing Old In America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

82 Anthony Trollope, *The Fixed Period* (Leipzig, 1882), p. 18.