

in higher education, and it is probably a useful addition to the studies already published by the Foundation.

Bill Ahamad
Consultant

Gwendoline Evans Pilkington, *Speaking with One Voice: Universities in Dialogue with Government*. Montreal: McGill University, 1983, 296 pp.

This work provides "an account of the relations of Canadian universities with Federal and Provincial Governments, as reflected in the history of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1911-1981." It derives in part from the history of the AUCC up to 1961 undertaken by Dr. Pilkington for doctoral thesis, and thus is founded on extensive research, both documentary and interview.

The irony of the main title, *Speaking with One Voice*, will be apparent to those familiar with voluntary associations of universities like the AUCC. The problem of securing consensus on major policy issues is difficult enough for the associations in one province (Ontario, Quebec), more so for those which span several provinces (Atlantic, the West), but is particularly taxing at the national level: "...the combined elements of the nation's geography, demography, cultural diversity, regional disparity, and, above all, the constitutional constraints that preclude federal participation in matters of education have always conspired to promote decentralization, provincialism, and parochialism." As with any voluntary interinstitutional organization, the AUCC's member representatives come together with differing personal inclinations (both substantive and strategic), and bearing a variety of institutional views. But they are also frequently caught between pressures from the two levels of government. Evaluation of the effectiveness of such an organization must bear these constraints in mind; the author is very aware of this.

Yet *Speaking with One Voice* is a perfectly apposite title, since it provides a metaphor for the central *raison d'être* of any interinstitutional organization, to be a spokesman for the common interests of its members. Constantly bedevilled by differences, it must pursue the goal of fostering consensus if it is to be effective, or even to survive. Abundant goodwill, readiness to compromise on lesser points for the greater good, and skillful diplomacy are all required.

These themes are well demonstrated through the historical account provided in this work. It is organized effectively by periods which reveal dominant characteristics, characteristics which are primarily determined by the societal and political environment.

The first period (1911 - 1939) was 'germinal', during which the organization was created and developed into an instrument which could be called into play later when the need for it was pressing. The association was not particularly active in relations with government, but its members developed the habit of

exchanging information and debating academic policy issues amongst themselves. Out of this grew a coalescence of common understanding and commitment which later could be capitalized upon in reacting to external events.

It was the Second World War which propelled the AUCC to centre stage in national affairs. Pressing manpower issues, involving first mobilization and then demobilization, required the universities to unite in the service of the nation, but also to speak forcibly in protection of their own proper concerns. At the end of the War, the members of AUCC recognized that it had assumed through the force of circumstances a *de facto* legislative and executive role that had not been envisioned, by acting with a common voice. While there was some debate over the legitimacy of this role, it was reinforced by subsequent exigencies.

The next period is characterized under the heading, "The Case for More Federal Aid". The financial crisis of the universities, suffered quietly during the Depression and exacerbated by the dramatic influx of veterans after the War, propelled them to become vigorous lobbyists (although they would not have liked this characterization) with government, and for the first time, with the public. Their success in 1951 in convincing the federal government to begin a programme of direct aid for the universities, was highlighted by the role given AUCC, bypassing the provincial governments, in ruling on institutional eligibility for this funding. In 1956, AUCC was given even more prominence as the vehicle for distribution of federal grants. An unfortunate offshoot of this development, however, was a degree of confusion over structure and roles.

The subsequent collapse of the central granting arrangement, beginning in 1959 with a federal government settlement of the long-standing dispute with Quebec over the grants, in favour of optional tax points, shifted the national environment again towards provincialism, and the universities became the rope in a new "federal-provincial tug-of-war". The nationalist aspirations of Quebec were now assuming a dominant role in this struggle.

The central part of the volume begins with the advent of the '60s, when the strains caused by federal-provincial tensions were compounded by the turbulence on campus. Not only did the administrators belonging to the AUCC have to cope with revolting students and faculty, but the task of representing the universities and their needs to government and the public was frustrated by the negative image of extreme challenges to authority and orthodoxy. Democratization of the universities proceeded at a rapid pace, bringing further difficulties for their leaders, within AUCC as well as at home.

University relations with the federal government took an about-turn in 1966, when Prime Minister Pearson announced that the federal government was turning the responsibility for postsecondary funding over to the provinces. Here truly was ground for an AUCC identity crisis. This dramatic announcement came entirely without warning let alone consultation. (The AUCC newspaper, *University Affairs*, at the time described the 1966-67 year with exquisite blandness as "one of adjustment to the increased role of provincial government in university affairs.") In adapting to the new situation, AUCC tried to establish relations

with the new inter-provincial Council of Ministers of Education of Canada (CMEC), and for the first time assumed a clear role in speaking to the provinces as well as the federal government. The CMEC ear turned out, however, to be congenitally 95% deaf.

The 1960s ended with an ominous statement from the Prime Minister (now Trudeau) that the cost-sharing formula established for postsecondary education in 1967 would no longer be open-ended. The AUCC rallied to the defence of university funding needs, but was unable even to get a hearing from the Prime Minister. The federal ear was becoming deaf as well.

The tug-of-war continued, but 1974 saw a slight breakthrough when CMEC for the first time responded positively to a request to meet with AUCC. Nonetheless, AUCC remained largely a spectator in the federal-provincial struggle. Meanwhile the AUCC faced internal problems in controlling its Secretariat and finances. These difficulties were faced and overcome for the time being. Another significant internal development was the evolution of closer relations with provincial and regional counterpart organizations of universities. This recognition of new realities has served all parties well.

The mid-seventies saw a new thrust when AUCC argued for a seat at the table where the federal-provincial wrangling took place. The concern over the new environment was not just that the universities had become the rope in the tug-of-war, but that the negotiations between the two orders of government affecting higher education were conducted by finance ministers, with little or no attention being given to the substantive issues affecting the health of the university system. The force of these representations was dulled, however, by the refusal of the Quebec universities to endorse them.

The end of 1976 saw a further withdrawal of the federal government from a position of influence over university development; federal support for post-secondary education would henceforth be given in the form of unconditional transfers to the provinces (the now infamous Established Programs Financing (EPF) Act which came into effect in 1977).

The nadir of university relations with the federal government was reached in 1971 when the AUCC was informed by federal ministers that "all future initiations concerning the universities must be discussed with CMEC. Research. . . was now the only possible area of direct contact between the AUCC and Ottawa." One could be forgiven for interpreting this development as the death-knell of AUCC. Adjusting again to its environment, however, AUCC began to concentrate on a national approach to the support of university research. In this area it has had some positive impact. AUCC also continued to argue for a national higher education policy and better processes of consultation involving both levels of government and the universities.

The eighties began with another in a series of reorganizations which AUCC had undergone since its inception. It has now come full circle back to its beginnings as a president's organization, having experimented for some years with a broadly representative structure.

This is a lively history, easy reading throughout, and occasionally colourful. The approach is primarily descriptive, but does offer interpretation and some evaluative comments. The coverage of the last few years seems the least satisfying, appearing rather thin. Perhaps this is an inevitable reaction to an account of recent events in which the reader was intimately involved.

More attention to the role of staff in the 25 years since AUCC has had a Secretariat would have been welcome. The organization has been profoundly influenced by the style and abilities of its executive officers. Yet the difficulty of so doing is easy to recognize: the history includes events so recent that most of the players are still around.

Careful reading is somewhat frustrated by the frequent absence of precise dates when certain things occurred. I found myself frequently backtracking to surmise what the year was. Only a couple of minor inaccuracies are apparent: the reference to Ryerson becoming a university (p. 150), and the implication that all provinces base grants strictly on enrolment (p. 205).

It is a stimulating account, and I commend it highly to all those interested in relations among universities, and between them and government.

G. Grant Clarke
Council of Ontario Universities

Frederick Gibson, *Queen's University, Vol. II 1917-1961, To Serve And Yet Be Free*. McGill-Queen's University Press 1983, pp. xvii + 518. \$49.50.

The first volume of the new history of Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, was published in 1978. It was written by Hilda Neatby and covered the years 1841 - 1917. As the Preface to Volume I relates, it was thought to be a distinct advantage that Dr. Neatby had no previous connection with the university and would be able 'to bring to the writing of its history an independent judgment and a fresh view'.

Unfortunately Hilda Neatby died in 1975, leaving a first volume essentially complete, and draft materials for a projected second volume. Professors Frederick Gibson and Roger Graham of the department of History undertook to see the Neatby volume through the press, and by reason of professional skill and experience, Gibson was then the obvious choice to be the author of the second volume. This book traces the story of the university from the middle of the first World War to the end of the principalship of W.A. Mackintosh, that is, to 1961.

As Gibson himself tells us in his Preface, the obvious difference between Neatby and himself is that he was born practically on campus, grew up in its ambiance, took his bachelor's and master's degrees in the department of History and, after further graduate study at Harvard and a few years' employment in the Public Archives of Canada, returned to Queen's in 1952. He has thus completed over thirty years in the service of the university. Nevertheless he has