

sentences. These aspects include: his relationship with Innis (the University of Toronto archives are rife with Cody/Innis correspondence), with other members of the professoriate including radical professors, (which is also discussed at relative length but still tantalizingly brief), and especially with women faculty who were agitating quite vociferously in the late 1930s and 1940s; his dealings with business and community leaders; and while President his relationship and nature of communication with the church (and in this capacity his evolving feelings for both institutions). In short, Cody's life was obviously involved, and his participation in the church, politics, and higher education deserves a far more analytical, in-depth, and critical approach, indeed, a two-volume set if the perspective were proper. This kind of survey was popular years ago with the pre-revisionism in educational history, and would more easily blend with the decor of a coffee table. In essence, it is a memorial to a man with many public accomplishments, but surely a more flexible treatment of Cody and a more detailed explanation of his times are in order.



Chilly Collective (Eds.). (1995). *Breaking Anonymity: The Chilly Climate for Women Faculty*. Waterloo ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press (Pp. x, 390). Price: \$24.95.

Reviewed by Lynn McDonald, University of Guelph

*Breaking Anonymity* is the work of a functioning, ongoing women's collective at the University of Western Ontario. Most of its twelve chapters were written by members of the collective; there are contributions also from Queen's University, the University of Saskatchewan and St. Mary's (this last a student perspective) and one by a sympathetic male professor at Western. The chapters, most of which were published before in some form or other, all have useful introductory notes. Most concern the chilly climate at law school, but women in academe in any university

in any discipline will find much that is, alas, still all too familiar. There are lessons to be learned, in some cases with specific tips, for every Canadian university.

The impetus for the book came from the distribution, October, 1986, of a memorandum by Sheila McIntyre, "Gender Bias Within a Canadian Law School," (Queen's), which was widely circulated through the *CAUT Bulletin* in 1987 and forms Chapter 7 in this collection. McIntyre's memo detailed the patterns of "stereotyping, sexualization, overt harassment, exclusion and devaluation" she experienced in her first year teaching (p. 1). The memo directly inspired the next moves, at Western, which make up Chapters 3, 4 and 5: "An Historical Perspective: Reflections on the Western Employment Equity Award" by Constance Backhouse; "The Chilly Climate for Faculty Women at Western: Postscript to the *Backhouse Report*," by Backhouse, Roma Harris, Gillian Michell and Alison Wylie; and "Epilogue: The Remarkable Response to the Release of the *Chilly Climate Report*," by Michell and Backhouse (with two appendices).

Incredibly enough, as the title of Chapter 3 announces, the University of Western Ontario received an employment equity award from the Ontario Women's Directorate, in November 1986, just after the circulation of the McIntyre report from Queen's. Many women believed that the award was "premature," as Backhouse, then an assistant professor of law, tactfully put it (p. 61). The Ontario government's award commended the university for its "aggressive strategy for hastening the representation of women," when the data actually showed that their representation had *declined* (from 15.5% - 20.6% in the period 1929-35 to 14.8% in 1987-88, the last year for which data were available).

Backhouse's article documenting the problem of under representation, lower compensation, discrimination in hiring etc., is written in the first person. It conveys the author's weariness that yet again it raised "the hackles of those who feel uneasy over the presence of *any* women in academia. The reports multiply, the backlash swells, and still there *is* no dent" (p. 62). Backhouse described her own experiences as a junior faculty member (appointed in 1979), one of only two full-time women in the law faculty, and the backlash she incurred when, speaking on a panel on legal careers for women, related the statistics on under-representation

of women in academic law and described the situation as “atrocious” (p. 63). The article recounts examples of women courageously resisting the university’s sexism in the 1970s that led to the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Women’s Salaries.

Chapter 5 recounts the response of the university to Backhouse’s report, including the opposition of a number of faculty women. All this makes for discouraging reading: the provost’s reply was belittling and he concluded that the report set back the issue five years! (p. 133); the university president issued accusations of McCarthyism (p. 143); and the four women authors were reported to the university’s ethics committee for investigation! (pp. 146-7)

Another chapter, by the President’s Advisory Committee on the Status of Women at the University of Saskatchewan, consists of excerpts from an extensive 1993 report, *Reinventing Our Legacy*. This work includes issues of safety, sexual harassment and educational equity, as it concerns faculty, students and staff. It both addresses the chilly climate issue and offers a “preferred scenario” for change. The committee itself was set up in 1990 by the university president for the precise reason that so many of the problems identified in reports from the 1970s remain twenty years later.

One of the best chapters is by Bruce Feldthusen, a Western law professor: “Gender Wars: ‘Where the Boys Are.’ ” It provides both a vivid description of the dynamics of sexism, noting men’s silence at the insults women receive, and analysis: “Men exercise ‘their’ ultimate tool of oppression, their right ‘not to know’” (p. 282). It ends with a plea to men to end discrimination and practical advice on how to do it (pp. 301-4). He is undoubtedly correct that “Men have more power to end the gender wars than do women” (p. 302).

One of the most painful chapters was Patricia A. Monture-OKanee’s description of her experience, when a law student, attending a summer conference, 1987, at her university, Queen’s. She related her distress at the use of the term “disadvantaged” for native or other non-white non middle class persons, pointing out the bias it revealed. “Disadvantage is a nice, soft, comfortable word to describe dispossession, to describe a

situation of force whereby our very existence, our histories, are erased continuously right before our eyes. Words like disadvantage conceal racism” (p. 268). At a workshop at the conference a white woman law professor from an elite American institution presented a case of a 68 year old, poor, black, arthritic woman from the Bronx. A month behind in her rent, and resisting eviction with a knife, the woman was shot by a black policeman. Monture-OKanee recounts that she felt “exposed and raw” hearing the story (p. 272). Professors normally show some concern when discussing rape, in case there are women present who have been victims of sexual assault. No such courtesy was given her. She felt that her pain had been appropriated, “taken away from me and put on the table and poked and prodded with these sticks, these hypotheticals” (p. 270). (I have to confess that I, as a reviewer, am not sure if I should omit mention of this material to avoid again causing pain to the author, or that her perspective needs to get around to sensitize those of us who do such things at conference workshops.)

Monture-OKanee’s chapter, and two others, were commissioned especially for the book after the manuscript was submitted, on criticism that the manuscript lacked material on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class and disability. Monture-Okanee was herself an (anonymous) reader for the press, then asked to supply both an introduction and her own observations, which she did. Leela Madhava Rau contributed a study of a protocol, adopted 1990 at the University of Western Ontario, on racial harassment. Claire Young and Diana Majury contributed a chapter, “Lesbian Perspectives.” The collective was unable to obtain a contribution on disability.

While most of the chapters are extensively endnoted, some lapses are noticeable. For example, university committees to examine the problem of under representation, lower salaries etc. are dated to 1974 only (p. 64), omitting mention of, and any comparison with, the pioneering study of women – faculty, staff and students – at McMaster University, published 1971 by the Group for Equal Rights at McMaster. The year 1996 marks a quarter century since that report, and a re-reading shows enormous change in the statistics. The weary tone of *Breaking*

*Anonymity* compares sadly with the confident expectation of good will that the earlier report exudes.



Cameron, David. (1996). *Taking Stock: Canadian Studies in the Nineties*. Montreal: Association for Canadian Studies (Pp. xvii, 238). Price: \$20.00.

Reviewed by Leonard J. Evendon, Director, Centre for Canadian Studies, Simon Fraser University

Some twenty-five years ago a controversy erupted in Canadian higher education: were Canadian universities and other post-secondary institutions threatened by the arrival of large numbers of foreign scholars to staff the rapidly expanding institutions? Given that there had always been foreign-born and educated faculty in Canadian universities, why did this become an issue, and why did it occur at this particular juncture?

A number of circumstances contributed to the tensions of those times. Higher education was straining to cope with the demands placed upon it. Large numbers of mature students, returning from active service, inundated the campuses after the war. Women began to attend in larger numbers. Better educated young people were apparently needed in expanding corporate and government sectors. The burgeoning birth rate seemed to prefigure expanding demand for higher education. The question was how to provide for that demand.

The answer involved three principal issues: how to conceive of the appropriate academic structures and orientations, how to provide staffing, and how to build necessary infrastructure. As for the last, greater participation by governments was the obvious way to secure new physical plant and operating budgets. But the first required a much deeper searching of the academic soul. Universities were small by today's standards and some were attached to various church denominations. Requirements regarding faculty teaching and scholarship were