

of the finance committee. Failing in his attempts to win support even from the students whom, upon his inauguration, he had vowed to serve and befriend, he finally admitted defeat and returned to England, leaving one legacy – McGill's first student residence, ironically named not after himself but after the grandfather of his successor, Lewis Douglas.

Douglas, "an astute and able administrator" with "tremendous personal charm," decided in 1939, upon his own initiative, that he should not remain at the helm of one of Canada's leading universities at a time when the nation was at war, but he did not leave until a new principal was found. His chief contribution during his short tenure was to so tighten the administrative reins and to adopt such stringent economies that he brought university expenditures in line with income.

James, a young academic and a well-respected economist, was not a Canadian but he worked indefatigably both in the interests of McGill and of the nation, chairing the Federal Government Advisory Committee on Post-War Reconstruction and the Finance Committee of the National Conference of Canadian Universities. He led the successful NCCU campaign for federal money, without which the immense expansion in higher education which took place throughout Canada in the 1960's would never have occurred. Possessed of a giant intellect, iron will, infinite patience, and almost unlimited energy, "he drove his team, but he never forgot that it was a team, as equally he never forgot that he was the driver and that he wanted it to go his way." Retiring in 1962, just when the waves of student radicalism reached the shores of Canadian campuses, James was among the last of the executive heads able to freely use his position coupled with his intellect and administrative expertise to the fullest advantage. It is interesting to speculate that if James had chosen to write his memoirs of McGill how very different they would have been from the recently published account by Claude Bissell of his presidency at Toronto.

There is room for more candid views of Canadian universities like Dorothy McMurray's because they can provide a perspective somewhat different from that afforded by ex-presidents-turned-historians, or by the professional historian writing on the basis of painstaking research rather than from personal experience. The main value of this book, however, is that in a very special way it preserves the record of a bygone era when the universities, although ever hovering on the verge of insolvency, did command unblemished respect and prestige and no one seriously questioned their right to survival.

Gwendoline Pilkington
Higher Education Group
University of Toronto

Abram G. Konrad, ed., *Clientele and Community: The Student in the Canadian Community College*. A Yearbook of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges. Willowdale, Ontario: The Association, 1974. pp. 158.

Abram G. Konard, rédacteur en chef., *La Clientèle du Collège Communautaire: L'étudiant du collège communautaire canadien*. Un recueil d'études de l'Association des collèges communautaires du Canada. Willowdale, Ontario: L'Association, 1974. pp. 183.

"Community Colleges," *CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, XXIII, 3 (December 1974), 8-25, 28.

These two documents – the first yearbook of the four-year-old Association of Canadian Community Colleges and a special report in the December issue of the *CAUT/ACPU Bulletin* – make promising contributions to the scanty literature of non-university post-secondary education in Canada.

The ACCC collection begins with an overview of the college systems of the Canadian provinces, by Gordon Campbell, followed by an outline, by Doris Ryan, of common principles in college development and their implications for planning. Two chapters introduce the clientele of the colleges – one set in Saskatchewan, the other in British Columbia. Then a variety of local arrangements are described – innovative teaching methods in colleges in Prince Edward Island, Ontario and Quebec, an approach to assessment of the college environment drawing on American research, an appraisal of student services in Canadian colleges, and an experiment in college government involving students and staff in a Quebec CEGEP. Studies of drop-outs in an Alberta institute of technology and a follow-up of all students leaving Quebec CEGEPs in a recent year provide some evidence of the effect of community colleges on their students.

With special reference to the problem of movement from college to university, Gordon Mowat puts the whole problem of transferability in Canada-wide perspective. To conclude, the editor, Abram Konrad, and his colleague, John Lang, summarize the issues and draw some implications for the future.

The coverage by the fourteen essays is truly national. In addition to the six that deal with community colleges throughout Canada, six provinces are represented by one or more chapters each: British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. Half of the chapters are research reports, several of them drawing upon their authors' doctoral theses. Much of the research literature to which they refer is American, and has to do with universities rather than colleges, but their work will improve the situation for their successors.

The seven articles in the journal of the Canadian Association of University Teachers begin with the same overview by Gordon Campbell. They too include reference to the problem of transfer from college to university – two articles in this instance. There are three on collective bargaining, a current concern of the CAUT and one with which the colleges have had more experience than the universities. Finally, there is a discussion of teacher classification in the CEGEPs of Quebec in which the author accuses the provincial government of an "ill-inspired" attempt at rationalization.

The colleges are sometimes subject to faddism, and those who write about them slip easily into jargon (one would not be surprised, for example, to see reference to a philosophy of congruent models), but there is something contagious about the enthusiasm of community college people. Obviously the colleges are anxious to serve their clientele – their students – and eager to discover whether they are succeeding in that task. The evidence is still spotty, but one can see that they are trying.

Edward F. Sheffield
Professor of Higher Education
University of Toronto