

research. J.E. O'Neill, Deputy Archivist of the United States, provides a useful six-page summary of American access legislation and regulations at the federal level. An historian who has sued for access to public papers, Allen Weinstein, acknowledges some anxiety about the potential misuse of previously confidential personal records. D.J. Reed, Director of the Office of Presidential Librarian, describes the application of access restrictions in those institutions. Professors B.W. Cooke and B.J. Bernstein, despite substantial revision of their papers after the conference, demonstrate the difficulty of writing about archival management without a mastery of the subject.

This volume does not provide a benchmark on the archival continuum between preservation and access, but it does serve as a report on the status of American archives, archivists and historians. The 1970 *Report of the Joint AHA-OAH Committee to Investigate Charges Against the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library* demonstrated a lack of communication between curators and users. Not all differences of opinion have been resolved since that report, but historians and archivists are discussing these subjects in a better atmosphere. Access to archival materials and preservation of the historical record are major news items before the American public. The emergence of the Society of American Archivists as a lobby with a full-time Executive Director has had some effect, but the key player has been a former President reluctant to make adequate provision for his papers.

A major theme of the conference was the evolution of the Presidential libraries, whose success in meeting the limited objectives of an earlier era are acknowledged. However, the extension of those objectives and the proliferation of libraries has led many to conclude that a more effective approach to the preservation of the nation's most important papers can be found. The National Archives has implemented many modifications to the operations of the libraries, particularly in the application of access restrictions, since the Roosevelt Library case eight years ago.

The *Final Report of the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials* is now available to compare with the original resolutions of the New Harmony conference. The Commission recommended that all records accumulated in the course of their duties by federal officials, including the President, be recognized to be the property of the United States and placed in the National Archives immediately upon the conclusion of the term of office. It also recommended that normal access restrictions to Presidential papers should not exceed fifteen years and that all classified material be reviewed for declassification after twenty or twenty-five years. If action is taken soon on these recommendations, the divergence between documentation accessible in Washington and Ottawa on the same issue will become even greater.

D.L. McDonald
Public Archives of Canada

A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960, ROBIN S. HARRIS.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, ©1976, 1977 printing. xxiv, 715 p. ISBN 0 8020 3336 9 \$37.50.

With no single name is the history of higher education in Canada more closely associated than that of Robin S. Harris. A simple glance at the opening of the bibliography of his latest contribution to this field, *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960*, attests to this fact. In 1960 appeared Harris' *Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada* (compiled with A. Tremblay); this was followed by book-length supplements in 1965 and 1971, as well as a series of updatings in successive

issues of *Stoa: The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*. For sheer determination in drawing together the widely scattered *corpus* of published writings on higher education in this country, Professor Harris must be given full credit. He is a bibliographer *par excellence*.

Harris' *History of Higher Education* marks the partial fruition of about twenty years of research and reflection. It is an imposing achievement, and it is difficult to disagree with the publisher's statement that it will become "the definitive work in its field, valuable both for the wealth of information and the historical insights it contains." Certainly the book will be found within close reach of any scholar or student engaged in examining Canadian higher education in its historical perspective. In its organizational structure and in its major focus—the evolution of curricula, research, and scholarship—the book makes easily available almost any item of factual data for almost any institution of higher learning in the country that one could wish to find. Some might say more.

It is important to note the magnitude of this achievement. Apart from such specialized studies as D.C. Masters' pioneering monograph, *Protestant Denominational Colleges in Canada*, there is almost nothing which attempts systematically to establish the structure and development of Canadian higher education within a general framework. In writing *The American College and University*, Frederick Rudolph had an impressive body of institutional, thematic, and biographical scholarship to draw upon, for example, Samuel Eliot Morison's two-volume *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*. Harris has had no Canadian Morison, for there is none; there exists instead a number of commemorative and uncritical histories of different institutions which provide valuable background, but leave much unexamined. Harris had also the multitude of writings on higher education of an occasional nature, ranging widely in intention and quality, but these had not even been collected bibliographically much less examined and synthesized in whole or in part. Little wonder that Harris' project has required almost a quarter century and has thus far reached only 1960, the point at which Canadian higher education underwent a growth of geometric proportions. He has yet to confront the "multiversity."

This relative paucity of systematic scholarship on higher education in Canada also explains why this book of 750 pages, while suggesting in its title an examination of the whole period 1663-1960, in fact focusses mainly upon only five years: 1860, 1890, 1920, 1940, and 1960. (Three short early chapters examine the development of higher education before 1860 in French and English Canada, but these total only thirty-four pages.) Each of these years becomes the focus of a section of the book; chapters within each section systematically and comprehensively examine—sometimes in overwhelming detail—Institutional Development (by region), Arts and Science, Professional Education, Graduate Studies, and Scholarship and Research. By focussing upon certain key years a couple of decades apart, Harris is at once able to subject university calendars to detailed static examination, to range back and forth between key years, and thereby to subject each period to a comparative analysis which allows him to draw general conclusions. It is an ingenious mode of organization, for it allows one to read the core chapters consecutively as a monographic overview or to focus upon one's particular interest—say Professional Education—and to read them in the same fashion. Some reviewers have rather uncharitably suggested that this is a book which by sheer wealth of detail will seldom be read cover to cover. It is far more likely that the book will be read front to back in several different ways. In a sense it is not one book, but many.

Harris set out to determine whether there was anything distinctive about the Canadian university experience. He concludes that there was, in part because of the melding

of other traditions—American, Jesuit, Scottish, London, and Oxford-Cambridge—and in part because of regionalization, with many institutions having resulted from geographic necessities. If these factors can be seen as divisive, several others served to unite Canadian universities: the mechanism of federation, and the national organization, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, formerly the National Conference of Canadian Universities. Harris notes: “The fact that there has been such a body embracing the great variety of institutions that comprise the Canadian higher education system, whether large or small, old or new, state-supported or denominational, multi-faculty or professional school, English language, French language or bilingual, has produced a situation in direct contrast to that which applied when the Prince of Wales visited the Canadian colonies in 1860. At that time the institutions operated in complete isolation from each other; they were rivals rather than partners in a common enterprise. By 1960, . . . they could speak with a common and authoritative voice.”

Harris suggests other distinctive characteristics which give Canadian higher education a unique character, but for this journal it is less germane to rehearse them than to note that Harris’ observations are derived from an extensive reading exclusively of *published* primary and secondary sources. Harris’ chapter notes and bibliography reveal that he has full command over the vast morass of such material, but missing from the research for the book is any examination and use of manuscripts. There appears to have been no consultation, or at least use, of the papers of those powerful educators who in some instances almost single-handedly not only placed most courses in university calendars, but also taught many of them. The private papers of G.M. Grant, J.W. Dawson, Robert Falconer, and D.M. Gordon, to name only a few, are replete with the raw materials from which a study of the inner dynamics, as distinct from the public face, of Canadian universities will be constructed. Also to be found in university repositories are such private papers of prominent members of the English-Canadian professoriate as those of John Watson, the philosopher; Adam Shortt, the political economist; Stephen Leacock, the political economist and humorist; and Frank Underhill and A.R.M. Lower, two of Canada’s leading historians. Apart from what these rich historical sources tell about the men themselves, they also shed much revealing and lively light on life-long individual experiences set within the confines of university campuses. A history of Canada’s universities which manages to explore such sources in combination with the data provided by Harris will set forward a decidedly different picture of higher education than that of the volume under review.

Professor Harris has, to be fair, written a different kind of book, one which has asked questions that can largely be answered by utilizing printed sources alone. M.K. Oliver, President of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in 1976, in effect notes this in his Foreword to Harris’ book: “There are other first histories of higher education that might have been written,” he admits. “Valuable, lively books could have been written about the shifting composition and concerns of the student body, the relations between universities and the community or government, or the development of post-secondary education as a whole. . . . Future historians of Canadian universities,” he concludes, “can explore the many other facets of higher education that Professor Harris leaves largely untouched, confident that the core book has been written.” That book *has* now been written, and doubtless it will greatly ease the tasks of those who take up Professor Oliver’s challenging suggestions.

A.B. McKillop
Department of History
University of Manitoba