This book was commissioned by the Federation of Medical Women of Canada on the occasion of their Golden Jubilee. It is a history of the struggle women had to obtain a medical education in Canada, portraying in some detail the lives of the first women to enter medicine and of those who made outstanding contributions to medicine and their country in succeeding years.

Canadian women did not want to masquerade as men to be accepted in medical schools, as the first woman to practise medicine in Canada had done. So, beginning with the suffragette movement, they campaigned vigorously and although they achieved their goal it was their outstanding performance as students and doctors that established them on a firm footing with their male colleagues.

The book is well written, describes the all-round characteristics of the lady doctors, their courage and tenacity, their duties as mothers, their love for beauty, music and attractive clothes; their good humor and wit and their dedicated service to medical practice. Their contributions were not only within Canada but also around the world - India, China, Tibet, Serbia, Ceylon, Africa. They also gave service to their country in the armed forces and received several awards of merit in recognition of their work at home and abroad. In less than a century, they progressed from “stay-at-homes” to leaders in their profession - the truly indomitable lady doctors.

Isobel Wright, M.D.
Montreal

This book merits only an essentially negative eulogy before it is buried among the Canadian publications that are remembered best because they were remaindered quickly. Such a fate is a relatively kind one for a work that promises much and delivers it so badly. It is regrettable, however, that Profiles of Canadian Educators will no doubt detract considerably from the recent efforts of both Canadian publishers and educational historians to improve the quality of their work.

With the suspect and rather whiggish point of view “that students, particularly those claiming novice standing as historians, prefer to read about people and their ideas” as a starting point, the editors set out to meet this need by preparing twenty biographical essays of Canadian educators. The Introduction explains their “attempt to examine a limited number of the more influential and representative lives and ideas in our educational past,” the practical need to limit their choice to the areas of “elementary and secondary education, and the professionalization of teachers” as well as their complaint by way of “justification for this approach... that the rapidly expanding body of published literature dealing with the history of Canadian education has not yet included a source book dealing with significant people...” These views are eminently reasonable as far as they go toward describing the editors’ reasons for embarking on a work they see as
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"a beginning." It would have been comforting in an academic sense, however, to read some discussion of the views contemporary scholars hold regarding the use of biography as a vehicle for historical explanation. (It is impossible to cite references for the above quotations because the pages of the Introduction are not numbered.)

Since I work in a building named for the man and have studied his work at various times, my attention was drawn initially to the essay entitled "John G. Althouse: Eclectic Educator" by J. W. Friesen, one of the general editors, and D. McGaw, a graduate student at the University of Calgary. And I was delighted to see reference made to some of my own writing in the footnotes. My pleasure, however, was short-lived as I realized rather quickly that Friesen and McGaw do not know the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarism. The sentence to which footnote 6 refers on page 389 contains forty-eight words. Forty-one of them, including the italics, also appear in the original on page 3190 of Canadian Education: A History, where they were published first in 1970. While the footnote reference is correct, there are no quotation marks in the text. Also, in the seven new words which appear an amateurish distortion has been perpetrated. "... a high percentage" (the original) is rather different from "... a higher percentage" (the Friesen-McGaw version) in the context of the passage.

The next sentence on page 389 also relies heavily on "borrowing." Of its total of forty-one words, thirty-three appear in two sentences on page 160 in the original publication, F. Henry Johnson's A Brief History of Canadian Education (1968). The extra eight words are used to alter tense, add connectives and change "high school teacher" to "secondary school teacher." Johnson received neither quotation marks nor a footnote number for his efforts. The only clue to the source is in the collected footnotes at the end of the article. It would seem that Friesen and McCaw have been far more "eclectic" than J. G. Althouse ever dreamed of being. He merely devoted his efforts to increasing democracy in education, improving scholarship and developing a sense of respect for integrity, honesty, industry and responsible individualism among students.

Of course, not all of the biographies are as bad as that of Althouse. Neil McDonal'd's work on Taché and Goggins is commendable, as is A. H. Child's sketch of Herbert B. King, a little-known educator who contributed his services in British Columbia. Jud Purdy has contributed his familiar interpretation of Strachan. R. S. Patterson and W. B. Hamilton have written interesting accounts of educators who influenced education in Alberta and the Maritimes. And the contribution of Adelaide Hoodless is dealt with adequately by R. M. Stamp. Despite individual efforts like these, however, the general assessment of the collection must remain negative.

Each essay is introduced unnecessarily by a Who's Who style summary which merely distracts readers from what follows. All of the sections are marred by gross errors in spelling, proofreading or careless scholarship. The editors, contributors and publishers are the only ones who are in a position to decide who is responsible. All of them will undoubtedly find it embarrassing. It is disappointing to find that Stamp's works on James L. Hughes and John Seath are very similar to his treatment of urbanization, industrialization and curriculum reform published in Heyman, Lawson and Stamp, Studies in Educational Change (1972). Also, something new might have been expected of J. L. McNeill's treatment of Ryerson if someone had suggested that he incorporate the results of the recent and readily available research of Susan Houston, Alison Prentice and J. D. Wilson. The text indicates that the complaint is justified although one would be hard pressed to prove it by footnote references. The last nine were never printed.
Many Canadian educators are not very well known it is true. But we might better wait for *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography* to fill this gap rather than embarking on collections of dubious quality like *Profiles of Canadian Educators*. I am certain that educators will forgive the editors if they do not produce the “companion volume” promised in their Introduction. In fact, scholars in Faculties of Education should be too busy keeping this book out of their students’ hands to prevent the spread of errors in hundreds of essays, reviews and term assignments to give the matter any further thought.

Hugh A. Stevenson
The University of Western Ontario

To say that the history of English education in the nineteenth century is a well-tilled patch is the grossest of understatements: three out of every four books published since 1945 deal in one way or other with this formative period of the national system. Seeing that Britain was the first industrial nation, this narcissism is perhaps understandable, but as Sol Cohen observes in a recent essay in Volume 2 of *The History of Education*, most historians to date stand guilty of the sin of parochialism in confusing education with schooling (“writing a narrow history of the schools”), not to mention the sin of evangelism (“seeking to inspire teachers with professional zeal rather than attempting to understand what really happened.”)

Mercifully, David Wardle’s study is not just another addition to the list. A blend of social, economic, and political analyses, it is a sober review of the complex forces whose interaction has secured the establishment of the state-controlled education system as we know it today. As he points out, “A mental effort is needed to think away the identification of ‘education’ with ‘schooling,’ but in historical terms the dominance of the school is very recent.” Since 1870 the extension of the school’s brief into what were formerly considered to be essentially private affairs can be illustrated in a variety of ways, notably by that recent development in British schools, the appearance of the school counsellor. This trend towards the assumption of responsibilities which previously were discharged by parents, priests, family doctors and other social agencies has become so pronounced that it has come to be taken for granted, almost as if it were inevitable, even desirable. As a result, arguments which assert that the trend needs to be checked, if not actually reversed, receive little or no support from public or professional opinion.

Though the author is at pains to disclaim any intention of presenting a critique of the case for de-schooling, he is clearly apprised of the strong points in that case, weighing its pros and cons with admirable shrewdness and fairness. Very sensibly, he rejects any suggestion that a wholesale dismantling of the existing is practicable: on the other hand, he recognizes the need to move on from a “schooled society” on the nineteenth century model to the kind of “learning society” envisaged by the UNESCO report, *Learning to Be*, and by such forward-thinkers as Torsten Husén if the ideal of education as a continuous process is ever to be achieved.

What emerges from his study is the idea that the rise of the schooled society coincided with a steady shift away from laissez faire policies in which free enterprise and self-help were the rule, to policies of welfare statism which stressed collectivism and the mass production of services intended for a consumer society. This dialectical process, it seems, is now giving way to a third stage of development, as yet not clearly defined, but witnessed by the growing interest in l’éducation permanente,