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price. The Conseil's attitude changed slowly, even after the fusion of the two Montreal Conseils in 1958. There were occasions when the differing Québécois national unionists worked with the CTM, particularly during the Common Front of 1972. But in most instances, the various unions went their separate ways.

Similarly, the question of politics was divisive and perplexing as the CTM grappled with functioning as a pressure group, or endorsing and/or establishing an independent workers' party. Despite the occasional success, they moved away from the latter and rebuked or ousted members who acted to the contrary. They concentrated their efforts at the municipal level, but in the 1960s encouraged support for the New Democratic Party and fluctuated in their position vis-à-vis the péquistes and québécois nationalism. Rank and file response, however, indicated their unwillingness to blindly follow Conseil directives.

The CTM's involvement with labour problems in the rest of the province is well documented. The broadness of their interests are documented in examples of the participation at Murdochville, the stand against federal wage controls, and the Conseil's increasing participation at the local level. The CTM became more of a community and workers' organization; not just unionist. And this remains one of the most positive aspects in its development.

There are some omissions in this study. Had they been included, they would have made the work far more useful. No attempt is made to demographically depict the Conseil's membership. Neither is there a close scrutiny of how involved the CTM was in municipal events. For example, the Conseil agitated for and organized the unemployed in the Great Depression. But what actions did the Conseil take in Montreal during the serious unemployment and housing crisis of 1913-15? And what was the CTM's relationship with the TLC and the CLC? Did the CTM uncritically adhere to all the directives of the Congresses or did they act independently? While the CTM can be justly proud of some of its labour leaders, a balanced assessment of them (warts and all), would have indicated why the CTM was not as effective as it might have been.

Although the book lacks the depth that a history of the CTM merits, it is a useful piece. It provides the reader with a quick and easy reference and thus fills a void. However, too many questions on how the Conseil affected, or was influenced by, Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa — politically and economically — still require elaboration.
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Space devoted to gardens in cities doubtless rivals that devoted to buildings and transportation, yet garden space receives much less attention than either of the others. Moreover, urban garden space has arguably increased in importance over the last century as streets have relinquished their role as social space to become largely conduits, and as creation of private space has largely been accomplished through land (and gardens) in the suburbs and landscaping in the congested core areas where land rents are high.

Apart from a history of city gardens, the more general history of gardening in Canada has yet to be written, as von Baeyer points out. In the meantime her "selected bibliography may help in answering some of the questions about how past generations gardened in Canada."

Material here has been limited to the designed garden rather than the natural, either that published before 1950 or that about gardens existing before 1950. Urban garden space is thus incidental to categories that range from Travel and Immigrant Literature and Naturalists to Railway and School gardening and Parks.

Much has been excluded, notably "the larger landscape questions of which gardening forms a part," including town planning. Local history was not canvassed, British and American horticultural literature read in Canada was omitted as its extent and impact is unknown.

This publication is available, free, in English or French, from Research Publications, Environment Canada — Parks, 1600 Liverpool Court, Ottawa K1A 1G2.
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When a masters program in urban analysis and administration was launched in 1985 at the Université du Québec à Montréal, it seemed a useful first step to prepare a bibliography on the subject.
This volume is the product of that happy thought. It is an initial gathering together of the rather scattered material on municipal administration. The volume is, in fact, both a bibliographical guide and a bibliography. The former part concerns with municipal affairs, a section on bibliographic resources, and a list of sources actually consulted in preparing the bibliography.

The bibliography itself comprises some 1,600 references, most published between 1976 and 1986 (though with some important earlier works). The bulk of citations are from Quebec, Canada, France, Great Britain and the United States. Few articles are featured: the focus is on books.

While the printed bibliography can be easily searched by reference to its 24 thematic categories, it can also be purchased on discettes, using the “Pro-cite” program, and searched electronically.

Though it is an admirable initial effort, even the authors concede it is not perfect and look to their readers for comment. Missing items are not difficult to spot: Planning Perspectives; material from the National Capital Commission; various provincial royal commissions and inquiries; City Politics in Canada; Perloff and Wingo, and Wilbur Thompson in urban economics; the data bases of the Institute for Scientific Information; etc.

From the “sources consulted” it appears that a great deal of reliance was placed on data bases that can be searched electronically. While they have improved by orders of magnitude in the past decade, they continue to leave much to chance. The American ones also tend to be the strongest and the Guide reflects that strength.

Copies of the Guide and further information can be obtained from M. Robert Petrelli, Professeur, Département d’études urbaines, UQAM, C.P. 8888, Succ. A, Montréal H3C 3P8.
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The title is misleading; the substantive field of the book is the architectural output of five individuals, William Robinson, Thomas H. Tracy, George F. Durand, John M. Moore, and Fred Henry who were successively the principals of one architectural practice in the town and, later, city of London, Ontario. The practice began with Robinson as part-time city engineer. Durand and Moore, who were particularly interested in drains, achieved province-wide status within the newly forming profession of architecture. The theoretical framework of the book is not the victorian architecture of southwestern Ontario, but the much broader and richer field of literary, allusionistic nineteenth century revivalist, eclectic architecture.

During my architectural training in the 1950s I was repeatedly advised that this period represented a lamentable lapse in architecture. Eclecticism, whereby full blown classical interiors might lurk within vaguely Gothic outer sobriety, was nothing more than a lack of real conviction, the absence of true principals, and rampant moral turpitude. Since nearly all historic architecture in Canada comes from this period, it was quite easy, in the 1950s, to condemn all premodern work out of hand, and to see the mission of modern architecture as that of replacing the bad old with the good new. Worst of all, victorian architecture was based on literature, not on construction, and therefore was unscientific, antiprogressive, sentimental garbage.

The irony of this mid-twentieth century position is pinpointed by the number of times that victorian buildings in Ontario have been demolished only to be replaced by “greatly inferior architecture,” as happened to Durand’s Canadian Savings and Loan Company, built in 1889, and torn down in the 1960s. In their account of London’s cultural history, interdigitated between the careers of the five architects, Tausky and Distefano repeatedly cite citizens’ and journalists’ pride in the developing architecture of the city, both in public buildings and private houses. Clearly these people expected that good architecture would make a tangible contribution to urban life and they had confidence that their local architects could produce it. By the latter half of the twentieth century such sentiments have almost totally ceased to exist. The attempt to gain quality in the urban environment has now become a drive to keep the architects out and to preserve the good old buildings. Quality urban environment now equates with victorian architecture, and there is very little sense of confidence that modern architects can come up with anything of comparable value.

The buildings erected by these five victorian architects run the gamut from modest cottages to large hospitals, opera houses and civic monuments. They include a large number of churches and these in particular are most eloquent. Buildings like Moore’s Dorchester Presbyterian church of 1889 seem like an Ontario vernacular, springing fully formed out of the very topsoil, not something concocted by an unprincipled (eclectic) architect intent on his own professional advancement. Moore, in any case, was a man of the greatest rectitude.