Historical Papers
Communications historiques

Graduate Studies in History in Canada: The Growth of Doctoral Programmes*

J. B. Conacher

Volume 10, numéro 1, 1975

Edmonton 1975

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030786ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/030786ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)
1712-9109 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Conacher, J. B. (1975). Graduate Studies in History in Canada: The Growth of Doctoral Programmes*. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *10*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.7202/030786ar

J.B. CONACHER
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

*Graduate Studies in History in Canada: The Growth of Doctoral Programmes**

I should like to enlarge on a topic I touched on in a C.H.A. symposium in 1974 with apologies to any of you who may have heard my remarks on that occasion. I can make little claim to originality, but I think the topic sufficiently important to justify my putting before you what seem to me to be some of the salient points. I am fortunate in having a number of recent studies on which to draw — the so-called ACAP Report on History prepared for the Council of Ontario Universities in 1974 and published as No. 15 in the C.O.U. series *Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies,* the Report of the CHA Committee on Graduate Studies chaired by Professor Ivo Lambi which has very recently been submitted to Council, a Report on "Recent Tendencies in Graduate Research in History in Canadian Universities," prepared for the Canada Council Commission on Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences[1] by Professor Carl Berger who kindly showed me an advance copy, an exposure draft of an Interim Report to the same Commission of a University of Toronto Task Force chaired by Professor John Leyerle, and various articles and reports published in the *AHA Newsletter* over the past five years on the job crisis for History PhD's in the United States. All these studies have been made very recently or are still under way and their number indicates the lively current interest in the general topic. If I have most to say about the ACAP study, that is because I was much involved in its preparation as chairman of the History discipline group.

Thirty years ago, at the end of the Second World War, graduate studies in history in Canada were conducted on a very modest scale. Most of the established universities, then less than twenty in number, offered the M.A. degree with a thesis, but the number enrolled was small. McGill and Toronto had small doctoral programmes, while Laval and Montreal took doctoral candidates although their formal doctoral programmes in history began later. A few other universities occasionally awarded a doctorate without having any

*This is not really an historical paper but an attempt to place before members of the Association a problem that I see facing our profession in Canada. The statistical basis of my argument is far from foolproof, and indeed I hope I may prove to be over-pessimistic. I believe, however, that the problem requires more attention than it has yet received.

regular programmes. Queen's, for instance, reports one PhD awarded in 1921 and one in 1931, while Ottawa awarded a doctorate in 1937. The School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto was inaugurated in 1922, and the first two PhD's in History were awarded in 1925 to Walter Sage, a life-time member of the Department of History at the University of British Columbia, and to W.B. Kerr, who joined the Department of History at the University of Buffalo. The programme at McGill was begun in 1930 and the first doctorate awarded in 1938 to J.I. Cooper, who was a member of that department for the rest of his career.[2]

The *Canadian Historical Review (CHR)* list of graduate theses in Canadian history for 1948 records one PhD thesis at Laval, five at Montréal, three at McGill and twenty at Toronto, but at least half the Toronto theses appear to have been submitted in other departments, mainly in political economy. As yet, the great majority of Canadian students seeking doctorates went abroad, mostly to the United States, but after 1945 increasingly to Britain as well. Almost two decades later, in 1964, the picture had not greatly changed. In the *CHR* list for that year, still confined to Canadian history, Laval had only one thesis registered and McGill four, but the Toronto number had risen to 54 of which only 22 were in the History Department. (There was no return from Montréal.) Four other universities were making modest beginnings with the Universities of Western Ontario and of Alberta each registering three theses, Ottawa and Saskatchewan two each.

Two years later, the picture was beginning to change rather dramatically. In 1966 the *CHR* list of thesis topics was superseded by the *Register of Post-Graduate Dissertations in Progress in History and Related Subjects,* compiled by the Public Archives of Canada in conjunction with the Canadian Historical Association (CHA). This annual listing was not confined to Canadian history or to historical theses done in history departments and it also included Canadian history topics being done abroad. The number of universities reporting PhD theses had increased to 13 and the total number of theses registered to 176, of which only 79 were in Canadian history. Toronto still maintained a marked predominance with 93 (not all in the history department), 38 of them Canadian, but McGill had 22 (only 5 Canadian), British Columbia 15 (6 Canadian), Western 13 (10 Canadian) and Montréal 12 (10 Canadian).

The great expansion was, however, only just beginning. The baby bulge of the late forties was now bursting out of the high schools, and provincial governments were chartering new universities and pouring money into the older ones to enable them to recruit more staff and erect new buildings. Only a trickle of history PhDs were as yet appearing from Canadian graduate schools

and these mostly in Canadian history (a total of 3 at Toronto in 1965 and 7 in 1966); and so, as we all know, most of the new staff came from the United States and Britain. Some were Canadians who had gone abroad to do their graduate work, but many of these remained away, notably in the United States, because of the contacts that they had made while at graduate school. Much has been said about the large number of Americans taking positions in Canadian universities in the sixties, but it may be presumed a not dissimilar number of Canadians probably took positions in the United States, where they were quickly lost to sight in the much larger American academic community. Operation Retrieval never seems to have been very successful.

Now in the mid-seventies we are producing a steady flow of PhDs when there is no longer much demand for them. It is true there is a levelling off in registration, but there is no overall drop in the total number of doctoral candidates. In 1974, twenty Canadian universities reported 534 history PhD theses in progress of which less than half (296) were in Canadian history. To mention only the larger programmes, 19 were being done at Dalhousie (only 4 Canadian), 55 at Laval (47 Canadian), 26 at Montréal (21 Canadian), 62 at McGill (only 17 Canadian), 32 at Ottawa (25 Canadian), 54 at Queen's (32 Canadian), 147[4] at Toronto (63 Canadian), 22 at McMaster (12 Canadian), 26 at York (18 Canadian), 22 at Alberta (8 Canadian) and 27 at British Columbia (7 Canadian). The remaining 61, of which the majority (38) are in Canadian history, are being done in 9 other universities with PhD programmes. The totals for universities other than Toronto probably include some history theses being done in other departments.

The great increase in non-Canadian history topics being undertaken in Canada is to be noted. In 1974 there were 105 in British history, 84 in modern European, 26 in American, 29 in Medieval, 20 in African, 11 in Far Eastern, and 11 in Near and Middle Eastern. In Canadian history topics Professor Berger notes that there is a marked increase in the number dealing with regional history and to a lesser extent an increase in the field of social history, especially among the more recent students. French Canadian universities continue to show a predominant interest in the history of French Canada, but there has been a marked shift into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. High enrolment in Canadian graduate schools has been maintained despite some fall in government support, although there has been an increase in the size of individual awards. The number of Canada Council graduate fellowships in history has dropped from 304 (totalling $1,295,000) in 1968-1969 to 175 (totalling $927,300) in 1973-1974.[5] The number of Ontario awards has been halved, although their value has been greatly increased. At Toronto, and I suspect elsewhere, this has been partly compensated for by an increase in university scholarships and in teaching assistantships, but such a trend

obviously cannot continue in the present climate of university financing. The Toronto Task Force Report has pointed out to the Healey Commission that federal support for the humanities and social sciences is much less than to the sciences. In 1972-73 it only amounted to $455 per capita for Toronto students in the humanities compared to $1,984 per capita in the physical and $1,968 in the life sciences, although the discrimination is not quite as great if one takes into account the shorter programmes in the sciences.[6]

What, we may ask, are the employment prospects of all the history doctoral students in Canadian graduate schools today? The Canadian Association of Graduate Schools has published a report on "Employment of New PhD Graduates 1973-74", compiled by Dr. M.A. Preston, which indicates 93% of those who obtained their degrees in humanities in 1973-74 have employment, but only 65% of them in university teaching. It should be pointed out, however, that many of the latter only had temporary positions and some had obtained their appointments as ABDs before the job market collapsed. In the Toronto History Department this year we had 41 job seekers who were nearing completion of or had completed their degrees. Of these, 16 obtained academic appointments, half of them temporary, 9 obtained non-academic positions, but 16 had no success. The outlook for those in the pipeline today is, I think, much worse, despite Professor Preston's optimism. Of the 534 graduate students who registered PhD history theses in 1974, we may expect one third (or more) to drop out or fail to complete in the normal time, but that leaves about 350 who will presumably graduate within the next five or six years at the rate of 60 to 70 a year. Yet of some forty Canadian universities, the eighteen who responded to Professor Lambi's questionnaire about employment prospects indicated that they only expected to make some 30 appointments in the next five years. Since these were mostly the larger universities one might expect less than 30 from the rest, making a total of less than 60 permanent positions, i.e. 10 to 12 a year. In addition, there are always a number of temporary appointments, but the holders of these are back on the market each year. The situation, however, is probably not quite as gloomy as this prognosis suggests, although bad enough. Between September 1974 and May 1974 *University Affairs* has advertised 43 positions, 17 of them temporary. Of these 43 openings I know for a fact that some of the permanent ones have become temporary and some of the temporary ones have been cancelled, but there have probably been a few other positions not advertised. Yet the total still seems higher than our previous calculation if we assume a similar number of openings in each of the next few years. There is no reason to expect any increase of permanent appointments over this year, indeed, the reverse is more likely, and the temporary openings will do no more than keep a dozen or so hapless PhDs in limbo flitting from one temporary job to

another, unless they are fortunate enough to get one of the 20 to 25 permanent positions likely to appear each year.

Actually, not all these jobs will go to PhDs from Canadian universities for in the free market they will be competing with applicants from American and British graduate schools, some of them Canadians, or with experienced teachers who have lost their positions because of cutbacks in American universities, and before long perhaps in Canadian as well. Nor will our relatively small number of graduate schools produce every year all the specialists in demand. In any one year we may have a surplus of French but a deficit of German, a surplus of British but a deficit of third world, a surplus of post-Civil War but a shortage of pre-Civil War American historians. It is impossible to expect that a country this size could produce all the specialists that might be needed in all areas and not glut the market in some areas. Many Canadian universities have a policy of hiring Canadians, other things being equal, but sometimes there are no good Canadian candidates *with the required specialist qualifications*. Some Canadians will, of course, get positions abroad, but these are not likely to be many. The recent guidelines passed by the CAUT could be a threat to academic freedom if applied pedantically by university administrations where non-academic considerations often prevail.

The employment situation in the United States for History PhDs or PhD candidates is probably worse. In 1973-4 1869 applicants were seeking positions of whom 1037 obtained "history related" appointments. Last year (1974-5) 1262 candidates found 867 history related positions of which 544 were in college or university teaching (136 of them temporary); 395 did not find history related positions, and only 108 found permanent academic posts.[7]

The American Historical Association has taken the employment crisis very seriously for the past five years or more, publishing articles, reports, and statistics on the matter in its *Newsletter,* operating a professional register and holding a career seminar at annual meetings, circulating employment information and exploring alternative careers for History PhDs.[8] The first call for cutbacks in doctoral programmes came as early as September 1970[9] and at the annual meeting of the AHA in December 1971 Professor Lawrence Stone made a stark analysis of the problem, advocating a general cutback in graduate enrolments and the elimination of many of "the numerous small and inferior PhD programs, which," he said, "have sprung up, largely for prestige reasons in the past fifteen years."[10] As might be expected these views were quickly condemned as elitist and self-defeating, but a standing committee was asked to draw up guidelines to help departments to meet the employment crisis.[11] As a result in 1973 a "Statement on Ph.D. Programs and the Job Crisis" was adopted, which contained a number of novel and

thought-provoking proposals.[12] It recommended that current full-time faculty should not be employed to teach courses over and above a normal teaching assignment at their own or other institutions for additional pay. Qualified individuals without full-time employment should be given preference in summer school appointments. Employment of retired faculty should be discouraged and early retirement encouraged where pension arrangements permitted. Graduate departments are urged to make PhD programmes more flexible to improve job opportunities for those being trained and exhorted to maintain a suitable ratio between admissions and positions available to their graduates. The "Statement" recommends that new programmes should not be initiated and that current programmes should be cut back to a point where suitable professional appointments are available for graduates. Finally, all graduate schools are advised to warn all applicants for admission of the grave job situation. There are, of course, differences of opinion within the profession as to what should be done. Some take the view that if prospective students are warned of the problem the profession and the graduate schools have done their duty, but others believe strongly that this is not enough.

There are then two questions: How many PhDs should be produced and where should they be trained? Stephen Leacock once wrote that the two main requisites for a university were a library and a smoking room, but he allowed if you had some money left over you might hire some faculty. It seems obvious that a graduate department of history should have access to a library well stocked with printed primary and secondary materials in the areas in which advanced graduate work is to be done. Leacock's opinion notwithstanding I would suggest that it is also important to have staff with national or international reputations in the areas in which doctoral work is to be directed. With the great expansion of higher education in Canada there are now a good many universities in the country that would meet such requirements. The university and the department must decide whether there is a sufficient demand and whether their resources allow the maintenance of a PhD programme. It is clearly an inauspicious time to start one, and all existing graduate departments should ask themselves seriously whether their programmes should be allowed to lapse for the time being or cut back. The recent ACAP report, about which I will speak later, treated the problem very lightly and proposed no cutbacks. In Ontario, however, for some years new programmes have only been permitted when approved by outside appraisers.

In its interesting and informative report the CHA Committee on Graduate Studies recognizes the bleak employment prospect for PhDs other than those in Canadian history. Most departments in responding to the Committee's questionnaire asserted that in hiring they looked for the best person, giving preference to Canadian citizens (not Canadian PhDs) only where other

qualifications were equal (which is not often the case in a ranked list). Three universities told the Committee that outside of the Canadian and medieval fields, historians are better trained outside of Canada. (I find this rather depressing since we have, I think, more publishing historians in British history at Toronto than in any other university in North America.)

Of the 19 Canadian universities offering PhD programmes (13 begun since 1960) 8 are located in Ontario, and of the approximately 534 doctoral students registered in these programmes last year some 341 were in the Ontario universities. Consequently, it might be worth having a closer look at the Ontario experience.

In 1966 the Committee of Presidents of the Universities of Ontario (which later became the Council of Ontario Universities) set up an Ontario Council of Graduate Studies in response to the unpopular proposals of the Spinks Report, which had advocated the creation of a University of Ontario on California lines. OCGS, as it was called, was formed "to advise on the planning and development of an orderly pattern of graduate education and research" in Ontario.[13] It in turn established a Committee of Appraisals in 1967 to guard against the indiscriminate expansion of programmes by instituting rigorous appraisals to ensure the academic quality of all new programmes. In the following year (1968) a second committee known as the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning (ACAP) was set up, but two years passed before its role was finally defined by OCGS and CPUO.[14] ACAP was to make recommendations regarding the development of new programmes and the continuation of old ones in the light of provincial needs, taking "long-term objectives and priorities of the province" into account. The Committee, consisting of a number of faculty members from various Ontario universities, chosen to represent a variety of disciplines and a geographical spread, was chaired by the Chairman of OCGS, but it was also given a full-time executive officer[15] and an office staff. What was more, it was given in 1971 a substantial annual budget to undertake initially ten discipline assessments to be completed within two years. To date 18 have been completed, including History, at an estimated total cost to the provincial university system of $100,000 an assessment.[16] At present there is a pause while the assessments are being assessed and the universities are counting the cost.

Thus, it will be seen that the decision to carry out a province-wide assessment of graduate programmes by disciplines in Ontario was made by the university administrations, primarily for political reasons, and not by the disciplines themselves. When the turn of History came, the Chairmen of the History departments were simply told to form a Discipline Group to assist in

the preparation of the History Assessment. We assembled in the autumn of 1972 for a one-day meeting at which we were asked to nominate consultants, two historians and one non-historian, all from outside the province, and to draw up terms of reference for them along lines developed in previous discipline assessments. Since the initiative was not ours and we were all preoccupied with other responsibilities, it may be we did not give sufficient thought to this task and carried it out in too perfunctory and mechanical a way, relying too heavily on the pattern followed by other disciplines as it appears ACAP wanted us to do. Our recommendations were followed in the appointment of the consultants. They were three highly distinguished and experienced scholars, and I might add most congenial colleagues, but as they themselves observed afterwards, not one of them was the product of the system they were assessing. Professors Elton and Kriesel completed their graduate training in England, and Professor Hamelin in France. This fact was undoubtedly reflected in the Report they wrote. Their task was a formidable one. They had to pay one-to-two day visits to the fifteen Ontario universities and to absorb a huge mass of statistical information that had been produced for them with much labour by the fifteen departments of history and their university libraries. Since the consultants were all busy men, living thousands of miles from each other, their visits had to be conducted in two rushed tours at the end of the summer and in December of 1973, and the time they had to meet together was correspondingly limited. The production and circulation of a 36,000-word draft report plus appendices by March 1974 was a *tour de force*. The Discipline Group met to consider the Report, prepared a formal response and then met with the consultants to consider changes, but we did not get very far. The Three Wise Men were weary and not prepared to do much in the way of rewriting.

The Report[17] is quite flattering, much more so than in some other disciplines, if a little patronising, or so it seemed from inside the province. It starts with a stout defence of the study of History, for it must be remembered that it is addressed in part to non-historians, to university administrators, to the politicians who provide the resources and indirectly the taxpayers behind them. The faculty are judged to be well qualified, well regarded by colleagues and students and engaged in an impressive amount of publishing and editing, but, lest they appear to be overdoing it, the consultants add that they did "not find many really outstanding persons among them." We are judged conservative in the stress we put on undergraduate as against graduate teaching, and in our "traditional preoccupation with Canadian history, political history and the conventional methods of historical study", and we are warned "that the step from caution and solidity to intellectual apathy and stagnation is not long".[18] The consultants admonish us that "there are moments and circumstances, even in the study and teaching of history, when

radical departures are called for".[19] They go on to urge that more faculty should be engaged in graduate teaching, without considering the question of qualifications for that role in terms of experience and publication, or admitting the adverse effect that any substantial shift would have on undergraduate programmes. Their main reason seems to be based on the highly questionable assertion that "teachers of history do decline in quality if their whole professional lives are spent with undergraduates."[20] The evidence to the contrary is so overwhelming in the experience of most Canadian and British universities until quite recently that one is puzzled how they could ever have come to make such a statement. Undoubtedly good graduate students can be stimulating, but indifferent ones are not and it seems unlikely that there are a sufficient number of good graduate students to be found to stimulate all university faculty in the country. In any event our concern must be the good of the students, graduate and undergraduate, and we must look for better arguments for increasing graduate enrolments than the stimulation of faculty.

The meatiest and most controversial part of the Consultants' Report lies in their discussion of the PhD programme in Ontario universities, which they consider "generally in sound shape and indeed meritorious", although "too leisurely and somewhat conservative."[21] They are most critical of the length of time taken to complete the degree (citing the figures of 5.9 years at Toronto), but as they admit this was in large part caused by candidates taking teaching positions before they had completed their theses, a practice much less likely now except in Canadian history. They are also critical of the amount of time spent in preparing fields and of the comprehensive examination system. Indeed, they recommend the reduction of fields to two of equal weight, the abolition of formal course requirements, the limitation of field preparation to a maximum of 12 months, and the modification, if not the abolition, of the comprehensive system.[22] As might be expected, there was much criticism of these proposals in the Discipline Group, although a minority warmly supported them. The Group in its response agreed that every effort should be made to shorten the time taken to complete the degree, but expressed scepticism regarding the making of hard and fast rules since circumstances varied so much from individual to individual. "Some students," we said, "will be better prepared than others who have had less satisfactory undergraduate training. Some will take up research projects that require extra years in mastering new and difficult language and methodological skills." We also argued that there was no reason for rigid uniformity in the matter of regulations regarding fields and comprehensive examinations and that there was something to be said for diversity.[23]

The consultants are inclined to think that we are over-preoccupied with Canadian history and suggest that we should encourage more students to work

in other fields where we have the necessary resources at least for preliminary research, such as English, American and some parts of European history. "If Canadian historians are to enter the international community of scholars with the effect that their numbers and quality justify, they will have to emancipate themselves from the provincialism which excessive preoccupation with their own country imposes."[24] In particular they single out a number of departments for failing to do as much as they might in non-Canadian areas, but they do this with little thought for the job prospects of such additional students.

Throughout the report we repeatedly hear the theme: graduate work is good, the more graduate work the better, with little thought to the end product or the cost. Thus in a section headed, "So many Schools of Research?" the consultants note that student demand is holding up and can only be satisfied by the existing range of programmes; that there are competent, indeed excellent, faculty at many universities in the province and students should be given the opportunity to work with them; that there is room for development even in Canadian history in socio-economic and in regional history, and in interdisciplinary procedures.[25] They also urge the need for closer relations with other departments such as economics, where history is taught, and closer co-operation between departments of history in neighbouring universities, although they acknowledge some evidence of this (Guelph and Waterloo, Carleton and Ottawa, York and Toronto, Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier).[26]

Overall, they recommend a modest expansion in student numbers and no limitation on admissions.[27] Most members of the Discipline Group agreed that there should be no artificial limitation on admissions "other than the maintenance of high standards of admission." The Group concurred in the recommendation urging a broadening of PhD fields "but doubted whether significant expansion could occur without additional faculty and library resources." The Group also concurred in the recommendations for more regional history, more co-operation between universities and more liaison with other departments in the same university, but thought that in each case there was more in fact than the consultants realized. We pointed out that funding and administrative difficulties put some limitation on the feasibility of joint programmes between different universities, but it may be observed that any graduate student in an Ontario university may apply to take a course in another university.[27] (Last year we registered nine such students in History graduate courses at the University of Toronto.)

The Discipline Group was "pleased and flattered" by the Consultants' view of "the general good health of History in the Province" and agreed with many of the less controversial proposals of their Report. The majority of us,

however, including the representatives of the largest and oldest doctoral programmes, were critical of the main conclusions and doubted whether the whole exercise was worth all the time, effort and money put into it. In particular we expressed regret that the consultants had not made "more explicit comment on quality, as distinct from quantity or structure."[29]

The Discipline Group Response was submitted in April of 1974 but this by no means completed the operation which continued into the late autumn. All the universities likewise made their individual responses and some were much sharper in tone than that of the Discipline Group, for the Consultants' distribution of brickbats and bouquets to the different departments was varied. The Report and the various responses were then considered by ACAP itself. Apparently, they were not entirely satisfied with the proposed expansion of PhD programmes, for they recalled two of the three Consultants, who prepared an addendum to their Report on this and some other points. By and large they stuck to their guns.

ACAP then prepared a 22-page report[30] to the Council of Ontario Universities (the old CPUO) appending the Consultants' Report with its addendum and the various responses as appendices. They recapitulate what they consider to be the main points of the Consultants' Report and proceed to make their own recommendations. They note that three universities, Toronto, York and Queen's account for 74% of the doctoral students and each of them offers at least four fields of specialization. They recommend that these three universities should be considered to have "general" doctoral programmes. The remaining six are recognized as specializing in Canadian history and one other field. The ACAP Report makes two other general recommendations, namely that the Discipline Group examine the structure of the PhD programmes with a view to shortening them,[31] and that they explore employment opportunities for graduates other than in university teaching. They note that "increasingly graduates will have to rely on non-academic avenues for employment." They conclude, however, that "employment of PhDs outside the university is a slowly growing trend and great caution should be used in relying on this trend for employment projections."[32]

The consultants had very little to say on employment prospects for PhDs (despite their encouragement of some expansion). They seemed inclined to think that prevailing prognoses were too gloomy in view of the fact that to date the vast majority (93%) had found employment "most of them in the work they want — academic teaching."[33] They conclude, too complacently in my view, that "The market is not swamped with PhDs; rather, production of students has kept well in step with job prospects. The increase of graduate students has been managed responsibly and successfully."[34] I will have more

to say on this topic in a moment, but, before leaving the Consultants, I should say that I do not hold them to blame for this weakness in their report since they were not given sufficient information to say much more and little stress, surprisingly, was put on the matter in their terms of reference. This obviously was the fault of ACAP and of the Discipline Group.

The long rigmarole was not yet over. The original draft of the ACAP Report went to COU in September and a revised one in November. On December 30th the Council of Ontario Universities produced a five-page "Report and Recommendations Concerning Graduate Studies in History", repeating in summary from the salient points of the previous reports and instructing ACAP to arrange for the Discipline Group to make proposals for shortening the PhD programme and to "explore the likely character and extent of non-university employment opportunities for doctoral graduates."[35]

I must apologize for my long digression about the ACAP report, but its history is instructive; and while the value of the experiment in terms of time and money expended may be questionable it does throw a good deal of light on the state of graduate studies in Canada, since the Ontario programmes account for over half of the total enrolment and I suspect are fairly typical of programmes in the rest of the English-speaking part of the country. It is reassuring on the health of PhD programmes, but less satisfactory on the question of optimum numbers given the needs of the country as a whole. An examination of the American experience may be useful in considering this question. As we have seen the American historical profession is seriously concerned about the over-production of PhDs. American graduate schools have been producing them for over a century since the inauguration of a doctoral programme at Johns Hopkins in the 1870's. The number of departments awarding the degree in history grew to 80 by 1960, 22 of them accounting for more than 200 degrees each during that period. Another 32 departments inaugurated doctoral programmes in the sixties bringing the total of history PhD granting departments to 112 by 1970 (today it is 130). A total of 5,884 degrees were awarded in the decade 1961-1970 and of 13,579 in the entire period 1873-1970. Moreover, of the 22 large departments, 7 (Columbia, Wisconsin, Harvard, Berkeley, Chicago, Yale and Pennsylvania, in that order) were predominant, accounting for 1,701 degrees in the sixties and 5,104 in the entire period. Thus, in the United States there is a solid core of graduate schools which have been operating major PhD programmes for a long time, some of them on a very large scale, and a good many more on a modest scale, especially in the last fifteen years.[36]

As we have seen, the development of doctoral programmes in history came much later in Canada with very little activity before 1945, and the

production of PhDs to date has been modest, 150 at Toronto, 58 at McGill, 48 at Ottawa, 28 at Queen's, 25 at Laval (exclusive of history doctorates in the Faculté des Lettres prior to 1950), 23 at Alberta, 21 at UBC, 16 at Western, 11 each at Dalhousie and McMaster.[37] The remaining eight programmes might account for another thirty or forty making a total of 225 plus say 25 at Montréal (from which I failed to get firm statistics), i.e. a total of 250 (of which more than half have been awarded since 1970) compared to the American total of 13,579. Obviously we are very much beginners and it seems to be unrealistic to suppose we might so quickly become self-sufficient in the production of PhDs, even though we are now producing more in total numbers than we can absorb. The point is, as I have already suggested, that we cannot hope to produce all the right specialists at the right time so that our over-production is thus accentuated. Yet we now seem to be producing PhDs at much the same rate as the United States. The average annual rate of production there in the 1960's was 588. Since 1970 there has been a steady decline of first-year enrolments in American graduate schools from 3,177 in 1970-1 to 2,278 in 1974-5. We may assume then that the production of PhDs has not gone much beyond 600 a year. A Canadian equivalent in proportion to population would be about 60, but the figure might be lowered if we compare college and university registrations. In Ontario last year we produced some 36 PhDs and allowing at least 14 for the rest of Canada, the total of 50 is comparable to the U.S. total. Since the U.S. is over-producing and since we cannot hope to fill all our own requirements in terms of specialization, I conclude we are badly over-producing. In the United States there are 130 universities granting PhDs in history and it is argued that this is too many. An equivalent number in Canada would be 13, but in fact we have 19.

There are, it seems, two problems. One is to dispose of the surplus in the pipeline as they emerge, by persuading governments and business of the value of people with such training and by persuading many of the new graduates that they must reconcile themselves to accepting non-history-related jobs. But if this is the situation can we be justified in going on producing PhDs in history, a very expensive and time-consuming process, to fill positions for which their training may be useful, but for which it is not really necessary? It is all very well to say that if students want to register we should take them, providing we warn them of the poor employment prospects in history-related positions, but are we justified in spending taxpayers' money on this scale? And are we not leading many of these young people up a garden path, encouraging them to spend their twenties, perhaps the most important decade of their lives, in what may turn out to be a blind alley? As the CHA Report on Graduate Studies asserts "inactivity on our part will strike many as irresponsible, including governments." The Report goes on to argue the best course lies "in reducing the number of students and improving the quality of the degree by limiting

admission to applicants who are outstanding and specializing in fields for which there appears some demand."[38] With this proposal I am in full agreement. The Report also concludes that Canadian universities should give strong preference to Canadian citizens and graduates of Canadian universities in their hiring for the next five years. This is a more controversial proposal, but does not go quite as far as the recent CAUT recommendation, which states that "the appointment should be offered to the best qualified Canadian who meets the stated requirements", unless a specially appointed university review committee "is persuaded that the appointment in the case of a non-Canadian is justified." Since this last step may have to be taken by a non-academic authority it appears to threaten the academic freedom of the university. I would prefer a greater element of discretion on the part of departments.

I picked this subject partly because of a number of topics I tried out on colleagues it seemed to be thought the most suitable, partly because of my recent involvement in the ACAP assessment. But as I wrote the paper I began to realize what a hot potato I had picked up, considering I happened to be chairman of the big bad wolf department in Toronto. Consequently, I am inclined to think that I should go no further with conclusions. I will be satisfied if I have succeeded in stirring up some more awareness of the problem of Canadian doctoral programmes in history in the seventies and a readiness on the part of those involved to find solutions to it. I have become much more aware of it myself while writing the paper and assure you that I will insist that my own department reconsider its position.

NOTES

[1] This Commission has been set up under the chairmanship of Professor Denis Healey, "to enquire into and report upon the nature, objectives and efficacy of Canadian graduate studies in the humanities and social sciences . . . and their future prospects."

[2] This paragraph is based on information obtained from departmental chairmen and others.

[3] The figures quoted here and below on thesis registrations are taken with some minor amendments from charts prepared by Mr. Murray Barkley for Professor Berger, who has kindly allowed me to use them.

[4] Exclusive of 92 in other departments.

[5] *12th Annual Report, the Canada Council 1968-1969*, p. 58, and *ibid, 1973-74*, p. 110.

[6] "Graduate Student Incomes in Ontario 1972-73", COU Report of April 18, 1974, quoted in "Interim Report of a University of Toronto Task Force to the Canada Council Commission on Graduate Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences" (Leyerle Report), January 31, 1975, pp. 50-1.

[7] *AHA Newsletter*, vol. 13, No. 2, February 1975, pp. 2-3, "Facts and Figures on the Job Crisis."

[8] *Ibid.* vol. 13, No. 4, April 1975, pp. 3-4, "The AHA and the Job Crisis."

[9] *Ibid.* Vol. IX, No. 2, March 1971, pp. 32-6.

[10] *Ibid.* Vol. X, No. 2, March 1972, pp. 26, "The AHA and the Job Market for Graduate Students."

[11] *Ibid.* pp. 11-12; No. 5, November 1972, pp. 54-63, "New Problems and Old Elites: Another View of the Job Crisis."

[12] *Ibid* Vol. XII, No. 3, March 1974, pp. 3-4, "The Council's Statement of Ph.D. Programs and the Job Crisis."

[13] "Historical Sketch (to 1973) Advisory Committee on Academic Planning," by H.S. Armstrong, Chairman ACAP, June 14, 1973, a six-page account issued by ACAP. Ontario universities undoubtedly needed, and still do, some method of self-regulation. See Ernest Sirluck, "The Future Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario," *Queen's Quarterly,* Vol. LXXV, pp 197-207. If I appear critical in what follows, I still do not fundamentally disagree with the overall objective.

[14] I say nothing of the differences between OCGS and CPUO and of the spawning of two further committees, ASAP and ACCORD, which appear to have been stillborn prior to the final adoption of ACAP, which was to be funded by CPUO and CUA.

[15] Dr. M.A. Preston, the first incumbent, held the position from 1971 to 1975.

[16] University of Toronto, S.G.S. paper "The ACAP Discipline Assessments: A Summary — November 11, 1974," University of Toronto Brief to OCUA, May 9, 1975, p. 25.

[17] Council of Ontario Universities, *Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies, 15, History 1974,* (Advisory Committee on Academic Planning Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, 1975), Appendix A, "Consultant's Report — Graduate Studies in the History Departments of Ontario," pp. iii, 97).

[18] *Ibid.*, A16-17.

[19] *Ibid.*, A17-18.

[20] *Ibid.*, A6.

[21] *Ibid.*, A47-8.

[22] *Ibid.*, A44-5.

[23] *Ibid.*, History Discipline Group Response, B2.

[24] *Ibid.*, A 46.

[25] *Ibid.*, A 47.

[26] *Ibid.*, A 48-52.

[27] *Ibid.*, A 60.

[28] *Ibid.*, B 2-3.

[29] *Ibid.*, B 1.

[30] *Ibid.*, "Report to the Council of Ontario Universities on History Planning Assessment, November, 1974," from OCGS Advisory Committee on Academic Planning, pp. 10-11.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 8-9.

[33] *Ibid.*, "Consultants Report," A 27.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] *Ibid.*, COU Report, pp. 3-5.

[36] "Dissertations in History 1961-70," *AHA Newsletter,* Vol. X, September, 1971, pp. 17-24.

[37] Information supplied by Departmental Chairman.

[38] CHA Report, pp. 26-7. The Report also makes a very sensible recommendation adopted by the CHA Council "that the CHA continue to compile statistics on the graduate student population and job opportunities for historians on an annual basis or until such a time as another agency assumes the responsibility."