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It would have been helpful, for example, if Shortt had identified some of the central themes in Canadian medical history, suggested by the other contributors. A discussion of this sort might have explored such themes as the conservatism of the nineteenth-century Canadian profession (in contrast to the more pronounced egalitarianism of the American), the impact of Anglo-French cultural tensions on Canadian medicine, the effect on medical progress of Canada's long period of subordination to England, and the influence (after 1867) of Canadian federalist politics, which encouraged medical buck-passing between local, provincial, and national governments.

It would also have been useful to have had an introductory note at the start of each article or, better, group of articles both to summarize upcoming essays and to put them in overall perspective. While not necessarily a model, Judith Walzer Leavitt and Ronald L. Number's Sickness and Health in America provides this sort of running commentary. For undergraduate students (and I am thinking, here, of the diligent ones, who will read the book through), such editorial guidance is almost essential.

As for the eighteen other essays making up the collection, editor Shortt classifies them as "a mixture of social and medical history" (p.ix), by which is meant a blend of articles looking either outward, at the profession's ties to the larger society, or inward toward professional development and medical practice. Some pieces, of course, face in both directions, and there is a fairly nice balance between the two approaches.

The only subject which is badly short-changed is medical research (to some, "internal history"), the sole representative being Charles Roland's "Early Years of Antiseptic Surgery in Canada." I was surprised to find nothing on the work of neurosurgeon Wilder Penfield. Perhaps there is nothing in the periodical literature, but a representative chapter might have been selected from his 1977 autobiography, No Man Alone: A Surgeon's Story.

Inevitably, the selections offered are uneven in quality. Among the less effective articles is Relief Mackay's "Poor Relief in Nova Scotia," which began by examining the institutions — a workhouse, an orphanage, and a hospital — established in eighteenth-century Halifax to care for a flood of dependent immigrants but then moved off on a somewhat unrelated inquiry into the general health conditions behind those institutions. After a look at smallpox the story seemed to run out of steam. Hilda Neatby, now deceased, was a first-rate historian, but her article on "The Medical Profession in the Northwest Territories" was a rather tiresome account of the internal governance of territorial physicians and tended to saccharin prose. There was no discussion of broader questions, such as the challenge of sectarians or the quality of medical practice. Roland's piece on anti-septic surgery, while an interesting account
of the debate between Listerians and their opponents, bogged down on the less important question of who first introduced the new practice. Michael Bliss "Pure Books on Avoided Subjects: Pre-Freudian Sexual Ideas in Canada," focused on an inherently interesting topic and was based on fascinating sources (the "self and sex" books from Philadelphia), but it dealt very little with Canada, and the author's effort to tie onto Canadian history was strained and somewhat slap-dash. Yet I must add that the quote on page 274 was, alone, worth the price of the book. Finally, among the less valuable articles, there is Neil Sutherland's "To Create a Strong and Healthy Race: School Children in the Public Health Movement, 1880-1914." Though competently written, the title was misleading. Implied was a connection between Anglo-Saxon racism and the child health movement, the article did not follow up that lead and was in fact silent on the whole question of the motivation back of Canada's progressive programme.

More characteristic of Medicine in Canadian Society are the large number of first-rate pieces. Space prevents consideration of every one, but at least half are solid contributions, some using research methods and sources relatively new to historical scholarship. Employing the skills of the geographer, Arthur Ray in his "Diffusion of Diseases in the Western Interior of Canada, 1830-1850," neatly illustrated the way physical and cultural factors have influenced medical history. According to Ray the spread of diseases like influenza and smallpox among Canadian Indians was the result of three interrelated factors: summer migration of Plains Indians, southward, for hunting and trading; the bringing of goods by Hudson Bay traders from centres of infection like York Factory, and the necessity (in order to beat winter's ice) to keep this trade moving west, even though its carriers were often down with sickness.

Historian Geoffrey Bilson's "Canadian Doctors and the Cholera," showed the effect of epidemic disease on professional organization. Already "divided, distrusted, and with little public respect," the medical profession, he noted, "further undermined public confidence in itself [and gave a fillip to the irregulars] by its failure either to explain or to deal with cholera when it came to Canada" (page 123). Although the public relations of Canadian doctors were as troubled as those of the U.S. profession, Joseph Kett shows us in "American and Canadian Medical Institutions, 1800-1870" that, where medical schools, licensing boards, and professional societies were concerned, the medical histories of the two countries were quite different. Compared to the chaotic competition and disarray to the south, Canadian institutions displayed permanence and stability, the result of political, institutional, and psychological factors unique to Canada.

In the case of women doctors, however, the Canadian experience roughly paralleled the American according to Veronica Strong-Boag's "Canadian Women Doctors: Feminism Constrained." Throughout her article there also ran a note of disappointment that Canada's female physicians, while supporting women's suffrage and giving some encouragement to birth control, largely mirrored the conservative male approach to radical social change. But Strong-Boag's piece was not strident, and her discussion of the social origin of women doctors, their role as medical missionaries, and their inclination toward cultural jingoism offered new insights into women's history.

The prize for the most fascinating piece, though, must go to Thomas Brown for "Dr. Ernest Jones, Psychoanalysis, and the Canadian Medical Profession, 1908-1913." Although based heavily on Jones's 1959 autobiography, the article explored one chapter of Jones' stormy life that has heretofore escaped notice — his five-year Freudian discipleship in Toronto. Merely being treated to the facts of Jones' jinxed career would have been entertainment enough, but Brown offered other bonuses as well, notably discussions of the sexual orthodoxy of Canadian physicians and the "somatic outlook" in Canadian psychiatry and neurology (which attributed all mental illness to organic brain disease). It was prevailing dogmatisms of that sort, more than any of Jones' personal derelictions, that foiled his Canadian mission.

Among the selections focusing on public health, the best is Terry Copp's "Public Health in Montreal, 1870-1920," which pointed up that city's dismal record and attributed its failure chiefly to the unwillingness of city government to give health projects adequate financial support.

A piece that was impressive both in its employment of untraditional sources and in the manner of their use was Margaret Andrews' "Medical Attendance in Vancouver, 1886-1920." Drawing on registers of the local College of Physicians and Surgeons, city directories, and a set of physician day books, Andrews revealed some interesting things about urban medical practice. One learned, for example, that most practices were of short duration, that women saw doctors less often than men, and that affluent patients welched on doctors' bills about as frequently as poor ones. Adding to the article's value was Andrews' skill in making plausible deduction. She concluded, for instance, that while Vancouver physicians were underemployed at the start of the period, by its end the public had grown more appreciative and demanding of medical service.

One other article dealing with physician-public relations was Robert Bothwell and John English's "Pragmatic Physicians: Canadian Medical and Health Care Insurance, 1910-1945." In the 1930s and early 1940s the Canadian profession's attitude toward "socialized medicine" contrasted sharply with that of U.S. doctors. Owing to eco-
nomial hard times, "indigent" Canadian doctors were willing to accept almost any scheme that would put money in their pockets. The only reason Canada did not get national health insurance in that era was because government, not doctors, choked on its cost. Then, in the late 1940s Canadian doctors, apparently now more affluent (the authors failed to make this clear) discovered all the objections long "known" to American doctors, and health insurance was knocked dead for another generation.

If one is an American and as typically and inexcusably uninformed as I was about Canadian history, this lengthy collection is a good antidote to ignorance, at least for several important areas of Canadian history. American (and Canadian) scholars interested in the history of medicine, health, and the learned professions will find Medicine in Canadian Society particularly valuable for its cross-national perspective. Teachers in those fields also have available a very readable supplemental text. The McGill-Queens University Press is to be congratulated for bringing out a useful and timely book.
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With these handsome volumes, the opening trilogy of an important new series, Studies in History, Planning and the Environment, is brought to completion. The volumes also share a common origin in the papers presented at the first International Conference on the History of Urban and Regional Planning, which was held in London in 1977. Now, however, they have the benefit of editorial direction, as they have been selected, arranged, rewritten and, in the case of Kain’s book, supplemented by invited contributions “to deepen the historical dimension and to widen the international perspective.”

Excluding the editors’ introductory essays, a total of twenty-four original papers has been assembled. Most were written by planners, geographers or historians (including specialists in the history of art and architecture), but it also striking me as particularly fitting that several of the contributors to the conservation volume defy easy pigeon-holing. Similarly, although most of the contributors are either British or American, there are enough from other countries (Germany, Austria, Poland, Greece, Japan and Canada) to give the books a truly international flavour. This is enhanced by the fact that some of the British and American authors have ventured beyond the English-speaking realm to which most of us are confined. As a result, these two collections cover a range of planning experience well beyond that which is normally available in the English-language literature. This, it seems to me, is their most important contribution.

The major respect in which the books betray their conference origin is in the variation in scope and intensity among the individual essays. This, of course, is unavoidable, no matter how firmly editorial control is exercised, but it inevitably raises awkward questions about the appropriate level of writing and the intended audience. In this instance, only a reader of the most catholic taste is likely to want to read each volume, cover to cover, although every essay has something of value for even the most knowledgeable scholars of planning history. But while most of the essays are likely to appeal to their own, fairly specialized readerships, there are several which seem more suited to a much larger audience. I mean this in two senses, which is another way of highlighting the difficulty the editors faced in trying to impose a sense of unity on their respective collections. On the one hand, there are those essays which ought to be known to people who would not normally think of looking into the planning history literature. The best example is by A.D. King: "Exporting Planning: The Colonial and Neo-Colonial Experience," an article which says as much about the whole process of cultural diffusion, and the transmission of metropolitan ideologies into colonial contexts, as it does about the history of planning. I found it fascinating, not least because the Canadian planning movement has depended so heavily on the same process. Then, on the other hand, and altogether different in tone and purpose, there are a number of survey articles which could well become standard entries in the reading lists for beginning courses in the development of planning thought. W. Houghton-Evans’ "Schemata in British New Town Planning" is a case in point from Cherry’s volume; the “schemata” are physical design concepts, and lead to a quick review of design principles from Aristotle and the Hippodamian grid to today’s variants of the “orthogonal grid.” (Am I alone in regarding this as a tautology?) A parallel example can be found in Andrew W. Gilg’s, “Planning for Conservation: A Struggle For Survival and Political Respectability”; the suggestive title to the contrary, this is a brief overview of the development of the nature conservation movement in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Of their kinds, these are all excellent essays; it is the mix that sits uncomfortably. To shift from Houghton-Evans, for example, to Watanabe’s detailed description of the development of a dormitory suburb of Tokyo in the 1920s, or from Gilg to Zarebska’s equally detailed description of the plan for the reconstruction of the Polish