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FOREWORD

The selection of Professor John Willis to conduct an inquiry into the education of town planners was a happy choice and the Town Planning Institute of Canada is very pleased to publish his report. He approached his task with a refreshing independence of mind and he has expressed his views in a lively personal style. His report should be read not only for its concern with professional education but also for its insight into the whole nature of a relatively new profession that is in the process of finding its proper place in our urban society. What kind of person is a planner and what kind of role will he be expected to perform in the rapid growth of our cities?

This Institute has grown up quickly both in stature and in size. A dozen years ago less than a third of the members had been trained in planning at a University, most of them being people drawn from other professions who had acquired their planning experience and skill “on the job”. Today two-thirds of the membership has had University education in planning, and in the future, the Canadian University graduate schools will be the principal source of those entering this field of work. To attract the most suitable recruits into this career and to give them the very best preparation is therefore a responsibility now thrust upon Universities, whether they like it or not. It is not an easy task for Universities because, by its very nature, the subject of town and regional planning involves the participation of several faculties in the physical and social sciences and arts. At the same time the number of graduate students in planning will never be large enough to command a substantial teaching establishment and must draw upon other resources within the University and from active practitioners in the public service. For these reasons it is hoped that University authorities will study Professor Willis’ report with a sympathetic interest and an understanding of the significance of this profession’s place in the new urban civilisation of Canada. The City is the environment of the University and is, in the end, the creation of all who are educated in the University.

The inquiry conducted by Professor Willis was made possible by a grant through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the housing agency of the Government of Canada. Since the establishment of the first University course in 1947 the Corporation has provided fellowships that have now aided 170 planning students at five Universities. This is one of the many ways in which CMHC has sought to aid better planning of Canadian communities. Mr. Stanley Pickett, the Corporation’s Adviser on Community Planning, acted as a consultant to Professor Willis and Mr. E. D. Fox, of the Corporation staff, acted as Secretary to the Inquiry.

HUMPHREY CARVER
President
Town Planning Institute of Canada
AVANT-PROPOS

Le choix du professor John Willis pour enquêter sur la formation des urbanistes a été un heureux choix et l'Institut d'Urbanisme du Canada a grand plaisir à publier son rapport. Le professeur Willis s'est en effet acquitté de sa tâche d'une façon impartiale et objective vraiment rafraîchissante et il a exprimé ses idées dans un style personnel bien vivant. On devrait lire son rapport non seulement parce que l'auteur s'est soucié d'y traiter de la formation professionnelle des urbanistes mais aussi à cause de la façon dont il a su pénétrer au cœur même de la nature d'une profession relativement nouvelle qui est en voie de trouver sa place dans notre société urbaine. Quel genre de personne est un urbaniste et quel genre de rôle s'attend-on à ce qu'il joue dans l'accroissement rapide de nos cités?

L'Institut s'est développé rapidement à la fois du point de vue importance et du point de vue prestige. Il y a une douzaine d'années à peine, moins d'un tiers de ses membres avaient reçu une formation universitaire en urbanisme et la plupart étaient des personnes appartenant à d'autres professions, qui avaient acquis à pied d'oeuvre leur expérience et leur habileté en urbanisme. Aujourd'hui les deux tiers des membres ont reçu une formation universitaire en urbanisme, et à l'avenir, les écoles conduisant à un diplôme d'une université canadienne seront la principale source de recrutement des personnes qui se livreront à ce genre d'activité. Il incombe maintenant aux universités, qu'elles le veuillent ou non, d'attirer vers cette carrière les recrues les plus prometteuses et de leur donner la meilleure préparation possible. Ce n'est pas une tâche facile pour les universités, parce qu'à cause de sa nature même, la science de l'urbanisme et de l'aménagement du territoire exige la participation de plusieurs facultés aux sciences et aux arts physiques et sociaux. D'autre part, le nombre d'étudiants diplômés en urbanisme ne sera jamais assez considérable pour exiger l'établissement d'une institution d'enseignement de grande envergure; il faudra donc avoir recours à d'autres ressources existant déjà au sein de l'Université, ainsi qu'à des praticiens actifs dans les services publics. Étant donné ces diverses raisons, on espère que les dirigeants des universités étudieront le rapport du professeur Willis avec un intérêt double de sympathie, et une compréhension de l'importance de la place que prend cette profession dans la nouvelle civilisation urbaine du Canada. En effet, la cité est le milieu ambiant de l'université et, en définitive, elle est la création de tous ceux qui reçoivent leur formation à l'université.

L'enquête dirigée par le professeur Willis a été rendue possible grâce à une subvention qui lui a été accordée par l'entremise de la Société centrale d'hypothèques et de logement, l'organisme du logement du gouvernement fédéral. Depuis l'établissement du premier cours universitaire, en 1947, la Société a fourni des bourses d'études qui jusqu'à maintenant ont aidé 170 étudiants en urbanisme dans cinq universités. C'est à une des nombreuses façons dont la SCHL s'est efforcée de contribuer à l'amélioration de l'aménagement des collectivités du Canada. Monsieur Stanley Pickett le conseiller en urbanisme de la Société, a joué le rôle de conseil auprès du Professeur Willis et monsieur E.-D. Fox, du personnel de la Société, a agi comme secrétaire, aux fins de cette enquête.

HUMPHREY CARVER
Président
L'Institut d'Urbanisme du Canada
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3. THE INDEPENDENT OBSERVER HANDS OVER
CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTORY

1. THE INQUIRY

(a) What the inquiry was about. This is, in formal terms and to quote the letterhead that I used, the report of an “Inquiry into Professional Education for Town and Regional Planning Conducted by Professor John Willis, Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, for the Information of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Town Planning Institute of Canada and the University Planning Schools”. In formal terms and to quote a statement issued on April 16, 1963, “the inquiry will assess the nature and scope of professional education in town and regional planning in Canada; will seek to determine the level and range of educational facilities necessary to meet the growing needs for planning services in a period of rapid urbanization and will consider whether scholarship funds for town planning education granted under Part V of the National Housing Act are bearing optimum results. Professor Willis will conduct the inquiry as an independent observer”. The inquiry was never intended to be, and was not in fact, a formal one and this report will not be a formal report. To emphasize that, I am writing it in the first person.

What I was asked to do was to spend three months or so in the summer of 1963 taking a quick look at something which was, when Professor John Parker, head of the planning school of the University of North Carolina, made his report to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) in January, 1950*, just an experiment, something just beginning. There was then only one planning school, the one at McGill University, but other universities were thinking of starting their own. Today there are five, all at the graduate level: at the University of British Columbia (U.B.C.); at the University of Manitoba (Manitoba); at the University of Toronto (Toronto); at McGill University (McGill); and the Institut d’Urbanisme at the University of Montreal (Montreal). My job was to go around the planning schools and the members of the town planning profession across the country and ask myself questions of the following order. How are things going now? Have the schools any problems; if they have, what are they? Are they thinking of making any changes; if so, what changes? What does the profession think of the schools? Now that the schools are established, are there any new developments that might be expected to occur in any field of learning connected with planning?

(b) Why the inquiry was for the information of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, the Town Planning Institute of Canada and the University planning schools. CMHC has, in pursuance of its duty to “cause . . . such steps to be taken as it may deem necessary or advisable . . . to encourage . . . sound community-planning” (National Housing Act, S. 39 (g)), a vital interest in all questions relating to the education of planners. It assisted at the birth of all the schools except the recently created Institut d’Urbanisme at the University of Montreal. For a number of years it made supplementary grants to the schools

themselves; these have, however, been progressively reduced and are now almost at vanishing point. It has since 1947 offered fellowships to qualified planning students. At the present time it is spending about $30,000 a year on the grants and the fellowships together. CMHC in effect wants to know whether all is well with a system of planning education on which it is spending time and money.

As the cross-Canada professional association of planners, the Town Planning Institute of Canada (T.P.I.C.) has, of course, an interest in anything that concerns planning education, but it has a direct and immediate interest in the kind of education that is being given to those who wish to be admitted to it. For it owes a duty to the public to see that those it admits are in fact equipped with the knowledge and skills that any one who holds himself out as a planner must have. It wants to know whether all of the five schools are giving their students a well-rounded course. Or is one school ignoring one aspect and another school ignoring another aspect?

The university schools are, of course, much better qualified than I am to deal with any question of planning education, but as a result of talking to those who teach at them I gained an understanding of their many problems which I shall do my best to set forth. At the time when the inquiry was first suggested they were told that it would not be held without their consent. They did consent and I am grateful to them all for the help they have given me.

(c) How the inquiry was made. As an independent observer and a law teacher who, until a short time ago knew nothing about planning or planning education, I had the virtue of detachment but the defect of ignorance. In getting together enough information to enable me to have some understanding of the field and to spot any problems, I had the help of many people—many thanks to them all. Questionnaires were drawn up to obtain what was felt to be necessary information and necessary opinions from the heads of schools, from a sample of employers of planners and from all members of the T.P.I.C. In the middle of May I visited the planning schools at Yale, Harvard and M.I.T. and from June 12 to August 2 I travelled across Canada, attending the annual meeting of the T.P.I.C. at Banff and talking to teachers (including all the heads) at all the five planning schools and to planners (federal, provincial, municipal and consultants) in Ottawa, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec and Halifax. I enjoyed the stimulating discussions I had all across the country and regret that I cannot do justice to the full range of the arguments. Having now read all those parts of the replies to the questionnaires that deal directly with planning education and re-read the copious pencil notes I made of what was said to me in interviews, I am now sitting down to write my impressions without referring to all that material except when I have to.

One word of warning before I conclude this overlong description of the inquiry. I am just an outsider, a newcomer, an ignoramus, and all I know is what I have been told—so that any opinion I may express is entirely without authority and is only put forward for discussion by those in the field who know. I am not, furthermore, writing up a survey; there was no survey intended or attempted. So I shall try to make this report long on ideas, the ideas (often conflicting) that I have got from other people, and short on facts. Nor am I a
whole committee like the Schuster Committee\(^*\) or a man deeply versed in planning education like Frederick J. Adams\(†\). It is for these reasons that I have subtitled the report "An Independent Observer's Reflections on some of the Main Issues".

2. WHO IS BEING EDUCATED FOR WHAT

For the benefit of readers who are not planners, I must first broadly and rather naively state who, as I understand it, is being educated for what. A professional planner is a man who specializes in problems of land use; he is a kind of doctor, practising in the field of preventive medicine, for the land use problems of a city or a region. He may be a consultant helping developers to plan a shopping centre, or a civil servant in a provincial department of community planning, or any one of several other kinds of planner; but he is usually to be found in a municipal planning office and his job there is to advise his political masters how to guide and control the future physical development of the city or region. His job is, in these days of suburban sprawl, city centre decay, traffic jams and the like, of enormous public importance.

What does such a municipal planner do? His main job—but he often has no time to do it, so involved is he in the day-to-day work of handling applications for the relaxation of zoning by-laws or for subdivision approvals—is to prepare a comprehensive or master plan for the city, the guide lines for how the city ought to grow. The pith and substance of that job is to view the city's problems as a totality and to recognize, and reconcile if he can, conflicting claims on that scarce commodity, the land in the city. He must, because he has to guess how the city is likely to grow, know something about how people like to live (sociology), how they normally use land (geography) and what business opportunities there are likely to be (economics), and be able to make the kind of surveys and projections that sociologists, geographers and economists do. Since he is going to advise on the uses to which any land in the city should be put, he must know what it is capable of being used for (geology) and whether it can be serviced with utilities and streets (municipal engineering). What effect will the proposed scheme of uses have on land values, and thus on city revenues (urban economics)? What legal powers has the city to impose restrictions on the use by private developers of their own land (planning law), and insofar as the proposed new uses are public ones (e.g. streets, I was told that 60 per cent of downtown Vancouver is streets) how is the city to pay for them (municipal finance)? In devising his plan he will find that with respect to any given piece of land the engineering, municipal finance, geographical and other considerations are likely to conflict with one another and it is then his job to make the best reconciliation between them that he can. He must also, in devising his plan, do his best to ensure that the city is pleasant to look at and live in (architecture and landscape architecture). He must then set down his proposals in the form of a map (drawing plans) with accompanying explanations (report-making) and he must do all this in the context of the whole scheme of government in Canada, and in particular the municipal government which he serves (government).

\(^†\)Urban Planning Education in the United States; (1954).
This is a formidable list—and a hopelessly incomplete one—of what a planner has to know. The saving thing is that he does not have to know all those things deeply. He needs only to understand the main principles of most of them. In deciding how he thinks a new street ought to run, for instance, he must be able to communicate with the city engineer, the finance commissioner, the private landowner’s economic adviser or lawyer and so on, but he does not have to go much deeper than that. He is, in a word, a bit of a sociologist, a bit of a geographer, a bit of an economist, a bit of a geologist, a bit of a lawyer, a bit of an engineer, a bit of an architect. He is, however, also something more than just bits and pieces; he is a new thing, a town planner. He is a “land-use conflict reconciler”, a “designer of cities” and must be familiar with the best that has been done in the past and is now being done to make these reconciliations and do these designs. He must, that is, be familiar with planning principles and be able to apply those principles to the practical problems with which he is faced.

“Wait a minute, wait a minute,” the initiated reader—the practising planner or the planning teacher—will say, “you’ve begged what is perhaps the most important question in the whole field of planning education and have selected as the planner only one kind of planner, the individual municipal planner. What about the planner who is a specialist member of a town in a large city office, the regional planner, the architect-planner who will often end up by having to design the actual buildings in the shopping centre he has planned, or one of many other kinds of specialist? And why, assuming that you were entitled to select the individual municipal planner as the planner, did you describe in full what you called ‘his main job’ when you yourself know and admitted that he spends most of his time on something else?” The reason why I did that is because this is the image of the planner—the general practitioner planner—that seems to have been accepted, subject to some dissents and with some variations, by the profession and the schools in the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada. I shall have something more to say on this in Section 2 of Chapter II.

How does the kind of man I described above get his training? He can, as used to happen and still does sometimes happen, just get his training on the job, or, as usually happened during the 1950’s, he can be “imported” fully trained into Canada. If, however, he is trained in Canada he will receive that training at one of the five university planning schools. These schools are at the graduate level and, before he enters one, he will usually be a geographer, a sociologist, an architect or an engineer. While there he will spend half of his time on doing projects and the other half on acquiring a body of knowledge and a collection of skills that will, it is hoped, make him into a planner. It is with some of the problems of this system of education and of the five schools that I am concerned.

3. SOME PROBLEMS OF PRINCIPLE

All countries, and in particular the United Kingdom and the United States, have their own systems of planning education and in considering their own systems find themselves involved in important problems of principle. But because I am an outsider and an outsider with only a few weeks to write a report I shall confine myself to the situation in Canada and shall keep close to earth. I pause here to note four problems of principle that I encountered this summer.
(a) "What is planning?" "Is planning a profession?" I shall disregard for the most part what is, I gather, a much discussed question in the United States (I have read something about it and understand only a little): "what is planning" and "is planning a profession". The involved philosophy in these discussions looks to me, an outsider, like an attempt by embattled interests, both in the outside world and in the academic world, to prove dialectically that the territory covered by this new and changing thing called planning belongs to them and not to the other fellow. In the complicated fight by planners to get recognition, over the objections of architects, engineers, surveyors and others, by a legislature as a profession, they sometimes find it necessary to define with precision what it is that is unique to them and distinguishes them from all other professions. The same sort of problem can arise in the course of empire-building in the academic world; are planners architects plus (so that "Planning" belongs to "Architecture") or public administrators plus (so that "Planning" belongs to "Public Administration") or something unique (so that "Planning" is a "Department" all to itself or an "Institute"). In the Canadian academic world—and it is with that alone that I am concerned—there has been little border warfare of this kind and nobody I met, except those who wanted undergraduate courses in planning to be established, bothered me with these dialectics. As it so happened, however, something was going on at three of the five Canadian schools this summer that did raise other and difficult questions of principle.

(b) The "university idea" versus the "professional idea". At one of the schools there was a change in the headship on the ground that the course—not its content but the way it was being given—was "not sufficiently academic". This is the most important problem in the field of university education for a profession, any profession. The interest of the university which is in "educating" planners, lawyers or doctors or engineers or architects and so on is always and inevitably opposed, to some extent, to the interest of the profession which wants "trained" graduates. Whether you call this conflict "theory versus practice" or "principles versus techniques" or "Lady Why versus Madam How" does not matter—for the conflict is there and it is a real one. All that can be hoped for is that each side will respect the other's position and make a sensible but ever shifting compromise. This was the way that all the planning teachers felt and so did most of the members of the T.P.I.C. who answered the questionnaire. The real problem is, where the line shall be drawn on any specific issue—curriculum, practical experience and the like.

The same problem, but from another angle, came to my attention at the University of Toronto. The planning school there has, after several years of effort, now succeeded in persuading the School of Graduate Studies to establish an M.Sc. (Planning) degree, and the new two-year course will go into effect this fall, side by side with the present one-year diploma course. Why did the School of Graduate Studies resist so long? That I do not positively know, but I will make a guess. Guessed-at reason number one is the academic snobbery that one finds at old-established universities. I am inclined to that myself and I try to resist it. "What is this queer new thing called planning; do you mean that this University, which has never quite accepted Social Work, is to go on down the slippery slope and train a kind of municipal employee called a
planner?” Guessed-at reason number two is the “queer mix” of subjects over which the planning student must range widely but not deeply; how does this comply with the traditional requirement for a Master’s degree, that the student should go deep? There is no point in just preaching at “wrong” attitudes. All I can record here is my impression that some of the planning schools in Canada have not quite “made it” into the charmed academic circle—and my feeling that a new planning school would be happiest at a new university. But how can anyone doubt the “academic worth” of ranging widely over the old disciplines which converge on a new and vitally important discipline—understanding the city and trying to do something about its problems.

(c) The changing role of the university professor. A wholly different question of principle faced me at another school—one created by the change that has recently occurred in the role that a professor in a Canadian university is expected to play. A number of people complained to me that its head did not spend enough time at his school. Twenty years ago there would have been no answer to the complaint; a professor was a teacher and his place was by the side of his students in the cloister. Today a professor is expected to go out into the world and contribute his knowledge and experience to the solution of its difficulties and, incidentally, to “advertise” thereby the university to which he belongs. It is hard for one man to play both roles and similar problems are now coming up in many departments in many universities. It is not just a planning school problem—it just attracts more attention there because they have so few teachers.

(b) The need to be realistic in discussing planning education. One other question of principle was pressed upon me by all the planning teachers I saw: I must, they said, be realistic. I shall try to be. In one important field, that of curriculum, I had read learned writings by “planning educators” setting forth all the bodies of knowledge and collections of techniques to which a planning student ought to be “exposed”. I had also been told about the “explosion” that is now going on in that area: urban studies, ekistics, regional science and computer programming are some of the words I remember. One of the heads of schools’ comment was “I wonder how much of that those fellows really do—it sounds to me as if it was written by one of the public relations departments that we have in universities now”. Always premising that there is an irreducible minimum of what a student should be “given”, the profession ought, I think, to be sympathetic with the problems that the schools are facing—limited budgets, difficulties in getting teachers to do “related subjects”, etc.—and not expect, except eventually, too much of them. Nor should anyone, at this time, feel dismayed because Canada has no planning school that can rank with the best ones in the United States. I am thinking now of two brash young men who handed me, in fun, a piece of paper on which were printed the words “until there is a good planning school in Canada the CMHC scholarships ought to be made tenable at an American university”.

4. SCHEME OF THE REPORT
In Chapter II, Background, I shall review briefly and in a very general way the change that has come over planning, the planning profession and planning educa-
tion since 1949 when Professor Parker was preparing his report. I shall then con­sider why people have conflicting ideas about planning education; one reason, I shall suggest, is that short post-graduate courses are being asked to do a heavier job than the one they were originally designed for; another reason, I shall suggest, is the doubts that exist about the validity of “the generalist concept”, which concept does, however, seem to be generally accepted. With Chapter III, The Schools and their Problems, I shall come to the main body of the report. I shall there describe, one by one, each of the five Canadian schools, its philosophy, entrance require­ments, curriculum and the like and shall sympathetically point out its peculiar characteristics and problems in the light of what teachers and old students told me about it. I shall then comment generally on the whole panorama, make tentative suggestions and dream a dream. The chapter will conclude with a short section on “incipient schools” and “tame planners”—with the latter being used to draw attention to the growth in the “contemplative” department of two universities of pro­grammes dealing in one case with urban, regional and resource planning and in the other with urban studies. In Chapter IV, Miscellaneous Problems, I shall first dis­cuss, briefly and in the light of what members of the profession said to me per­sonally and in their replies to the questionnaires, some problems of the schools, viz. students (including in this connection the question whether the CMHC Scholar­ships “are bearing optimum results”), teachers, approach and curriculum. I shall then, very briefly indeed, discuss the problem of entry to the profession otherwise than through a planning school and the practical experience problem. Chapter V “Highlights; Problems not Considered” will attempt a very short summary of the highlights and will list, shortly and inadequately, some of the multitudinous prob­lems not dealt with.

CHAPTER II—BACKGROUND

1. CHANGES IN PLANNING, THE PLANNING PROFESSION AND THE PLANNING SCHOOLS IN CANADA SINCE 1949

I shall here compare, in a very general way and within the limits imposed by my own meagre knowledge, the situation in 1949 when Professor Parker was preparing his report and the situation today.

(a) Planning. In 1949 planning in Canada was in a very rudimentary state and what there was of it was limited to urban planning in a few large cities—mostly done by consultants. There was no more than a “growing recognition of the need for permanent planning staffs . . . in larger cities”; “a number of cities with populations between 5,000 and 1,000,000 had engaged consultants to prepare plans” but “had had no opportunity to learn what planning as a per­manent and continuous process of government can mean in the way of effective guidance of physical development”. “The provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Sas­katchewan and Alberta had each set up provincial town planning services . . . to provide technical assistance to the small community”; but their appropria­tions were very small (Ontario’s was $32,545) and they were unable to do very much. As a rough estimate there were only forty-five persons in Canada (excluding five at Universities) employed in responsible positions in the field
of planning; twenty on large city staffs, ten on provincial staffs and fifteen as private consultants (Parker Report pp. 4–8).

The following run-down of the situation today is drawn mostly from a memorandum to which I had access. “The town-planner has become accepted as a ‘standard’ municipal official. He is increasingly recognized and respected. He is, in some areas, influential. Planners are working effectively in the majority of provinces. There are several metropolitan and regional planning organizations. In the rolling fringe of cities planning consultants are now retained by virtually all major developers. Ten years ago none of the above statements was true. Planning was embryonic and its influence casual.” At the provincial level all the provincial governments now have planning departments of varying size and function—including Alberta (whose program aims to cover the whole province outside Calgary and Edmonton on a comprehensive regional basis), Ontario (whose program at present mainly aims at establishing local planning boards and encouraging them to prepare official plans) and Quebec (which is, I understand, preparing to go in for planning in a big way). At the municipal level “virtually all cities of 25,000 and over have regular staff planners”. Large cities, such as Vancouver, Winnipeg and Toronto have built-up skilled planning teams; the Vancouver office has, as I remember it, eighteen qualified planners distributed among several divisions. “A few regional planning agencies have developed, including Metro Toronto, Metro Winnipeg, Lower Mainland in British Columbia and the National Capital Commission in Ottawa”. The planners do not, of course, have perfectly plain sailing. Private enterprise attitudes are still strong and the planner has, I was told in Vancouver, to be at one and the same time a man who loves the democratic process and so is ready to face the rejection of his advice by his political masters and a man who has the courage to tender advice which he believes to be right when he knows that if he tenders it he may get fired. When I arrived there this had just happened to three of them. Several people also said in effect what the following comment says: “Because of the shortage of numbers in planners and in planning technicians we are hardly able to catch up with an understanding of our urban, suburban and rural problems, let alone do anything serious about them.”

(b) Planning profession. Against the forty-five practising planners Professor Parker found in 1949 must be set the more than three hundred active members that T.P.I.C. has at the moment of writing—a figure that does not include persons who are qualified to be members but are not members. Where did they come from? Most of them came from the United Kingdom; 60 per cent of all planners in Canada are said to be “imported planners”. This stream has now almost dried up and it is from the five Canadian schools that most of the future planners must come. Again, in 1949 the T.P.I.C. had no active existence. Re-activated in 1952—that is, after the time when all of the planning schools except the Institut d’Urbanisme were established—it has, in the normal fashion of professional societies, been tightening its admission requirements and developing an interest in planning education. As to job opportunities for graduates of the planning schools, the situation in 1949 was none too clear, but Professor Parker eventually concluded (Report p. 21) that “it would seem safe to predict
that the planning movement in Canada will be seriously handicapped unless the universities anticipate the potential (my italics) demand and undertake training programs in the near future”. In 1963 there is a clear shortage of planners but there were not enough replies to the questionnaires to indicate how much of a shortage. A number of the offices that I visited, however, told me that they had vacancies now that they could not fill and other offices told me that they were going to expand shortly. At Banff I heard of an employer who had belligerently asked “where has this year’s crop of graduates gone?” and in newspapers across the country I kept seeing advertisements for planners.

(c) Planning Schools. In 1949 there was only one school, McGill. The striking thing about the five schools we have in 1963 is that they differ in a number of ways—of which the most important are admission requirements, curricula and general approach, and duration of the course. They are, however, all alike in admitting only graduate students and in making “project work” or “studio” or “workshop”—solving practical problems by doing—the core of the course.

Although I do not pretend to know much about the circumstances that shaped them, I think I know enough to be able to speculate sensibly about why they are different. McGill (1947) a one-year course for graduate students, which seems designed to introduce them to the planning aspects of their original discipline and to intensify, rather than dilute, them in that discipline, started in the relaxed way one would expect of a “private” university—because of the common interest that a group of university teachers, living in a sophisticated city, had in planning problems. Manitoba (1949), a one-year graduate course for architects and engineers only, was started, in part at any rate, at the suggestion of the Government of Manitoba and in order to supply for small prairie communities architects or engineers who could meet simple planning needs in a practical way. U.B.C. (1950), a two-year course for graduates in a wide variety of subjects related to planning, which in a province of regions emphasizes regional planning, had as its first and present head, a man who had come from the school of planning at Harvard and brought with him the idea of a “full-fledged” planning school on the “Eastern seaboard” model. Toronto (1951), a one-year diploma course (the two-year M.Sc. (Pl.) course will not begin until the Fall of 1963) for graduates with a rather lower standard of admission than the other schools, seems to have been started to meet the very real and immediate need for planners in a rapidly expanding metropolitan area and has had three different heads. The Institut d'Urbanisme at the University of Montreal (1961), a two-year graduate course with an ambitious curriculum, a full-time staff of three for a handful of students and a supporting staff of practising planners with degrees from good American schools, was sponsored by some of these practitioners for French-speaking students. The Province of Quebec, is, I understand, soon to embark on a vigorous planning program and will need French-speaking general practitioners. With such varied histories, is it any wonder that the schools are different from one another?

Turning back again to the unsatisfied demand for planners, the total enrolment at all the schools was until recently very small. Between the academic year 1955–56 and the academic year 1959–60 the lowest figure was twenty-one and the highest twenty-seven. In the last three academic years, however, the
numbers have been growing, but nobody seems to know why. In 1960–61 total enrolment was thirty-five; McGill, six; University of Toronto, seventeen; Manitoba, five; U.B.C., seven. In 1961–62 it was fifty-eight; McGill, four; University of Toronto, twenty-three; Manitoba, nine; U.B.C., fourteen; Institut d’Urbanisme, eight. In 1962–63 it was seventy-six; McGill, eight; University of Toronto, twenty-six; Manitoba, ten; U.B.C., twenty-six; Institut d’Urbanisme, six. All the schools are expecting more students in 1963–64 than they had in 1962–63.*

2. WHY PEOPLE HAVE CONFLICTING IDEAS ABOUT PLANNING EDUCATION

In my reading and in talking to people this summer I have found much conflict and much confusion in ideas about planning education—more than one finds in discussions of other kinds of education. Why? One reason is that planning education is pretty new and planners can still worry planning teachers by saying: “The purpose of planning education is to educate planners; is the system we now have producing properly qualified planners?” Older professional schools, like law schools and medical schools, have been going long enough to acquire sufficient confidence to answer similar awkward questions with “we know what we are doing” and just sweep them under the rug.

(a) Short post-graduate courses being asked to do a heavier job than the one they were originally designed for. Another reason—which I only touch on—is that the short post-graduate courses which are pretty standard today were originally designed to give architects and engineers a “planning tinge” and are not really adapted to doing the different and more extensive job of producing the “pure planner” or “general practitioner” or “composite man” out of sociologists, geographers, engineers, architects and several other kinds of people. If we were starting afresh today we would probably make a distinction between three different kinds of people. The first kind would be architects who wanted to become urban designers; they would—and this movement has begun in the United States—be trained in schools of architecture. The second kind would be large range of people who—for one reason or another, including sometimes the reason that they intended to work in the planning team of a large city planning office but not as planners—wanted a quick look at the planning process; to these sociologists, geographers, engineers, architects and other disciplines related to planning we would give a “planning tinge” in a one-year post-graduate course and graduate them in their original discipline. The third kind would be the “pure planners” or “general practitioners” that I mentioned earlier. To these people we would say, as Durham and Manchester do in England or Pennsylvania does in the United States: “Come to us straight out of high-school and we will in four to six years give you enough of the wide range of necessary knowledge and skills to enable you to call yourself a planner.”

Following the majority tradition in England and the United States what we actually do in Canada today is as follows. In seven months (Toronto), in seven months plus (Manitoba), in a calendar year plus (McGill) and in two

*The three different sources from which I drew these figures do not entirely agree with one another. This is not, however, for my purposes important.
years (U.B.C. and Montreal) we try at the post-graduate level to produce “general practitioners” out of people so different as, say, geographers and architects. But—“do not destroy what we have”; “be realistic”. Meanwhile, however, one reason for the vague sense of malaise about planning education in Canada that I have sensed this summer is clear; most planning schools in England, the United States and Canada are asking a machine designed for a light job to do a heavy job and it is complaining. Sometime in the future we Canadians may be able to buy a new one; meanwhile we can only keep the traditional one we have and strengthen it where it needs strengthening.

(b) *Doubts about who is “the standard planner”; the generalist concept.* Another reason for the conflict and confusion in ideas about planning education is that there are so many kinds of planner and new kinds are being born every day—the city planner, the regional planner, the traffic planner, the consultant planner who is likely to have to end up designing the buildings too, the planner in a large city office who does nothing except review applications for relaxations of zoning by-laws and sub-division approvals, the individual municipal planner who will have to do everything from the technical job of producing a comprehensive plan to the public relations job of attending meetings of ratepayers. Which of these many kinds of people or what combination of them should the profession recognize as “the standard planner”?

All professions have to face this problem and they solve it in different ways. The engineers recognize several different kinds of engineer; the lawyers recognize only one kind of lawyer, the general practitioner; the doctors insist that everyone be first a general practitioner and then go on, if he wishes to specialize, to qualify himself for that specialization as well. Which way has the planning profession gone? The Town Planning Institute in England, the American schools—and, as I understand it, the T.P.I.C.—recognize only one kind of planner, the “jack of all trades” or “generalist” or “one-horse town planner”. What, then, is he imagined to be doing? The answer to that question is as follows: whatever additional or more restricted things he may in fact be doing, he is imagined to be doing all those things that are necessary to make a comprehensive plan of a town. In that process—which I described earlier—he must know a little about a great number of things. From both a professional and an educational point of view the result is not, in some ways, too happy and it disturbs thoughtful people. It disturbed Professor Gordon Stephenson, for instance: “In the minds of most people who have been setting up schools, the image they have of the planning job is of a person who can cope with any kind of problem in a relatively small office. This is the notion of the ‘generalist’—*par excellence*—the Australian notion of the doctor who goes out in the bush and must be able to cope with everything from haemorrhoids to measles and do something about it, even though he’s got to use a carving knife. . . . I think we’re now at the stage when all kinds of people should be coming into planning and schools should be developing all kinds of planners. . . . But there are all kinds of roles and I think there is room for all kinds of schools.”*

Nevertheless, and Professor Gordon Stephenson notwithstanding, there is, as I see it, now a tradition in the field of planning education. It is described

*Plan, November, 1960, at p. 187.*
in the extract I shall quote below from a recent short report on Professional Planning Education in the United States and Canada and central to it is the concept of the generalist or, in professional terms, the general practitioner.

"Although the various planning education programs in United States and Canadian universities are not identical in specific objectives, scope or details of curricula, there is nevertheless enough of a common view of the ultimate objective of planning education to provide certain rather wide areas of agreement and similarity. Chief among these is the concept of the planner as a generalist, which has been aptly described in the following statement from the 1947 policy statement of the American Institute of Planners, The Content of Professional Curricula in Planning.

‘One thing is certain; we cannot treat all fields of knowledge of concern to the planner as though he were required to be a specialist in those fields. To do so is to misunderstand the essential function of the planner; and hence to pervert the educational process as it applies to him. At the same time, he must know enough of the varied subject matters with which he is involved so that he will be able to coordinate the different elements of a planning program, and will know when to get more specialized advice and how to use the results.’

“The various programs recognize this concept in various ways. Some tend to emphasize physical design, both aesthetic and ‘practical’; others emphasize social and economic considerations and the processes of administration and decision-making. In no major program now existing, however, is either of these approaches developed to the exclusion of the other.”*

In Canada the Council of the T.P.I.C. has, I was told, been following “the generalist concept”. Surely the Council is right in so doing; they are doing exactly what the legal profession and the medical profession do. Of the schools U.B.C. and the University of Montreal have avowedly adopted it and so has Toronto, but Toronto may be hampered in carrying it out by the fact that the diploma course is only one academic year (seven months) in length. Manitoba, however, is trying to train its architect or engineer “as a general practitioner in the field of civic design”. A site planner is perhaps a better expression. And McGill is, as I understand it, taking people from other related disciplines and giving them a “planning tinge” “without getting too involved in technical details”.

CHAPTER III—THE SCHOOLS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

Coming now to the main body of this report—the planning schools in Canada and their problems—I must say right now and in three short sentences three things that everyone reading it must bear continually in mind. These three sentences would, if the art of printing allowed it, be set forth in letters of fire. The first is: *in writing about each school I am totally disregarding what, for want of a better word,
may be called the “personality” of its head; because each school is a small school his “personality” is inevitably of the utmost importance in determining the kind of school that it is; to this extent, therefore, my report cannot tell “the whole truth”. From end-to-end of the country I was plied to my dismay with subjective assessments of the kind of men Professors 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were and what it was in each of them that made “his” school a “good” school or a “not so good” school. But all I can do is to say that, while I think that those who talked this way had put their fingers on something very important, I am not writing a gossip column on planning teachers but a report on planning education. The second sentence is: while I think planning education is important (did I not spend the summer of 1963 looking into it?) we must all, I think, refrain from overestimating the importance of what a short time spent in a planning school can do for the aspiring planner and, a fortiori, from overestimating the importance of tinkering with the kind of things he does while he is there. Ebenezer Howard and Le Corbusier did not go to planning school. As for the ordinary Joe, the man who is going to spend his life as a member of the planning profession, he cannot at planning school hope to do more, as one distinguished member of the profession said to me, than “learn to learn how to become a planner”. He will get his real education, as the same man also said when I asked him where he got his planning training, by “living, looking, reading, thinking”. The third sentence is: underline the Schuster Report’s first two requirements for the planner: they are (1) “certain innate qualities of intellect and character and (2) a sound basic educational discipline”. In answer to my standard question “what knowledge and skills do you think a man working in your office should have?” Many people answered: “First and foremost he should be a gentleman, and be able to get on with people” (something you don’t learn in school). Many said: “What he has to advise on is in the end often a question of values, e.g. the short-run view of cost versus long-range intangible benefits to the community or ‘keeping our view of the mountains’ versus accepting a big new development that will stimulate employment, and he ought to have studied moral philosophy” (something that isn’t done in planning school). Many said: “He has to be able to sell his ideas to the politicians and to the community and so he should be able to write reports in good clear English and he should be a good public speaker” (something that in my view—notwithstanding a large number of suggestions to the contrary—should be taught before, and not in planning school).

With these limitations in mind, I shall first describe, one by one, each of the five Canadian schools, its philosophy, entrance requirements, curriculum, and the like and shall point out its peculiar characteristics and problems; in this I had the help of both teachers and old students. My descriptions will be to some extent impressionistic. I shall then comment generally on the panorama. There will be a short concluding section on “incipient schools”, on “tame planners” in connection with universities that have no planning school and on two liberal arts courses that bear on planning. My description of the schools is not meant to be just a dead-pan description. I probed deeply into each of them, far more deeply than I originally intended. I tried to find out what each was trying to do, how each was actually operating and what was the “feel” of each. Those readers who want a straight

forward factual description I refer to an excellent report on Planning Education made by the Community Planning Association of Canada in June 1961.

1. THE FIVE CANADIAN SCHOOLS

In what follows please note that the descriptions of each of the curricula of the five schools are meant to be very general and are only given to block out the difference between the schools in a large way. I am quite aware that a subject, e.g. research techniques or planning law, may, without having a named course to itself, be to some extent dealt with elsewhere, e.g. in the studio or workshop work. I am also aware that any given-named course, e.g. planning law, may have quite a different content or approach at School A from what it has at School B.

(a) McGill (1947). Starting in a dead-pan way to describe a school which is anything but a dead-pan school, this course (the oldest one) is open to any student who is proceeding to a master's degree in a discipline related to physical planning, e.g. architecture, economics, engineering, geography, law, political science, sociology, etc. Forty per cent of them have, over the years, been architects. There have never been very many of them; the figures for the last three academic years (rather larger than in earlier years) were, I was told by Professor Spence-Sales, 6, 4, and 8 respectively. Professor Spence-Sales is the head of the school and, to all intents and purposes, its only full-time teacher. The teaching part of the course takes one academic year (seven months) but there is a rigorous thesis, supervised by both the original department and Professor Spence-Sales, and nearly all the students take longer than a calendar year to complete the course. Because the school does not put out a brochure I am very vague about the curriculum and it varies, I understand, from year to year. Last year, however, it was, I gathered from a student, somewhat as follows: planning theory, historical and current; planning seminar attended by a variety of visitors discussing a variety of current planning problems; studio or workshop on what seemed to me sophisticated projects, taking up half of the students' total time; a half-year course on municipal government tailored to planners' requirements; a half-year course on urban land use problems for geographers and planners together; and a course on urban sociology given for architects and planners together. The curriculum did not, so far as I could gather, contain any course on urban engineering, urban economics, planning law, regional planning or planning techniques; planning techniques and matters of engineering, economics and law must, however, have been discussed in the workshop. You see how vague I am, but I was unable to get much help on details, any details.

This description does not, however, give any idea of what the course is really like. I must now try to paint my own picture of it—based in part on what Professor Spence-Sales told me. The school does not aim to produce a “generalist” or “pure planner”, as U.B.C., Toronto and Montreal do. It is trying to give a “planning tinge” to architects, geographers and the like and, at the same time, to intensify them in their original discipline. In line with this aim the student remains under the jurisdiction of the department of that discipline, is expected to involve that department in the workshop projects of the school, is supposed to speak in that workshop only on the discipline he knows and must in his thesis combine the two worlds of that discipline and of planning. It is
furthermore very much a “university school” and very little a “trade school”; the students are expected to acquire an approach, principles and ideas “without bothering very much about technical details”. It has too, something in common with the Beaux Arts system in France and the Oxbridge tutorial system in England; Professor Spence-Sales runs, in the course of his own practice, into many interesting and “sophisticated” problems in planning and shares those problems with his students. Graduates of the school will be found in some of the top planning jobs in the country and in the National Capital Commission, whose main interest is in civic design.

A school of this kind is bound to be admired, however grudgingly, by its detractors and to be criticised, however mildly, by its admirers and I found both admirers and detractors. The detractors fastened on the school’s comparative disregard of the workaday problems and workaday tools of the ordinary practising planner and the admirers fastened on what one of them called “a genuine academic experience”. To my mind the school faces two questions: (1) is there, from the point of view of the profession, a place for a school which does not purport to turn out general practitioners? (2) suppose the profession says no, then won’t the school have to hold the balance more evenly between the “university idea” and the “professional idea” and, eventually, go on to a two-year basis? Whatever the answer to those questions may be, there will always, of course, be a place for a school which like McGill is, in true university manner, giving the planning point of view to people who will be involved in the planning process as architects, geographers, sociologists and the like.

(b) University of Montreal: Institut d’Urbanisme (1961). The University of Montreal School, the Institut d’Urbanisme is, as I said earlier, the youngest school. Receiving its initial impetus from a group of practising planners and aiming to supply French-speaking planners to meet the “planning explosion” said to be expected soon in the Province of Quebec, it only started in September 1961. It has a full-time faculty of three and a supporting staff of practitioners with degrees from good American schools. It has, however, had only a handful of students: in 1961–62, eight of whom only four survived; in 1962–63 the four just mentioned and two new ones; for 1963–64 five new students are certainly coming and five other new ones may come. The course is a two-year postgraduate one (two and a half years, counting the thesis) and is open to candidates who have graduated in disciplines related to planning; in the students who have so far come to the school no one discipline has predominated. The degree given is Master of Planning. Because there is in existence a detailed brochure giving details of all the courses and because Professors Alaurent and Begin gave me a detailed memorandum on all matters relating to curriculum, I know, in so far as I am capable of understanding it, a good deal about this school. They also told me all I wanted to know about the discussions that took place when the curriculum was being hammered out.

The school has thought deeply, and ambitiously, about what it is trying to do both for now and for the future. For the future it has devised a basic course leading to either a generalist in urban planning or a generalist in regional planning and for the more distant future it has plans for specializations, e.g. traffic
planning, housing planning and the like, and also plans for night courses. For the present it is being realistic about what the Province of Quebec needs right now, viz. general practitioners in urban planning, and about the facilities it now has. The present course therefore concentrates on the body of knowledge and collections of skills needed to produce an urban planner; it does however devote part of the last semester to regional planning. I have not the time, or the space, to set out all the curriculum, but I shall briefly describe it. Following through the implications of the generalist theory—where, unlike the “intensification of original discipline” theory followed at McGill, the student’s prior background has to be levelled off to produce a “composite man”—the student is first required to take certain pre-requisite courses in other departments of the university. The “planning” part of the course is organized in such a way as to show the student where he is going—around the three policies involved in the planning process, (a) land use policy, (b) administrative policy and (c) implementation policy—and workshop is deferred until the student has absorbed enough basic knowledge. The first-year courses are: planning principles; history of planning; planning standards; planning techniques; research techniques; civic design; “land use policy” workshop is interspersed here and there. In the first semester of the second year the courses are: planning law; planning administration; urban finance; conservation, rehabilitation and re-development; and administration and implementation policy workshop. In the second semester of that year they are: regional planning principles, regional planning law; estate management; traffic and communications; regional planning workshop; and professional ethics.

This school is obviously trying to establish in Canada a planning course which will hold the balance even between the “university idea” and the “professional idea”. It has however run into minor problems. Although the stated aim of the school is to educate planners in principles and there is the safeguard that the sponsoring practitioners, as well as the teachers, seem to believe in the “university idea”, the headship changed this summer, on the ground that the method of teaching was “not sufficiently academic”. Another difficulty has been that the course has proved too comprehensive to complete—a difficulty inseparable from any serious attempt to “cover the ground”.

(c) University of Toronto (1951). Possibly because it is situated in the fastest-growing urban area in Canada, and gives a diploma course which is only one academic year (seven months) in length, this school has always had the most students. The numbers have risen gradually from ten in 1955–56 to twenty-six in 1962–63. It has now a full-time staff of three. It has, however, been dogged by a special problem of its own. Its first head left it suddenly in 1954, so that the course was not given in 1954–55. Perhaps because he was unable to obtain from apparently unsympathetic university authorities the degree course which he wanted for the school, its second head, Professor Gordon Stephenson, later departed for Australia. Professor John Dakin—whose generous help, freely given at any time I asked for it, I here acknowledge—has now got the degree course M.Sc. (Planning)) and it will go into operation in the fall of 1963. The one-year diploma course, however, will continue to exist and, it is expected, attract the most students. In recent years the diploma course has been increas-
ing in coverage (or getting more crowded, if you prefer it) and regional planning has been added to it.

Leaving aside for the moment the new degree course, the diploma course is open to graduates (even graduates in pass courses) in any discipline contributing to town and regional planning and also to qualified land surveyors. Most of the students have had prior work experience, many of them in planning offices, their previous disciplines are geography (20%), architecture and architectural engineering (20%), economics, political science and sociology (20%) and others, e.g. land surveyors, geology, fine arts (30%), so that no one discipline predominates. In the short seven-month period the student must take the following courses: project work, which takes up half the student’s time and is designed to range over a wide variety of planning situations; theory of urban and regional planning; a seminar course on planning literature; local government, planning law and administration and municipal engineering, each tailored, with differing degrees of success, to the needs of planning students; and one elective, from the fields of soil conservation, land economics, urban geography and some others. The school accepts the generalist theory but there is no time for the student to take, as he does in the two-year courses at the University of Montreal and at U.B.C., the “pre-requisite” courses designed to help make him over into the “composite man”, no time for real coverage of the field and no time for real depth in the topics covered. Teachers and old students alike all recognized this problem. So that, to use the words of Professor Dakin, the school is forced to adopt the limited objective of “alerting the student to the problems of planning”. To use the more formal statement appearing in the Calendar: “The curriculum is designed to give students from a variety of backgrounds a basic understanding of the nature of urban and regional problems, to impart essential knowledge of the theory and techniques of planning, to orient the student’s thinking toward appreciation of the nature of our society and to develop in him a system of attitudes which will fit him to play his professional role.”

From a professional point of view, this school plays an indispensable role in producing graduates who can go into, or back into, largish municipal, provincial or federal offices and there receive further practical training on the job. There is no doubt that it performs a real public service in so doing, particularly now when planners are so sorely needed. I received many comments from old students of which the following is typical:

“The course was too short to provide more than an introduction to planning literature, to some of the problems and to a few of the techniques available for dealing with them. It did not permit much analysis in depth, or any specialization in a particular field within planning, nor was it able to make up for deficiencies in undergraduate background.

“The course did, however, provide invaluable training in looking at the many sides of a planning problem (however cursorily) and was very stimulating because of this broad approach. In short, the course was more satisfactory in breadth than in depth.”

For a man who will go straight from the school into a one-man municipal office or (as has happened) to become a planning director the course may not,
because it is so short, be too satisfactory. And a very large number of replies to questionnaires by both employers of planners and members of T.P.I.C. thought that all planning courses in Canada should be two-year courses. From the point of view of quality this may be so but from the point of view of quantity—and this is important just now, particularly in Ontario—it is much more doubtful. In any event the Toronto school will continue the seven-month diploma course for the present.

I shall not describe the new two-year M.Sc. (Pl.) course; it will add the coverage and depth that the comment above asked for and will also (as everyone emphasized about two-year courses) give time for things to sink in and time for the student to think. A student entering the school will have three choices. He can register at once for the degree course, in which case he will have to have a B average in an honours course in his previous discipline; or he can take the diploma course and leave it at that; or he can, having taken the diploma course and done well in it, do another year to complete the degree course, either immediately or at a later date.

(d) University of Manitoba (1949). This one-year (seven months) post-graduate course is only open to those who have degrees with a B average in architecture or engineering; over the years there have been twenty-six architects and twenty-nine engineers but at present many more engineers than architects are coming to the school. A common type of student is now, I understand, a municipal engineer from the West who is trying to "better himself" by getting a planning qualification; he will usually go from the school to a job requiring physical design of some kind, again mostly in the West. There is only one teacher, Professor Kostka, and—there being until recently very few students) usually 2 or 3)—he teaches the course on a tutorial basis in a small room off the draughting room of the School of Architecture. In 1961–62, however, there were nine students; in 1962–63 there were ten; and for 1963–64 about twelve are expected. This increase in the number of students has placed a heavy load on the tutor and there are now real problems of space.

The course itself is slanted in the direction of physical or site planning, doing subdivisions, civic design, industrial estates and the like and the social considerations are, in comparison with Toronto or U.B.C., underemphasized. Half of the student's time is, as in the other schools, spent on studio work; in the first term this consists of various projects (Planning Procedure and Design); in the second term it consists of a design project that the student does himself and is normally a residential subdivision, a shopping centre, a city centre re-development plan or the like (Thesis). There are lectures on Planning Principles and on Municipal Engineering or Community Planning and Housing. On the social science side there is a course on sociology (Community Organization) but, there being no urban sociologist available, Professor Kostka gives that course himself. There is also an excellent course called Government and Planning, but the course does not have much to do with municipal government or with planning; apparently there is no one available to teach the kind of course required.

As I mentioned above, the school was established to meet the needs of the Prairie region for site planners and it continues to meet that need; what was
wanted, as the late Dean of Engineering is said to have said, was “someone who can go out and plan a town”. Even on that basis, however, the school now seems to be facing problems, including inadequate staff and inadequate space. From a broader point of view lack of time—time again—prevents the introduction of courses dealing with law, money and other social considerations, so that, as Professor Kostka said, the architects and the engineers merely reinforce one another’s preoccupation with things. I also received the impression when I was in Winnipeg that the university may not have all the facilities in the social science field that a planning school needs. Someone who should know summed up the situation as follows: “In view of the restrictive admission requirements and because of the limitations imposed by this one-year course, I think that these students are inadequately prepared for comprehensive planning work.” There is however some suggestion that consideration is being given to removing the “architect or engineer” restriction and to extending the course to two years. Meanwhile, the course is producing site planners and thereby filling a need that no other Canadian school seems to fill.

(e) University of British Columbia (1950). This school was, until the French-speaking school at the University of Montreal started in 1961, the only school in Canada with a two-year course. The course is open to post-graduate students with good marks in any of a variety of Bachelor’s degrees, preferably those in fields related to planning; 25 per cent of them have over the years come from geography and 15 per cent from engineering, with the rest divided pretty evenly between a large number of other disciplines. There is a full-time staff of two, including Professor Peter Oberlander, the head of the school. In recent years, however, the second member of the staff has changed twice. There is also a strong supporting staff drawn partly from other departments of the university and partly from outside the university. Until 1961–62 the school had had very few students—from the time it started in 1950–51 until 1959–60 only forty-four all told—but since then numbers have risen sharply. In 1961–62 it had, counting the first and the second year students together, fourteen; in 1962–63 it had twenty-six; and for 1963–64 more people applied than the space normally available will take, which is twenty-eight. Why the sharp and sudden increase Professor Oberlander did not know. The students are drawn mainly from British Columbia and Alberta.

The school aims at turning out a generalist and has from the first, as I said earlier, emphasized regional planning—British Columbia being a country of natural regions. Because the student is to be turned from, say, a mining engineer, into that composite man a planner, he first makes up the deficiencies in his own individual background by taking selected courses in areas where he is likely to be weak, e.g. in the social sciences. There is, of course, no time for this in one-year courses. Thereafter he takes a curriculum common to him and all the other students. As at all the schools, the core is in the studio or workshop: first the nature, scope and evolution of the city, then planning problems dealing with the details of survey, analysis and design; second, an existing community is studied, leading toward a comprehensive survey and analysis of existing social, economic and physical conditions; and last, regional planning
workshop. There are lectures on: planning analysis; planning engineering; planning law and administration; regional planning theory, methods and techniques; and at least three additional courses in fields related to community and regional planning. As a thesis, the student must work on an extensive planning project. I am not competent to evaluate any curriculum; all the above was merely copied out of the calendar for whatever information it may give.

Several ex-students now practising as planners came to talk to me and all of them said that on paper the curriculum was more or less adequate. Most of them were, however, highly critical of the school, their complaints being directed against the administration of it. As to the approach, the philosophy behind the course, the emphasis is clearly on principles; what is being studied in true university manner is the process of decision-making and “the city and its problems and learning to try to do something about them”.

Professor Oberlander was able to tell me from his long experience how necessary it is for members of the profession who say “a planning school ought to do this or do that” to be realistic about the problems of the schools. How do you get students; for many years U.B.C. had very few. How do you get and keep teachers? How in a small school can the head of the school at one and the same time be doing what he should in the world outside and be at home with his students, giving to each of them the individual attention that a planning teacher has to give? How in this subject that cuts across many disciplines do you get people from other departments in the university to give courses tailored to the very special needs of planning students—particularly when the student group is small? These problems affect all the planning schools. The reason I mention them in connection with U.B.C. is because, having looked at each of the Canadian schools individually, I now want to look at them as a whole—to glance over the Canadian panorama.

2. THE CANADIAN PANORAMA

In glancing over the panorama the following features stand out. First, the schools differ from one another in important respects. Second, no school is as yet a “really good” school.

(a) The Schools Differ from One Another in Important Respects. The schools obviously differ from one another in admission requirements, general approach, curriculum and duration of the course. They also differ in academic qualification offered at completion of the course and in the place where each fits in the administrative hierarchy of the university; these matters are in some respects important (a one-year master’s degree, for instance, may impress a prospective employer more than a one-year diploma and one of the schools may owe some of its troubles to being “an unloved stepchild” of the School of Architecture) but I shall disregard them. Assuming that the T.P.I.C. is looking for general practitioners Montreal, U.B.C. and Toronto fall into one main class; all of them are trying to educate general practitioners. The courses at Montreal and U.B.C. are two-year courses but the Toronto diploma course is only seven months. Can Toronto do the job satisfactorily in only seven months? Will it not eventually have to do away with its diploma course and give only the new degree course? Crowding more subjects in seven months is no answer; the
result can only be still less depth and still less time for thought. Meanwhile, however, it is concentrating on principles and filling a real need. In the other main class are Manitoba and McGill, both one-year courses. The Manitoba students seem to be “inadequately prepared for comprehensive planning work”; will not this school eventually have to do away with its “architect-engineer” restriction, and, going on a two-year basis, enlarge its curriculum and swing away from its present site planning emphasis? Meanwhile, however, it is concentrating on a limited but necessary kind of design work (no other Canadian school does it) and filling a real need. The McGill school gives a relaxed, sophisticated and truly “university” course. Its graduates may, for all I know, be potentially better planners than the products of the other schools. They will, in any event, as architects or sociologists and the like who have been given a planning tinge and intensified in their original discipline, be valuable in any planning office—but won’t there eventually have to be more “bothering with technical details” and an extension of the course to two years if they are to meet the standard of the general practitioner? This may, from the point of view of the school, mean a lowering of standards in some respects but every professional school has to make a compromise between the “university idea” and the “professional idea”. Meanwhile the school is doing something that no other school in Canada does and its distinguished graduates are a sufficient guarantee of its worth.

I am not here suggesting that the five planning schools roll themselves down into a monotonous uniformity. They ought to be different and cannot ever be anything else but different. The teachers in each school will have different interests and will lay different emphasis on what is important in the planning process. The planning problems lying to hand in the area around each school will be different. All I am suggesting is that, given a T.P.I.C. requirement of “the general practitioner”, the length of the course should be the same, viz. two years, the admission requirements should be substantially the same, viz. B. average in any discipline related to planning, and there should be a “common core curriculum”. The “university school”, as opposed to “trade school”, approach is already common to them all. So also is a vitally important part of the curriculum, viz. the studio or workshop, where the students learn to solve planning problems by doing. By “common core curriculum” I am thinking of those exercises, those bodies of knowledge and those collections of skills which, as an irreducible minimum, any planning student aspiring to be admitted to the T.P.I.C. as a general practitioner ought to do in school. What they are I, a non-planner, do not know. I do know, however, because others have told me, that McGill, Manitoba and Toronto (diploma course) are “not doing enough of them”, that Montreal may be trying to do “too much of them” and that U.B.C. may, or may not, be doing “enough of them”.

All I can contribute is a few rather general ideas. Note that I underlined the words “in school” a sentence or two above. Imparting to the student who seeks admission to the T.P.I.C. an “irreducible minimum” is in part the responsibility of the profession. Some of that “irreducible minimum”, the “routine operations” or “what everyone knows” part, should not be done in school at all. The profession will have to do that part itself. As to what should be done in the
schools, let me warn some of the "imported planners", who said that the Canadian schools might model their curricula on the syllabus of the Town Planning Institute in the United Kingdom, that the Canadian tradition in the field of professional education is very different from the English. In England the hands of all the professions are very heavy on their university professional schools. In Canada, following the excellent tradition long established in the United States, university professional schools have a dual role, "but the university role always comes first". Principles, problems, ideas—those are the things that Canadian university professional schools deal with. So that the "common core curriculum" will be concerned with principles, problems and ideas. It will furthermore, as in other professional schools in Canada, leave a very wide area open for each school to follow its own interests—diversity, and not uniformity, will be the aim.

How can the "common core curriculum" be arrived at? There is only one way that I know of—by agreement between the parties interested, that is to say the schools and the T.P.I.C. And there I leave the matter.

(b) No school is as yet a "really good" school. All the four older schools, good as they are in some respects, are in other respects "not so good"; the University of Montreal school is young and has yet to prove itself. As will have appeared from my review of them individually each one has its problems. Those who, entirely uninvited, gave me their views on them, personally or in replies to the questionnaires, were sometimes sympathetic and sometimes very much less than sympathetic but they were all agreed that not one of them was as yet "really good". "Really good" by what standard? By the standard of the best schools in the United Kingdom and the United States. I might also mention in passing that not one of them—not even U.B.C. with its two-year course—is recognized by the Town Planning Institute in the United Kingdom as giving exemption from its Final Examination. At this point, be realistic. How could they be "really good"? Two of them are one-teacher schools and as to two others the staff has changed too often. All until recently had very few students. Let me here quote what Dr. John Jackson said in the paper I heard him give to the annual meeting of the T.P.I.C. this summer (the italics are mine):

"The breadth of approach necessary for training in planning make it preferable to have a range of staff with a variety of different backgrounds and experiences. The staff should complement each other rather than re-iterate in each other the same aptitudes. It follows that there are substantial arguments for a small number of largish schools adequately staffed by planners from various disciplines, rather than for many small schools with one or two staff members and their inevitable prejudices and limitations. In my view, if we assume one hundred and fifty planning students in Canadian schools, three schools with fifty trainees and six staff would be preferable to ten schools with fifteen trainees and two staff. This policy of quality before quantity would probably be at variance with provincial pride..."

Dr. Jackson is not, I think, suggesting that any of the present schools should disappear; "let us not destroy what we have". But is there any way in which Canada could get at least one "really good" school—one where there could be specialization and research with a really top-notch staff and a top-notch student body, one that could rank with any school in the United States? Do we just
wait and hope that one of the existing schools will surmount its problems and become “really good”? Or do we do something?

Here let me dream aloud a dream that two people put into my head when I was in the United States—a dream derided by one planning teacher as “an absurdity”, by another as “amateurish and obviously unsuited to Canadian ideas and conditions” but given at least qualified approval by another. I think it is a sensible dream and entirely in accord with what has been going on in the field of planning education in Canada since the beginning. Why doesn’t CMHC start spending money—real money and not the trifling amount of $30,000 a year (about the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada) that it now spends.

CMHC to spend money—on what? On one of the existing schools? That would be too invidious. One possibility would be to spend it on creating out of the McGill school, the oldest and most truly “university” school, and the Institut d’Urbanisme, the youngest and most evenly balanced between “university” and ‘profession’ school, a new and “really good” school. This would mold the French, the English, the American, the French-Canadian and the English-Canadian streams of planning thought. The new school would be able to draw on the intellectual resources of two great universities. It would be in a province where a planning “explosion” is about to throw up new problems, right on the doorstep of the school. Many difficulties can be suggested—language among them—but they are not, I think, real difficulties. The real difficulty—but could not this be overcome eventually by goodwill on both sides—lies in the strong personal likes and dislikes that I found when I was in Montreal. This is the version of my dream that I like best.

Another version of my dream is that CMHC should spend money on an experiment—on an undergraduate school of planning. Why undergraduate? A large number of people—and nearly all of them were not themselves products of Durham or Manchester—told me, quite uninvited, that an undergraduate course is what is really needed. This “uninvited” subject produced the only two briefs I got and took up more discussion time than any other—more even than details of curriculum, which the questionnaires had invited. The pros said _inter alia:_ you need at least four years to cover the planning subjects and get the planning “feel”; getting a prior discipline, such as architecture or sociology, is both a waste of precious time (for you won’t use it that much) and a handicap (for you will retain the bias it gives you and not emerge the truly composite man you ought to be); Durham and Manchester have shown it can be done. The cons said _inter alia:_ “planning requires a mature mind and eighteen-year-olds just haven’t got it”; “what I want is a man who can be of immediate use to me, e.g. an architect-planner or sociologist-planner, and not a jack-of-all-trades who can design _almost_ as well as an architect or make a survey _almost_ as well as a sociologist”; “having another profession which he really knows gives a man what he needs above all in planning, confidence”. To these contradictory intangibles the “practical men” added their equally contradictory asseverations: “no parent in his senses would let his teen-age boy commit himself to a four-year course that gives him only a planning qualification at the end of it when he can in six years get both an engineering and a planning qualification”; “all professional courses are far too long and this four-year course would
get him out of school and into life before he became a grandfather”. As far as I can see (as I said in Section 2 of Chapter II) these post-graduate courses are historically just a hangover from a situation that has now disappeared. And I am attracted by what to me, as an outsider, seems pretty obvious: (a) you need at least four years to cover the planning subjects and get the planning “feel”; and (b) a boy ought to be out of school and earning by the time he is 22. Why not try the undergraduate course as an experiment?

Where would CMHC make its experiment? In Alberta which has in its regional planning system the most up-to-date kind of planning in the country? In Saskatchewan or Nova Scotia where a rarely studied but vitally important contemporary planning problem, that of the declining community, could be studied? Unfortunately these provinces are too far from the centres of population. Ontario would probably have to be “it”. At what university in Ontario? At a new university (where the academic snobberies and rigidities haven’t had time to develop) which is in or near a large city, has a strong geography or public administration department and has, spontaneously and without outside urging, begun to sprout planning courses. Does such a university exist?

Where would the teachers come from? Would any students come to the new school? I do not know, I am only passing on my dream and suggesting an experiment, paid for by CMHC, which might produce one “really good” school in Canada.

3. “INCIPIENT SCHOOLS”; “TAME PLANNERS”; “A GEOGRAPHY COURSE WITH A PLANNING OPTION”; “URBAN STUDIES”

Having now completed my review of the five professional schools of planning in Canada, I turn briefly to “incipient schools” and “tame planners”. An “incipient school” is one that is on its way to becoming a professional school but hasn’t yet got there. A “tame planner” is a planner who is “kept” by a university without a planning school for the purpose of giving instruction to students in some discipline related to planning, e.g. surveyors or geographers. Two interesting new developments—an undergraduate course in geography with a planning option and a projected undergraduate course on “Urban Studies” are dealt with under “tame planners” because the information reached me too late to give them a heading of their own. The Report on Planning Education by C.P.A.C. gives a factual account of these phenomena as of 1961. I do not know much about either of them and I shall only speak of what I personally found out about them this summer.

(a) “Incipient Schools”. Because I had heard that Waterloo University and the University of Western Ontario had incipient schools I made inquiries at both and obtained from Waterloo the information I wanted. As it reached me after I had written the first draft of this part of my report, my brief comment thereon will be found under the heading of “tame planners”. I had also heard that there was one at the University of Alberta and I inquired about it when I was in Edmonton; a reliable outside source told me that the University was not going ahead with it for the moment. I spoke to many people about incipient schools generally and nearly all of them—except those who lived in the localities concerned—hoped they would not come to fruition. “There are too many schools already; let’s get the ones we have going well before we start others”. “There is
no objection to any number of schools, provided always that each one is really
good—but being really good takes money and have they got it?” These are
typical of the opinions expressed.

The one area that seemed to several people to show a real need for a new
planning school was the Maritimes. One reason is that planners from Central
Canada and points west do not want to go there—in part because the salary
range is lower—and vacancies are hard to fill; in any event the Maritimer
really wants a local boy. Another reason is that the presence of a planning
school there would provide a much-needed stimulus to public interest in good
planning; untrained local boys are, I was told, being taken on in the Halifax
area (“this planning is just common sense”), with unfortunate results. As will
be seen from the C.P.A.C. Report, three planning courses were in 1961 (and
still are) being given to engineers in the Civil Engineering Department of the
Nova Scotia Technical College and in June 1962 a committee of interested
people from Nova Scotia Tech, Dalhousie University and the C.P.A.C. recom­
mended, for the reasons sketched out above, the establishment of a planning
school in Halifax. The school was envisaged as a co-operative venture by Tech,
with its departments of architecture and engineering, and Dalhousie with its
social science departments. In August 1962 the Committee changed its mind
and concluded as follows: although facilities exist to provide training in physi­
cal planning subjects at N.S.T.C. and planning law at Dalhousie, there are not
at present adequate facilities for training planning students in the social
sciences; and it is not possible to justify the establishment of a planning school
on economic grounds as the cost of operating such a school could exceed
$5,000 per student per year, at least in the initial period until student numbers
increased. The impression I received on my visit to Halifax is that there is now
no incipient school there.

(b) “Tame Planners”. I can add very little to what the C.P.A.C. Report says about
the universities which offer courses related to planning but not leading to a
professional qualification. I talked with a “tame planner” at Laval University
who gives to the land surveyor students there one of the two planning courses
—Planning Principles and Planning Techniques—that are intended to broaden
their background so that they can collaborate with other specialists in planning.
These courses—which are similar in intent to those given, say, to engineering
students at Nova Scotia Tech or to architecture students at the University of
Toronto—are all that has, as yet, come out of the proposal by this University
to establish a planning school that Professor Parker reported in 1949.

I also talked with another “tame planner”, a practising consultant, who gives
two evening classes in planning under the auspices of the “planning option”
part of the undergraduate Honours Geography and Planning programme at
the University of Waterloo; they are “Urban and Regional Planning; Landscape
Design and Analysis” and “Urban and Regional Planning; Political and Admin­
istrative Processes”. They are given in the evening so that both intramural
students and planners working in the surrounding municipalities can take them.
The four-year liberal arts course for undergraduates is concerned with sub­
jects that lie at the root of, and are the basic requirement for, a career in
either urban, regional or resource planning. Insofar as it shows signs of budding
off a new planning school at the graduate level, I ask, echoing and amplifying the opinions adverse to incipient schools that I recorded above: has Waterloo got the money; has it got the necessary supporting disciplines; is it in an area that puts important urban and regional problems right at its door; is it in a position to create a "really good" planning school? But regarded as a pre-planning course for overall regional planners who need to understand both the city and rural region and its resources or as one designed to interest any citizen, whatever he may be going to do with his life, in these problems, the course is a welcome new development. Quoting from a letter from Dr. Krueger that I received on August 21: "In order to master the broader field of both urban and regional planning, I believe that we must start at the undergraduate level . . . Since Geography itself is a study of man and his environment in regional settings and since it includes a study of cities, economic activities, soils, geomorphology, climatology, etc., it is probably one of the best foundations from which to start a planning education."

Another similar programme with a different emphasis—this time on urban studies—is, I believe, under consideration at York University. "Urban studies" are arousing great interest in the United States just now and some professional schools of planning there are co-operating with the "contemplative" departments of their own and other universities in pursuing them. This too is a welcome development. I heard some people complain this summer that planning has no "discipline"—by which they meant that planners have no body of knowledge of their own but only borrow and apply bits of other people's knowledge. And I was surprised to find how little meat there is in courses called "planning principles". If the job of the planner is to guide and control the forces that shape the physical future of the city, then he has to understand what those forces are and how they affect one another. This understanding is likely to come—as the doctor's understanding of the body has come from the "contemplative" scientists like biochemists, physiologists and the like—from studies of the city pursued by supporting "contemplative" social scientists such as economists, sociologists and geographers.

CHAPTER IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROBLEMS

In this chapter I shall set out and discuss some of the problems of planning education in Canada that were raised by those who talked with me or wrote to me. Please remember, once more, that it is an "outsider" who is discussing and that it is only some of the problems raised that he will be discussing. I asked before I began what the issues were but because I was supposed to be an "independent observer" no one wanted to tell me and I had to do the best I could to sort them out myself. The problems that I think I detect are almost inevitably bits and pieces but I shall for convenience organize them under three heads. The first, a longish one, will be "School Problems" and it will be divided into the following sub-heads: students, with a side excursion into the CMHC scholarships; teachers; approach; curriculum. The second, a short one, will deal very briefly and very generally with
the problem of entry to the profession otherwise than by going to planning school, “The Problem of External Study”. The third, also a short one, will deal, again very briefly and very generally, with the problem of equipping the planning school graduate with enough of the down-to-earth day-to-day skills of the practising planner to qualify him as a member of the profession, “The Practical Experience Problem”.

1. SCHOOL PROBLEMS
(a) Students; herein of the CMHC Scholarships. What kind of people want to become planners? Planners' views on this question, none of them solicited by me, were both interesting and conflicting. “Dedicated men”, “men who like looking at all sides of a complex problem”, “men who are interested in the city and its problems”, was one side of the picture. “People who see power and go out to grasp it”, “odd balls”, “refugees from other disciplines”, was the other side. What kind of person does the profession want? Planners' views, again unsolicited, ranged from “poets” or “men with inventiveness and imagination” to “hard-headed practical men, but we’re not getting them from the universities”. I asked a number of people why they decided to become planners. “I was interested in a girl at the university (who is now my wife) and wanted to stay on there another year, so I got myself a CMHC scholarship”; “my dad was an assessor for the municipality and used to talk about planning at the dinner table”; “I came to Canada from Europe and I was appalled at the mess I saw around me”; were some of the answers. It's all very accidental apparently. How bright, intellectually, are planning students compared with say, law students or medical students? I put this last question, not a very sensible one, to all of the planning teachers; most of them said, very sensibly, that they had no means of knowing. Why, in the light of the present real need for planners and the vacancies that exist, don’t more people go into the profession—and how does one get them to go in?

I don’t think the question of quantity as important as I did when I began this study. As I said earlier, I do not know and have no means of knowing exactly how wide the gap is between supply and demand. But I do know that whereas the annual total enrolment in the schools between 1955 and 1960 was around twenty-five, it has risen sharply in the last three years and is expected to be around eighty for 1963–64. I think that we can now afford to concentrate on quality. This brings me to the CMHC scholarships.

(i) CMHC Scholarships. The CMHC scholarships, officially known as “Planning Fellowships” but usually called “scholarships”, are awarded annually to students at any of the five schools. There are at present 15 of them and each is of the value of $1,500. They have been offered since 1947 and of the 196 offered during this period 169 have been awarded. The candidate must be recommended by the head of the school of his choice and the awards are made by a committee which usually consists of a CMHC representative, a university dean and a fairly senior member of the profession. The basis of the award is merit, academic excellence, but as usually happens in such cases considerations such as “is he
likely to make a good planner” and “does he need the money” sometimes enter in too. In the case of students in two-year courses, the scholarship may be renewed if the holder has done well in the first year.

The question put to me, a rather vague one, is whether these scholarships are “bearing optimum results”. The original purpose of these scholarships—which have from time to time changed in number and value—was to prime the pump and attract students, good students, into the new and struggling planning schools. From 1951 to date they were accompanied by a small supplementary grant to each school which, as I said in the early part of this report, has been progressively reduced and is now almost at vanishing point. From 1951 to 1960 about 40 per cent of all students attending the schools held these scholarships and during this period the scholarships and the grant together were to all the schools, except perhaps Toronto, “the difference between life and death”, as one planning teacher put it. Now that students are coming to the schools and the schools are getting on their feet, does the pump need priming any longer? I ask this question of myself. I did not ask it of any planning teacher; from what they all said to me about the scholarships (and the supplementary grant) they would, I know, be horrified even to be asked it. All thought the scholarships “essential” and several of them commented on how they were with the supplementary grants able to do such important things as helping needy students and paying student expenses for travel in connection with planning projects in surrounding areas. Until such time as either of my dreams in Chapter III is realized, both the scholarships and the supplementary grants will continue to fill a real need. Planning still needs good students and the planning schools an “emergency” fund.

Most of the comments by the planning teachers on the scholarships dealt with rather minor matters, e.g. upping the value a little to take care of the continued devaluation of the dollar, having the committee of award meet in, say, August to allow students registering later than the beginning of June to compete and stabilizing the membership of the committee of award in order to allow it to gain experience. There was general agreement that academic merit should remain the basis of the award, but one man felt that the real test should be “is he likely to make a good planner”. Everyone was against increasing the number of scholarships; the award should, they said, remain an honour, something to be “won”. One or two suggested that, in addition to the scholarships, there be grants on the basis of need, e.g. to married students. There were one or two suggestions that were not, I think, meant to be taken seriously and I refrain from reproducing them. All agreed that scholarship holders did as well as, or better, or substantially better, than the other students.

(ii) Previous discipline. Since I have from time to time mentioned the subject of previous discipline, I here record a few things in connection with it. A number of employers said that there was a real shortage of architect-planners; due, it is said, to boom times for architects very few are
coming into the schools. Although traditionally the profession has come mainly from the design disciplines of architecture, engineering and surveying, most of the students (except at McGill and Manitoba) are now coming from the social sciences. Several answers to questionnaires expressed concern at some of the disciplines now allowed into some of the schools. In this connection I might mention here that at two of the schools last year "the best men" were a lawyer and a classics man! Others complained that the making-over process wasn't working very well: design men were weak in social science and social science men were weak in design. Both these complaints are beyond the competence of this independent observer—except that once again he asks "Aren't we asking our light machine to do a job too heavy for it?"

(b) Teachers. This short note is intended to explain "the facts of life" to those members of the profession who took pot shots at some of the teachers. How do you get and keep full-time teachers at a Canadian planning school? U.B.C., Toronto and the Institut d'Urbanisme have all run into difficulties here. At a small school with an established head, there is no "career", advancement is slow and opportunities are better outside; there is not much inducement for anyone to come in or, having come in, to stay in. Why is it easy to give valid criticisms of any head of a planning school? Because he is put in the impossible position of having to play too many inconsistent roles. He must be a "solid fellow", a good administrator, and a "brilliant personality"; he must move around in the outside world and stay in the cloister with his students; he must be a scholar with an adventurous mind and a down-to-earth practitioner who is at home in the day-to-day work of a planning office. Put in a jam like this he cannot win. Why don't more planning school teachers attend the annual meeting of the T.P.I.C.? Is it not, perhaps, because both sides are vaguely suspicious of one another, the man in practice suspecting the "theorist" and the university man suspecting "the hard-boiled practitioner"? Gentlemen of the planning profession, these problems are not peculiar to planning school teachers. They affect all teachers in all professional schools, and there is no complete solution for any of them.

(c) Approach. What kind of a course should a planning course be? "Roast beef and potatoes" with an emphasis on "this is how we carry out the operations most likely to be encountered in practice"—which is what I suspect the English courses of being? Or "fundamental", with an emphasis on "thinking about the problems of the city and learning how to do something about them"—which is, I gather, now the approach of the best American schools? I have referred several times already to this question, the conflict between the "university idea" and the "professional idea". All I want to do here is to tell those members of the profession who answered the questionnaire that they are about evenly divided among themselves on it, the "imported planner" assuming (without discussing) that "roast beef and potatoes" is what is required and the Canadian-trained or American-trained planner assuming (but usually discussing) that the "fundamental approach" is right.

I here set side by side for purposes of contrast some of the comments that I
received. "I feel that there is no place in practice for the long-haired planner. He merely discredits us"; "I regard myself as the conscience of the community where I live." "I consider that greater time should be spent in solving practical problems in the field, but less time spent in study of general planning theory, as for example, within books such as Mumford's 'Culture of Cities'"; "Planners seem to be in danger of becoming mere functionaries (instead of visionaries), drafting minor revisions to zoning by-laws when they should be questioning the very concept of zoning." One comment, which took a look at both sides, is worth quoting in full: "The . . . graduates indicate to us their virtual amazement at many of the practical situations in which they find themselves within the first two weeks, . . . They seem to be unanimous that the . . . course should have involved something like compulsory attendance at several planning board meetings in the various municipalities during the year and that some sort of look at a private planning operation would have helped them. This writer is not so sure and personally tends to feel that the university courses can well afford to concentrate on the theoretical aspect. Our experience has been that our graduates very quickly adjust to the practical situation without any difficulties. Having in mind that they face another thirty or forty years of nothing but practicalities the writer for one feels that it is important that at least during their university year or years the emphasis be on the theoretical."

Curriculum. I have already said all that I want to say on curriculum. That is: (1) I am not competent to discuss details of curriculum and I am not going to do it; (2) the profession and the schools should together agree upon a common core curriculum that covers the agreed irreducible minimum of the bodies of knowledge and collection of skills that every planning student ought to cover in school, that irreducible minimum being conceived of as being quite small and as leaving to each school a wide area in which it can do as it pleases; and (3) the curriculum, core and otherwise, will naturally continue to follow the well-established Canadian tradition of being more "university-minded" than "profession-minded".

All I shall do here is record some of the opinions expressed in the replies to questionnaires. Four people took the trouble to draft a more or less complete curriculum for me. Nearly everybody wanted something added to the curriculum; the questionnaire in effect invited them to do it. Defying as pretentious, and probably fraudulent, nonsense some of the United States writing on planning education that I subjected myself to this summer, my feeling is: do not add to your curriculum unless you have to; do only what you are capable of doing properly and your students are capable of absorbing.

Favorites in the race for "the new curriculum cup" were new technique courses, courses in land economics and courses in civic design, sometimes in the sense of design for social need and sometimes in the sense of design for visual beauty. The two senses are not, to me, the same—although one man I know has not given up trying to persuade me that they are. The demand for courses in civic design in the sense of design for visual beauty appeals of course to this layman's heart; until a year ago he thought, quite mistakenly, that that was what town planning was about. Toronto and U.B.C. are, as I understand it, deliberately understresssing civic design on the ground that the
social science subjects are more important: “the city is dying and one does not put cosmetics on the face of a dying man”. A course in civic design must however be of practical importance, for many of the practical men are asking for it.

On the subject of curriculum emphasis there was a wide variety of opinion. Some people wanted more emphasis on the implementation stage: “The curriculum should centre upon the concepts and principles of public administration and actual real life situations should be staged by practitioners in which the values at all levels are seen to be dramatically and confusedly in conflict.” Some people wanted more emphasis on the stage of survey and analysis (but not “bull-work”!) and still others on learning how to work with others and to co-ordinate conflicting policies. Differences of this kind probably reflect the particular frustrations of the stage on which my informant happened to be working at the time he gave his reply.

2. THE PROBLEM OF EXTERNAL STUDY

As I understand it, the Council of the T.P.I.C. regards full-time attendance at a university planning school as the normal method of entry to the profession. However provision is made for entry by those who are doing planning work in planning offices and have no university degree of any kind or have a university degree but only in a subject related to planning. In addition to serving periods of internship which are longer than that required of planning school graduates, these people must pass a qualifying examination in certain prescribed subjects. The qualifying examination has recently been tightened up and two members of the Council are at present working on a definitive syllabus for it.

English-trained planners are accustomed to the system of qualifying by on-the-job training, supplemented by part-time attendance at a university planning school or by articled pupillage without attending such a school at all. So one or two of those who replied to questionnaires thought that “an emphasis should be placed on external study in conjunction with apprenticeship ... both university courses and apprenticeship study should be equally available”. This approach is, of course, right out of line with the well-established North American tradition to which I have so often referred. Most of those who touched on this matter, however, recognized the tradition and were concerned with the special problem of the man who requires to earn his living while studying, e.g. the man of forty with family responsibilities. One method of solving this problem, a real one, was the suggestion for introducing evening courses at the university planning schools; “the combination of academic and practical work can be a decided advantage”. There are no such courses at present in Canada and I do not think that any school has sufficient staff to start one—or could justify starting one for what is, after all, a very special problem. So we are left with the method of supervised reading under an assigned “tutor” which the Council has devised for those desiring to take its qualifying examination.

I assume, and hope, that the Council will continue to regard as wholly exceptional any departure from the planning school route of entering the profession. If the forty-year-old is a good man, could not the department for which he works give him the necessary time off to go to a school? In any event, looking at two other professions, the doctors and the lawyers, you can only become a doctor by going to medical school and although the external study method is in theory still open to
lawyers in some provinces, it is very rarely used. What a professional man has to
know is how to apply what he's learnt and you don't get that by boning up infor-
mation in books and then disgorging it at an examiner.

3. THE PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE PROBLEM

There are two aspects to this problem. The first is merely one aspect of the
"common core curriculum"—what topics are so "strictly practical" that giving
instruction in them is the responsibility of the profession and not of the schools and
what topics are, although “practical”, sufficiently “fundamental” or “theoretical” to
be the responsibility of the schools? To give one illustration that came to my notice,
is the head of a school, who is asked by a student why he hasn’t been given a sub-
division to do, justified in replying “this isn’t a trade school”? I am not competent,
as I said earlier in connection with curriculum, to answer this kind of question; it
has to be settled by agreement among the parties. All I want to do here is to sug-
gest to some of the members of the profession who complained about the planning
school graduate's ignorance of “practical topics” is that “strictly practical” topics
are not the responsibility of the schools but the responsibility of the profession. The
profession has to shoulder its own responsibility and cannot throw it back on the
schools. The responsibility for all professional education, including planning educa-
tion, is a divided one. Is the T.P.I.C. shouldering its part of this responsibility?

The second aspect of the problem is one that is also common to all professional
education—how does a student get practical office experience? My impression is
that many, perhaps most, of the students in the five schools have already worked in
a planning office before coming to the school and that in the two-year schools they
almost all work in one during the summer between the two school years. The
T.P.I.C. however requires that after graduation and before he is admitted to the
profession he must serve an internship, i.e. be “engaged in responsible planning
work for one year”. Many problems about this internship period came to my atten-
tion during the summer—what is “responsible planning work”, what degree of
supervision should the T.P.I.C. exercise over the internship, should there be an
examination at the end of it are typical ones—but I shall not discuss them. They
are only on the periphery of my job and, as one man said to me, “the situation is an
evolving one, it is well in hand and all we can do is to feel our way along”. I must,
however, mention one difference of opinion that interested me—interested me
because the internship system is not altogether easy to apply to public employment,
which planning usually is. Could the intern, I asked, be switched for his own educa-
tion around the various jobs to be found in a large public office? Some answered
no: “he is hired to do a job and I cannot justify using public money on his educa-
tion”. Some answered yes: “educating him is an investment and my council are
glad to do it”.

CHAPTER V—HIGHLIGHTS; PROBLEMS NOT CONSIDERED

1. HIGHLIGHTS

This is not a summary of the report—which is already too long and repetitious.
It is merely an attempt to focus on some of the highlights.

1. In considering the university planning schools in Canada I have tried to be
realistic and I know that CMHC and the T.P.I.C. will be realistic too. I have also noted in several connections the dual loyalty that these schools, being both university schools and professional schools, owe. I assume that the universities, the schools, and the profession will continue to respect both the “university idea” and the “professional idea”. Chapter I, 3(b) and (d) and passim.

2. Ideas about planning education seem to be rather confused and uncertain. One reason for this may be that the short post-graduate courses which are usual in the United Kingdom and in the United States (and the only kind we have in Canada) are “historical hang-overs” and are not really capable of doing the heavy work we ask of them today; “let us not, however, destroy what we have”. Another reason may be that the concept of the “general practitioner” as the “standard planner” for professional purposes, and so the desired end-product of the schools, is not accepted by everybody; following the majority, and what seems to me the sensible position I have accepted it. Chapter I, 2 and Chapter II, 2.

3. In the fourteen years that have elapsed since Professor Parker wrote his report on Planning Education in Canada, planning has become more or less accepted, the planning profession has become established and there are now five schools instead of only one. Chapter II, 1. For a long time these schools had very few students, but the tide seems to have turned and in 1963-64 total enrolment is expected to be between seventy and eighty. Each of the five schools has its own peculiar history, aims, characteristics and problems. Chapter II, 1(c) and Chapter III, 1.

4. The schools differ from one another in the important characteristics of length of the course (Manitoba, Toronto and McGill giving a one-year course and U.B.C. and the University of Montreal giving a two-year course), admission requirements (Manitoba being restricted to architects and engineers and the others admitting graduates in any discipline related to planning), aims (U.B.C., Toronto and the University of Montreal aiming at producing the general practitioner, Manitoba a site-planner and McGill a man who has been intensified in his original discipline but with a “planning tinge”) and curriculum. Each school is now filling a real but different need. But if, in order to protect the public, the T.P.I.C. requires a candidate for admission to be a general practitioner—a sensible position—and a properly equipped general practitioner, won’t all the schools eventually have to adopt a common minimum standard? This would mean: a two-year course; admission of graduates in any discipline related to planning; and a “common core curriculum” —this “common core curriculum” to be one dealing with an irreducible minimum leaving a wide area in which each school is free to pursue its own special interests and to be hammered out by agreement between the parties. Chapter III, 2(a).

5. No school is as yet a “really good” school—“really good” by the standards of the best United Kingdom and United States schools. Here I have dreamed a dream. Why doesn’t CMHC—which assisted at the birth of four of the present schools and fosters them all by means of the scholarships and the small supplementary grants—spend real money in creating one “really good” school? There are two versions of my dream; one would combine the peculiar strengths of the University of Montreal school and the peculiar strengths of the McGill school; the other would create an undergraduate school, which many members of the profession think we ought to have. Chapter III, 2(b).
6. There seems at present to be only one “incipient school”, i.e. one that is on its way to becoming a school but hasn't got there yet. Do we want yet another school—unless, of course, it is the one envisaged in the second version of my dream? The arts courses in “urban studies” or “urban and regional studies” that seem to be growing up in some universities are, however, welcome and needed. Chapter III, 3.

7. Although there is no longer the need to prime the pump that there was, the CMHC scholarships and small supplementary grants are still “essential”—to use the word used by most of the heads of the schools. The changes they suggested in the present system were only minor ones. Chapter IV, 1(a).

8. The views expressed by heads of schools and by members of the profession on the planning schools and on planning education suggest the following. As to the students: many different kinds of people enter the profession and for many different motives; more are coming from the social sciences than from the design disciplines; the “making over” process does not seem to be working very satisfactorily. To those who criticised the teachers I pointed out some of the difficulties. Opinion as to whether the approach of the schools should be “practical” or “theoretical” was about equally divided. There were many requests (all of them, no doubt, familiar to planning teachers) for additions to the curriculum; my comment here was “be realistic”. Several people raised the problem of entry to the profession otherwise than by fulltime attendance at planning school and many complained of the graduates’ ignorance of “practical matters”; my comments thereon will be found in the text. Chapter IV.

9. A Canadian who wishes to specialize in urban design has to go to England or the United States to do so. Could not one of our schools of architecture fill this gap? I forgot to mention this matter in the text.

2. SKETCH LIST OF PROBLEMS NOT DEALT WITH

What happened to the information on planners that I must have collected in my travels and from the replies to the questionnaires: what different kinds of planners are there, what do they do, what are they paid, what vacancies are there for what kinds, and so on? I did not get the number of replies or the help in analysing them that I had expected. So the information—fragmentary, incomplete and unanalysed—is in my files. Why is there no description in the report of (a) the present state of planning education in the United Kingdom or (b) in the United States? Because I should, starting from scratch, have had to have made studies there too and that was obviously impossible. I discovered early on by word of mouth that there have been significant developments in both places since the Schuster Report of 1950 and F. J. Adams' report of 1954 on Urban Planning Education in the United States (both of which I had); but I found no factual writing on them. Some argumentative writing but no factual writing. I could not therefore rely on Schuster or Adams' descriptions as being correct today and I could not make my own new ones.

And now for a short and wholly incomplete list of problems that people pressed on me as “very important” but I have not even considered.

(a) Professional Problems. I am thinking of those professional problems that bear directly on planning education. Illustrations are: why am I reporting to the T.P.I.C. when the “admitting bodies”, e.g. the Society of Professional Town
Planners of the Province of Quebec, will necessarily be organized on a provin­cial basis; given the existence of such provincial bodies, to what extent and by what method should qualification in one province confer qualification in the other provinces; is the period of internship now required by the T.P.I.C. long enough and is it working satisfactorily?

(b) Problems of sub-professional and super-professional education. Illustrations are: Inducing some technological institute somewhere to start a course for “planning technicians” (some people thought that this was the most pressing problem in planning education); refresher courses for practising planners (how do you organize them and should they be “philosophical” or “technical”); “staff college” courses for planners who are nearing the upper echelons.

(c) Planning school problems. Illustrations are: content of curriculum (which some people expected me to do, which I wasted an inordinate amount of time on and which I eventually gave up as being right outside the competence of anyone except a practising planner or planning teacher); whether or not a planning school should be connected with a school of architecture (in two of the schools relations with the School of Architecture seemed to be uneasy and in two of them simply fine, so I came to the conclusion that there was no question of principle involved); methods of bringing all supporting disciplines together on a planning problem and of bridging the gap between the school and the outside world (these important questions, which were the subject matter of Dr. John Jackson’s paper at Banff, are technical problems of teaching administration and are beyond my province).

3. THE INDEPENDENT OBSERVER HANDS OVER

This independent observer’s job is now done and he hands over his comments and suggestions to those who know—to CMHC, to the T.P.I.C. and to the five planning schools. He brought to the job what J. K. Galbraith the other day called “that most dubious of all virtues, an open mind”. Those who know too much and understand too much to have open minds may be able to use my report as a starting point. “What he says on page so and so is sheer nonsense”. That’s O.K. by me; you will, I know, not just leave it at that; you will sit down, pen in hand, and say what he ought to have said on page so and so. “Truth”, as Lord Bacon said, “cometh out of error.” If anything that I have said contributes even in that back-handed way to the advancement of planning education, the planning profession and planning in Canada, my job will have been well done.
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