

CMCC's persistent pursuit of university affiliation: Part 1

Douglas M Brown, DC*

Introduction

The Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College (CMCC) or its agents, have been seeking some form of university affiliation for at least 30 years, yet to date those efforts have been fruitless. It has been said that one's success is not measured by the position you have attained – but by the obstacles you have had to overcome to get there. CMCC has run into many stumbling blocks on the road to amalgamation. This triad of papers (Parts II and III to follow at a later date) will endeavour to describe

and document those barriers and the resourceful attempts that have been marshalled to surmount them.

Part I, 1945 to 1969, concentrates on the first recorded proposals, emanating from the Western Divisions of the Canadian Chiropractic Association (CCA). Part II, 1969 to 1988, will outline the scattergun method that was used to approach numerous institutions, primarily in Ontario. Part III, 1988 to 1991, will focus on an account of the push for union with the University of Victoria, in British Columbia (U Vic).

Part I: Western initiatives 1945 to 1969

Recollections of early graduates of CMCC indicate that university affiliation was a hot topic of conversation at the College almost from its inception in 1945. Unfortunately, the CMCC Board of Governor's minutes from the end of 1947 until January 1953 have been lost, so it is hard to know when the College began to seriously look at this subject. The first available references were recorded in 1960.

"He (Dr. Homewood) reported that Dr. R. Rutherford feels that the college should be affiliated with the University and have a faculty with some University standing degrees." [Minutes CMCC Board, June 11, 1960. President's Report] "Dr. Homewood recently made a trip to Ottawa and interviewed Dr. Mathews to find out if we could affiliate with the Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges. He was referred to Dr. Bissell of the University of Toronto. He (Dr. Homewood) has had a meeting with Dr. M. Moss, president of the newly formed York University. He (Dr. Ross) feels we would not be happy if affiliated with them. He (Dr. Ross) thought that maybe in five years they might be interested in having the chiropractors join them." [Minutes CMCC Board, August 24, 1960. Dean and President's Report]

University of Alberta, Calgary (UAC)

[Later University of Calgary]

In a letter to Roger K. Partlow, DC, President of the CCA, January 26, 1965, Alan J. Macfarlane, DC, states that the Chiropractic Faculty Committee (CFC) of the Alberta Chiropractic Association (ACA)

"... has been working on the advisability and feasibility of University status since the latter part of 1958." The first record of this activity is in 1961. "Dr. Thompson said that he had received a letter from Dr. McFarlane (sic) chairman of the University Faculty Committee in Alberta asking for plans of the new building and other information because of a brief to be presented by the Alberta chiropractors who are going to apply for affiliation with a new university to be set up in Calgary." [Minutes CMCC Board, August 19, 1961: 2]

On August 24, 1963, the CFC of the ACA made a formal proposal to the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta, in Edmonton (UA), to consider a plan for the establishment of a Faculty of Chiropractic within the University, on its Calgary campus. This called for "... the physical facilities, equipment and faculty, similar to, but not SEPARATE AND DISTINCT from, the Faculty of Medicine at Edmonton." It was, "To provide fully equipped, Chiropractic, Basic Science and Out-Patient Clinic facilities, capable of meeting the necessary requirements ... of 60 students per year of a four year course of study. This prospectus, under "ORGANIZATION OF FACULTY" stated, "... that ALL faculty nominations by the President ... shall be subject to approval by the Chiropractic

* President, CMCC Governors' Club, Guest Lecturer, CMCC, 2191 Victoria Park Avenue, Scarborough, Ontario M1R 1V5. Telephone: (416) 447-9001. Fax: (416) 445-4982.

© JCCA 1992.

Education Committee." [Proposal for Consideration of a Plan for the Establishment of a Faculty of Chiropractic in the University of Alberta, Calgary]

The driving force behind the UA initiative was Alan J Macfarlane, DC, Chairman, CFC, and his plan seems to have come as an unpleasant shock to the CCA and provoked a blizzard of correspondence between the ACA, CCA and CMCC. A widely distributed letter by Roger K Partlow, DC, President of the CCA, August 9, 1963, reads in part,

"At the presentation of the ACA Brief to the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta, Dr. LM Heard will attend and represent the CCA. He will be seeking more information from the Board and will vote against any commitments except to arrange a future conference at which negotiation may be continued with the Board by representatives of the ACA, CCA and CMCC."

This ACA brief was subsequently considered by the Board of Governors of UA on October 3, 1963, and rejected. [Letter from Dr. WH Johns, President, UA, to ACA, October 28, 1963] The ACA then sent a letter to all members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly and Cabinet, requesting support for this affiliation based on the premise that, "Equal opportunity for a University education should be extended to prospective Chiropractic students on the same basis as those now provided for prospective students of other recognized professions."

At the Annual Meeting of the National Board of the CCA, March 4, 1964, a motion was passed "... expressing disapproval of action already taken by them (Drs. Simpson and Macfarlane) in respect to the possibility of future affiliation with the University of Alberta ..." [Minutes CCA, March 4, 1964: 40] At the Annual General Meeting of CMCC, March 7, 1964, the President, Robert N. Thompson, DC, declared, "Accreditively (sic) - there is much talk of joining or affiliating with some university. The prospect for this possibility for Chiropractors is off as far as the Universities of Alberta and Manitoba are concerned." [Minutes CMCC Board, March 7, 1964: 2]

On May 8, 1964, Dr. Macfarlane wrote his "Observations on the Formulation of a National Policy to Accredite Canadian Chiropractic Education at the University Level," and mailed them to the President of the CCA. Here he stated that the minimum objective should be to establish two chiropractic institutions affiliated with universities; one in the West, the other in the East. His "ULTIMATE GOAL" was:

- "a. Public Image - recognition equivalent to those enjoyed by other professions associated with a University.
- b. Access to 'Public Funds' for Education and Research, i.e.: Federal and Provincial grants, National Research and Fund Drives - Heart, Cancer etc.
- c. Access to 'Philanthropic Funds' for Education and Research, i.e.: Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corporation, etc.
- d. Access to Public Institutions, i.e.: Hospitals and Laboratories etc."

Dr. Macfarlane was now willing to work in conjunction with the CCA and CMCC and his committee met with the President of CMCC, Robert N Thompson, DC, and the Chairman of the CMCC Board, William Trelford, DC, on January 28, 1965. When his request to attend the annual meetings of the CCA and CMCC from March 2-7, was refused, he protested and was invited to attend a joint meeting of the newly elected CCA-CMCC Boards on March 7, 1965.

On October 29, 1965, the CFC of the ACA submitted a revised proposal for a Faculty of Chiropractic at UAC. Because it was felt that the initial brief of August 21, 1963, had been rejected primarily on the basis of cost, the new version called for the establishment of a composite basic sciences health centre to be utilized jointly in the pre-clinical years by the faculties of medicine, dentistry and chiropractic. This submission also proved unacceptable.

Brandon College [Later Brandon University]

Although the Alberta Association was the first to make a formal presentation to a university, the Manitoba Chiropractor's Association (MCA) had begun to consider the possibility of a Faculty of Chiropractic within a university in 1955. In 1966 the MCA held several meetings with John E Robbins, PhD, President of Brandon College and also discussed the subject with the Premier of Manitoba, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health.

"... at the November annual meeting of CMCC it was tentatively agreed that about \$500,000 would be available through CMCC to support the Brandon development." [Minutes CCA Executive Officers' Meeting, Fort Gary Hotel, Winnipeg: 1]

The above method of financing was unrealistic because at that time CMCC was: a. worth at most \$900,000; b. about to have its award for damages from Metropolitan Toronto reduced from \$770,000 to \$143,000; c. indebted by a \$500,000 mortgage at 12%; and d. unable to sell its Bloor Street property because the City still held title to the land it had expropriated in 1959.¹

Earl Homewood, DC, who had resigned as administrative dean of CMCC in August 1961,² first discussed this proposal formally at a special meeting of CMCC and the CCA in October 1965. Following considerable study and correspondence, Dr. Homewood developed a preliminary outline of physical requirements for teaching and clinical facilities and a list of problems to be solved.

On May 12, 1966, Dr. Homewood travelled from the Los Angeles College of Chiropractic (LACC), in Glendale, California (where he was then Chairman of the Chiropractic Department), to Brandon, Manitoba, to confer with Dr. Robbins and representatives of the CCA and CMCC. Following this five day trip, Dr. Homewood reviewed his original impressions and prepared a final report for the CCA in which he strongly advised that CMCC be maintained in Toronto in conjunction with a faculty of chiropractic at Brandon. [Report to Robert M Ruther-

ford, DC, and George L. Ferguson, DC, May 22, 1966.] Dr. Homewood's greatest fear regarding any complete union, which he reiterated on several occasions, was that once CMCC's assets in Toronto had been liquidated, the chiropractic faculty in any other institution would be vulnerable to abandonment, thus crippling the growth and development of the Canadian profession. [Letter from Dr. Homewood to Dr. Rutherford regarding a proposed merger with UA. Letter from Dr. Homewood to Ian D. Coulter, PhD, concerning union with the University of Victoria, BC, August 24, 1988.]

On December 15, 1966, Dr. Homewood was named Educational Consultant to the CCA. His duties were to help Donald C. Sutherland, DC, then Executive Secretary of the CCA, to prepare briefs for the Ontario Committee on the Healing Arts (CHA), assist CMCC with fund raising and work on the Brandon project, when needed. [Letter from Dr. Sutherland to Dr. Rutherford, February 2, 1967] In this latter capacity, Dr. Homewood returned to Brandon College from February 23 to March 1, 1967, and held a number of meetings with Dr. Robbins and members of his staff to discuss the possibility of joining the faculties of Brandon College to those of a chiropractic college. This resulted in a proposal for a chiropractic building of 40,000 square feet to accommodate 300 students, a tentative timetable for an integrated curriculum for one pre-chiropractic and four chiropractic years of study, plus a scheduled visit by two Brandon faculty members to four chiropractic colleges.

From March 19 to 23, 1967, Dr. Homewood escorted Ross Moir, PhD, Dean of Science, and JA McLeod, PhD, Professor of Zoology, Brandon College, on a tour of CMCC in Toronto, Ontario, National College of Chiropractic (NCC) in Lombard, Illinois, and Palmer College of Chiropractic (PCC) in Davenport, Iowa. Dr. Homewood felt "... that Drs. Moir and McLeod were favourably impressed with chiropractic educational effort, sincerity and dedication," and were prepared to meet with the Brandon University Committee of the CCA in April of that year. [Report to Brandon University Committee of the CCA, March 24, 1967.]

By the end of 1967 communication had broken down between the major players in this drama, Dr. Homewood, the CCA, the MCA and CMCC, producing conflict and confusion. On November 25, 1966, Dr. Homewood accepted Dr. Rutherford's offer of the position of Dean of the proposed faculty at Brandon, effective January 1, 1967, and requested a salary of \$15,000 per year. [Letter from Dr. Homewood to Dr. Rutherford, November 25, 1966.] However the following correspondence from Louis L. Heard, DC, President of the CCA, is contradictory.

1. The position title should be known as 'Acting Dean'.
2. Salary of \$1,000 per month, plus any extra ordinary expenses
3. Salary should be paid by cheque from CCA for February to August
4. That all persons recommended for appointment to the Brandon faculty be first approved by the CCA Board
5. The position of 'Dean' to be finalized AFTER Brandon has become an University." [Memo from Dr. Heard to Dr. Rutherford, November 25, 1966.]

ford, November 25, 1966.]

Subsequently Dr. Homewood expressed his mounting frustration: "Now since December 15, 1966, I have: ... 3) Spent two weeks on the road to raise the mortgage money for CMCC at an out-of-pocket cost to me of \$456.92 ... In return for the effort, I have received \$700 from Howard Gauthier out of the Fees Account (of CMCC), so have \$243.08 net for six weeks work. That is worse than when I was the Dean of CMCC." [Letter from Dr. Homewood to Dr. Rutherford, November 5, 1966.] James A. Langford, DC, who was Chairman of the CCA Education Committee from 1958 to 1968 and Chairman of the Canadian Chiropractic Examining Board (CCEB) from 1968 to 1985, advises that all Dr. Homewood's salary and expenses for the Brandon project, were paid by the CCEB. [Letter from Dr. Langford to the author, August 14, 1990.]

On his trip across Canada, Dr. Homewood sold the profession \$250,000 in debentures bearing interest at 7% per annum, which were used to help pay off the \$500,000 mortgage at 12%. (Dr. Homewood was named President and Dean of CMCC in May 1967 and remained there until his dismissal in October 1969.)²

At the CCA National Board Meetings in November 1966 the Directors attempted to indicate their support of both Brandon and CMCC:

"The chiropractors of Manitoba are quite excited with the prospect of the Brandon College proposed affiliation ... Dr. Rutherford announced that someone should come out to Brandon in early 1967 to be ready to design classrooms, etc. ... Dr. Rutherford announced that he was now open for names - a DC degree only is required ... Two names have already been considered for the man to become pro-tem Dean. One is Dr. Veal, of the CMCC and the other Dr. Homewood, who has not actually applied as yet ... Apparently Dr. Homewood expressed himself at one time as being opposed to University affiliation, believing that the CMCC would disappear as a result ... MOVED by Dr. Ferguson, SECONDED by Dr. Corrigan that the Board authorizes the University Committee to proceed with the establishment of a faculty at the University of Brandon. Dr. Langford stressed the importance of keeping one college going now. He had heard a prediction that if, and when, university affiliation becomes a reality, the CMCC will be out of business in five years ... Dr. Rutherford expressed himself emphatically that he was not promoting the Brandon College to knock the CMCC out of business ... CARRIED. MOVED by Dr. DeLaurier, SECONDED by Dr. McDougall that this Board reiterates its support of the CMCC and assist its further efforts to obtain affiliation on a university level." [Minutes CCA National Board Meetings, November 7 to 12, 1966.]

By the end of 1967 university affiliation was at a standstill. There was nothing new to report from Brandon and a meeting with Ontario's Minister of University Affairs scheduled for November 8 was cancelled because the Minister had been summoned to see Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson. [Minutes CCA Annual Meeting of the National Board, November 13, 1967: 35.]

At the CCA Board Annual Meeting, November 12, 1968, Dr. Rutherford confirmed the diagnosis of severe illness in the Brandon Project: "Complete changes in the 'U' grants set-up, creation of two new universities, change of Premier, and now, a complete Cabinet change have held up any concrete works." [CCA Brandon University Report, 1968.] Shortly after this meeting Dr. Robbins resigned and the Brandon opportunity expired.

Notre Dame University

In mid 1968 Notre Dame University, Nelson, BC, approached Dr. Homewood regarding establishing a Faculty of Chiropractic. Notre Dame had recently become a public institution, offering bachelor degrees and preprofessional courses in a number of disciplines.

Dr. Homewood met with Father Aquinas Thomas, President and Father Potsma, Director of Research, on June 12, 1968. After this meeting it was proposed that Notre Dame teach a three year basic science course and award a BSc degree. This was to be followed by a two year program at a Toronto graduate school of chiropractic studies (CMCC) and a DC degree. Although Dr. Homewood thought this overture was "... encouraging," he found it "... quite impractical" and had "... grave misgivings" regarding Notre Dame's ability "... to teach all the basic sciences in depth." There is no record of further correspondence with Notre Dame. [CCA Education Committee Report, 1968.]

Observations

The prime movers in the search for affiliation during the 1960's were Dr. Macfarlane in Alberta and Dr. Rutherford in Manitoba, supported by their Provincial Associations. The Directors of the CCA were, for the most part, ambivalent about these initiatives, reacting to the activities of the Alberta and Manitoba Associations, rather than leading the way. That may have been because the CCA Directors also served, simultaneously, as Directors of CMCC. They were placed in the difficult position of serving two masters and were wary of any move that would prove detrimental to the College in Toronto. The precarious financial, physical and legal situation of CMCC at this time caused its preservation to be the paramount concern of the CCA. The CMCC itself, preoccupied with these overwhelming problems, other than offering occasional disapproval, was a passive observer of these proposed mergers. Dr. Homewood, in his capacity as consultant to the CCA, remained CMCC's most effective defender.

It is interesting that in all three Western Initiatives, approaches were made directly to or from the involved institutions. While there was communication with government bodies, there was no official government intervention or direction. During the 1960's a number of Canadian committees and commissions had investigated the chiropractic profession and made educational recommendations but there was no apparent government policy on if, when, or how to bring chiropractic education into the university system.

Government inquiries

The first recorded Canadian study on chiropractic, chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Hodgins, published its "Report of the Ontario Committee on Medical Education" (OCMER), in 1918. "Hodgins was extremely critical of the length of chiropractic training... He also ridiculed the educational facilities of the Canadian Chiropractic College (not CMCC)... he stated that chiropractic schools were 'merely private profit-making enterprises' and urged that these schools be stamped out in the name of protecting the public (OCMER), 1918:33"³ Fortunately, this report proved too controversial and was never implemented.

In 1964 and 1965 the Royal Commission on Health Services (RCHS), chaired by Chief Justice Emmett M Hall, released Volumes I and II of its Report.⁴ Mr. Justice Hall's remarks concerning the chiropractic profession hinged on the issue of legitimacy. He felt that the conflicting opinions of medicine and chiropractic "... ought to be faced and resolved in the public interest" and called for an independent scientific study to settle the issue. Commissioner Hall was aware that such an investigation was already being conducted in Québec by the Royal Commission on Chiropractic and Osteopathy, under the Honourable Mr. Justice Gérard Lacroix, of the Superior Court. Therefore, all Mr. Justice Hall's recommendations were predicated on the outcome of that review. "... if the study now being done by Mr. Justice Lacroix concludes that the position taken by the medical profession is the correct one, then all Canadians should be made aware of it. On the other hand, if the claims of chiropractors are found to be valid, they then should be incorporated into and integrated with the teaching of the health sciences in universities."⁵

Mr. Justice Lacroix's Report on Chiropractic, July 1965, lists the following opinions: "A. - Chiropractic: - is an accepted reality as a treatment by manipulation; B. - Should be used only after a sound, accurate and valid differential diagnosis; C. - At present, this diagnosis can only be made by a person who has received a far more complete training in this field than that presently given to chiropractors; D. - In other respects, manipulative treatment, once it has been correctly indicated, should only be used and applied by a person, not necessarily a doctor, who has been adequately and thoroughly trained for this purpose."⁶

Lacroix further comments under "Authority of Boards:

1. - An internship of at least one (1) year which would be compulsory after having received a diploma from an accredited chiropractic school accepted by the Board.
2. - This internship from the point of view of the basic sciences and also from that of clinical instruction, should be organized so as to provide the knowledge required in order to make a differential diagnosis and, under conditions where this could be accomplished, that is, at the bedside of the patient. This internship should be under the supervision not only of chiropractors but also of men of science who hold doctors' degrees in subjects which would form part of the

compulsory course of study during the period of residence training."⁷

Although this Royal Commission was in a position to judge the chiropractic profession based upon what it found in a then unlicensed jurisdiction (Québec), both CMCC and the CCA bowed to the request of the Québec Associations, not to submit briefs to Mr. Justice Lacroix. However, the Commissioner travelled to other Provinces and countries in his investigation and received a wealth of information from the CCA, CMCC and the National College of Chiropractic.

In 1966 the Ontario Government appointed the Committee on the Healing Arts (CHA) . . . "to enquire into and report upon all matters relating to the education and regulation relevant to the practice of the healing arts . . ."⁸ In 1967 CMCC, the Ontario Board of Directors of Chiropractic (BDC) and the Ontario Chiropractic Association (OCA) each submitted detailed briefs to the CHA in which they all agreed that chiropractic education should be publicly funded within the university system.

CMCC declared: "1) That the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College be provided with educational grants, both capital and operational, by the Government of Ontario . . . 3) That the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College be assisted in affiliating with, or becoming a faculty of, an Ontario university, and that it be given degree-granting authority."⁹

The OCA recommended that "a) the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College be granted the same financial assistance as provided to other institutions of higher learning in the Province. b) the Canadian Memorial Chiropractic College be affiliated with an Ontario university or become a faculty of chiropractic in an Ontario university, and in either case be authorized to confer degrees."¹⁰

The BDC statement was not as specific: "(k) that chiropractors be entitled to the use of tax-supported facilities . . ."¹¹

In 1970 the CHA handed down a two volume report. CMCC, the OCA and BDC joined forces to rebut, separately but under one cover, 15 of the 340 CHA Recommendations. CHA Recommendation 278 suggested bringing chiropractic education " . . . within the publicly supported and administered system of education for the health disciplines . . ." and proposed that it be located, " . . . in an appropriate College of Applied Arts and Technology or other similar post-secondary educational institution . . ."

CMCC argued that chiropractic is a prime contact profession and its members are required to make differential diagnoses, therefore, education should occur within the university system and advised:

"That CMCC be brought under the authority of the Department of University Affairs (DUA) . . . That operational and capital grants be made to CMCC . . . The DUA assist CMCC in entering into discussion with a suitable university to plan for a School of Chiropractic within an established Faculty of Science. When this School of Chiropractic has gained maturity and experience then consideration

should be given to having it form an independent faculty within the university complex."

The BDC's view was that Recommendation 278 " . . . would be a retrograde step and one neither in the public interest nor acceptable to the public. The Board of Directors of Chiropractic . . . has always considered chiropractic education to be at the professional university level and not at the technical tradesman level." [Comments on Recommendations of the Committee on the Healing Arts by the Chiropractic Profession in Ontario.]

By the end of the 1960s CMCC, now established in its new home on Bayview Avenue, with enrollment doubling and some degree of financial stability, was beginning to look seriously at various educational alliances. In addition, the weight of official inquiries attesting to the value of chiropractic, while pointing out the necessity for improved education, was affecting public opinion. Government could no longer afford to ignore or appear indifferent to the needs of this emerging profession. The 1970s would see a dramatic alteration in CMCC's thrust for university affiliation and in government response to that activity.

Acknowledgement

The author graciously recognizes the assistance of Ian D Coulter, PhD, and Oswald Hall, PhD, in the organization and editing of this paper. He also wishes to thank James A Langford, DC, for gratefully donating his extensive personal files and rich correspondence on the subject of University Affiliation, to the Archives of the CMCC Library.

References

- 1 Brown DM. CMCC's hazardous journey, 1945 to 1968. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1988; 32(3):147-148.
- 2 Brown DM. A. Earl Homewood, DC, chiropractic educator. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1989; 33(3):143.
- 3 Biggs CL. No bones about chiropractic? The quest for legitimacy by the Ontario Chiropractic Association 1895 to 1985. [Thesis], Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto, 1989:147.
- 4 Royal Commission on Health Services Vol. I. 1964, and Royal Commission on Health Services Vol. II. 1965.
- 5 Royal Commission on Health Services Vol. II. 1965:79.
- 6 Lacroix JG. Report on chiropractic. 1965:153.
- 7 Lacroix JG. Chiropractic. 1965:157.
- 8 Committee on the Healing Arts Vol. I. 1970:vi-viii.
- 9 CMCC Brief to CHA. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1967; 11(4):33.
- 10 OCA Brief to CHA. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1967; 11(4):10.
- 11 BDC Brief to CHA. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 1967; 11(4):22.