In the ensuing chapters, McLaren provides the context necessary to understand that Douglas did not work in isolation, but merely reflected common beliefs of his time.

Basing his analysis on a wide variety of sources, including archival documents, contemporaneous books, articles from journals, and newspaper items, as well as secondary works, McLaren uses an examination of the careers of three key figures in the Canadian eugenics movement (Francis Galton, Helen MacMurchy, and Peter Bryce) to illustrate its development. A further case study of Madge Thurlow Macklin, eminent geneticist, gives an example of the support which eugenics continued to receive from Canadian geneticists in the 1930s and 1940s, even after the revelation of the Nazi Holocaust. Other chapters examine the eugenicists’ dual concerns of preventing reproduction of the “unfit” and the use of birth control by the “fit” members of society, the legislation in British Columbia and Alberta which allowed the sterilization of the mentally ill and retarded in institutions and, finally, the demise of eugenics after World War II.

Recently, a number of television documentaries have been produced on the subject of advances in genetic testing and engineering. Anyone who has listened to the debate over the moral, legal, ethical, scientific and social implications of these new developments in genetics cannot fail to notice the link between current times and history. Present rhetoric and vocabulary relating to genetics have been updated, but many of the underlying concepts seem to have remained unchanged from the heyday of the eugenics movement — at least, so the filmmakers argue. In any case, Our Own Master Race offers a good introduction to the history of eugenics in Canada for those who have no previous knowledge of the subject, particularly the general reader at whom this series is directed.

Catherine Bailey
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Of the many good things which the Canadian Centre for Information and Documentation on Archives has contributed to the archival community in recent years, this unfortunate, confusing volume will not be numbered among them. Listing more than 2,000 references to articles, essays and monographs from a wide range of sources under some 100 categories, with an author index, the volume has the laudable aim of diffusing information to archivists about their professional research base and thus of encouraging a fuller, more cumulative archival scholarship.

This aim is not realized. Readers do not know which periodicals and collections have been indexed. The very first requirement for such a bibliography is a list up-front of all source material used (except for monographs) so that the range of coverage is explicit and the results of the indexing therefore trustworthy. Take Cartography as an example (section 3.1.4.1). Under reference and research, there are articles, for the three years covered by this book, on mapping in China and Hawaii, early Australia and Arabia, New Zealand and Scotland, among others. These entries are drawn from the few journals to which the indexers had access. Yet there are several major annual map-related bibliographies published around the world (the Bibliographia Cartographia, for example,
has well over 3,000 entries each year). These list hundreds and hundreds, indeed thousands, of other, better sources. What criteria were used to isolate the very few chosen for this book? Why are these more extensive general bibliographies themselves not listed? Why are very slight articles (two-page notes in newsletters) indexed often three separate times, but major articles in *Archivaria*, for example, appear but once? Selection criteria are unexplained, indexing categories are nowhere defined, and article placement (judging from entries to my own work) is quirky.

To be more useful in future, this project should be done on microfiche or optical disc, be made cumulative each time it is issued and be forced to narrow and make explicit its intellectual and indexing scope. Hard-copy publication in the present format and in an era of restraint is not justified.

*Terry Cook*
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