

this works well. However, as a specialist in the Algonquians of the western subarctic region, I would have preferred a separate section for these cultures rather than having them grouped with the "Eastern and Central Subarctic and Great Lakes Region" Algonquians.

Two other organizational problems also exist, and these are more serious. First, sources appear only once, and hence there is no cross-referencing. This results in more effort to uncover sources when, for instance, references to subarctic Indians might appear in sections on the fur trade, missionaries, health and disease, and the ethnographic section on the subarctic. Second, there is neither an author nor a subject index. The result of these omissions, then, is that the researcher is forced to browse through much of the bibliography, with over 2000 sources, looking for references of interest.

Overall, Krech's bibliography stands as a useful, though flawed, effort. Clearly, the publisher must bear much of the responsibility in this regard. Nonetheless, Krech's work is by far the single best source of information on a wide variety of topics on Canadian Native people. It would be especially useful for students, as Krech suggests, and should be seriously considered for adoption in Native studies courses.

James B. Waldram

J. Anthony Long and Menno Boldt, editors: **Governments in Conflict?: Provinces and Indian Nations in Canada.** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988. 296 pages.

Governments in Conflict? is the third of an impressive series of books edited by Long and Boldt dealing with Native peoples and public policy in Canada. It follows Pathways to Self-Determination (with Leroy Little Bear) and The Quest for Justice. Each of these texts brings together policy statements and analyses by Native leaders and non-Native politicians with scholarly

reflections and analyses produced by academics and consultants. While the essays in Pathways to Self-Determination tended towards the programmatic side and suffered from a lack of balanced analysis, The Quest for Justice provided a remarkable number of seminal statements not least of which was the article by Boldt and Long on "Tribal Traditions and European-Western Political Ideologies" in which they point to the dangers--as possible forces that would work towards assimilation--of forms of self-government that adopt Western political models.

The latest in this series, Governments in Conflict?, coming as it does after the failure of the First Minister's Conference to entrench a satisfactory definition of aboriginal rights for Canada's Native peoples in the Constitution, turns to the question of the role of provinces in the formulation of policy for, and delivery of, services to Indian First Nations. The editors note that in "recent years we have observed a significant shift in responsibility for Indians from federal to provincial governments," but "There has been no systematic attempt to examine the role of the provinces in the development of policies affecting Indians" (pp. 17, ix). Governments in Conflict? attempts to fill this gap with a selection of essays by lawyers, consultants, administrators, politicians and academics. The essays are arranged into sections that deal with the broad themes of "Federal Indian policy and the provinces," provincial approaches to the constitution, provincial policies and programs, provincial positions on land claims, "Jurisdictional Issues between Provinces and Indians" and a comparison with other federal systems. As in the case with their earlier books, Long and Boldt include a substantial section of documents as appendices, in this case including the opening statements by Prime Minister Mulroney and Assembly of First Nations' National Chief Georges Erasmus to the 1987 First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Constitutional Matters.

There is no denying the importance of the issues addressed in Governments in Conflict? or the significance of Long and Boldt's work. Once again, they have produced a thought provoking analysis of Indian policy in Canada. Although the book

rightly merits praise, there are three areas of difficulty I want to focus on here, in the interest of giving it the attention it deserves and reflecting on the issues it raises. The first two probably are inherent in the timing of the work. Governments in Conflict? resembles Pathways to Self-Determination in that it seems hurried, somewhat thrown together. Although the editors stress in their preface that "all of [the] papers were prepared especially for this volume" (p. ix), their need to explicitly foreground what would be a minimal expectation points to a weakness. Some of the articles take on a programmatic thrust as a result; that is, they are more concerned with justifying a policy or program than with serious reflection. For example, Keith Penner's article reads like a partisan political policy statement in an election year, as well as a defense of the ideas embodied in the now famous Report on Indian Self-Government that goes under his name. Such a defense might be useful if it were in response to the concerns raised by some provinces at recent constitutional conferences. Instead, Penner is content to repeat the story of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government he headed and to affirm his support for the idea "that the inherent power and authority of the Indian First Nations has always existed and was never at any time relinquished" (p. 36). Unfortunately, merely restating this will not make it a reality. A more careful and considered argument, on the other hand, would at least help.

A related issue is the theme of the collection itself. In the wake of the failure of the Constitutional process there is a good deal of confusion as to what political direction Native people should and will adopt. The issue of provincial jurisdiction, policy and programs is only one in a complex set of legal and political structures. By focussing on it as they have, Long and Boldt have to some extent constrained the analyses in the text. It is impossible not to wonder if the current situation would have been better served by examining other possibilities. The book might have asked what constitutional options remain open?; what can be learned from the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act?; will the issue once again become a focus of land claims negotiations?

and so on. On all of these issues the book is remarkably restrained. For example, Harold Cardinal's article concludes by noting that "the constitutional conferences through 1987 were only one of the forums in which a dialogue on aboriginal rights could take place" and by pointing to "legislative negotiations" and "claims negotiations" as possible alternative forums (pp. 88-89). Much more thought needs to go into the pitfalls and promises offered by these kinds of approaches to self-government. On the Sechelt agreement, one of the few concrete instances of a negotiated approach to self-government within the existing framework, all we find are a few approving references by Penner and in the article by Robert Exell on "British Columbia and the Native Community." Exell's piece on the whole reads largely as a justification for British Columbia's appalling record on aboriginal rights. The self imposed constraint was undoubtedly in the interest of providing a focus for contributors and ensuring the originality of the work, but it leaves the book silent on many of the areas of deepest concern.

In large part the essays in the book seem to have been molded around a decision made by Long and Boldt and expressed in their Introduction to the effect that in "the context of the federal government's shrinking legislative authority under the constitution, and its dismal and deteriorating economic position and prospects, Indians may be well advised to rethink their insistence on maintaining an exclusive relationship with the federal government" (p. 19). This might be taken as a seminal statement on Native politics in the age of Mulroney and Meech Lake. Such a rethinking implies a reconsideration of Section 91 (24) of the 1867 Constitution Act, which gave the federal government jurisdiction over "Indians and Indian lands." Long and Boldt are fully aware that Native people have been resisting attempts by the federal government to devolve its responsibility for Native peoples to the provinces in the last few decades. If we are to rethink the relationship of Native people to the provinces we must remind ourselves why Section 91 (24) exists in the first place. In an historical sense, this has something to do

with the British crown's lack of faith in its colonies not to act in their own immediate interests when it came to lands and resources, ignoring those of Native minorities. Hence the Royal Proclamation of 1763. Hence also Section 91 (24) which kept control of Indian affairs in the hands of a more distant federal government that might be, and historically has been, less prone than many provincial governments to ignore the rights of Native people (even given the federal government's own inadequacies). That reasoning, it seems to me, still holds true, even in the age of a federal government weakened by Meech Lake. There is little room for accommodation with the policies of British Columbia. Even Manitoba has shown a startling disregard for the rights of Native people over resource development issues. Although Long and Boldt are right to call for a careful examination of provincial programs and policies because these are more important now than they have ever been, it seems to me such an examination might best take place in the context of continued resistance to devolution, rather than accepting it as a *fait accompli* or, as they seem to suggest, going so far as to encourage the process.

These problems aside, Governments in Conflict? is clearly another of Long and Boldt's growing contributions to our understanding of Native politics in Canada. As in the case of their earlier works, it raises the level of debate by providing a number of thought provoking articles. Worth special mention in this regard is Boldt and Long's own piece on 'Native Indian Self-Government: Instrument of Autonomy or Assimilation?' in which they pursue the questions they raised in The Quest for Justice. Their call for a more grassroots approach to self-government is undoubtedly one of their more significant contributions. While noting the necessity of "concerted action with other bands and tribal groups in conjunction with international appeals," they point to the need for Native leaders to "redirect their energies from participating in the Canadian constitutional process to unilaterally developing constitutions at the local level" (p. 56). This is a position worth stressing at a time when the constitutional process has bottomed out and there seems to be a real risk of loss of

direction and stagnation at the level of organized politics. To its credit, Governments in Conflict raises these questions and Long and Boldt, at least, provide some guidance. What I can not help waiting and hoping for, though, is the day Long and Boldt relinquish the role of editors and take on, in a more substantial fashion, the role of authors.

Peter Kulchyski

Jean Barman, Yvonne Hebert, and Don McCaskill, editors: **Indian Education in Canada. Volume 2: The Challenge.** Nakoda Institute Occasional Paper No. 2. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

The challenge of Indian controlled education, its philosophy and implementation are the major themes addressed in this volume. The editors explore the new era in Indian education beginning in 1972 with the National Indian Brotherhood position paper "Indian Control of Indian Education." Most of the papers in this collection describe the changes that have taken place since then and relate various experiences of taking control.

Dianne Longboat's chapter, "First Nations Control of Education: The Path to Our Survival as Nations," is one of the few which does not describe an experience of taking control. She deals instead with the issues which must be resolved before true First Nations' control can occur, and outlines the political context in which the First Nations' right to control education is asserted. Longboat identifies numerous obstacles to effective control over education, including the federal trust responsibility, and Department of Indian Affairs' structure, funding formulae, and policy development.

In his chapter "Role Shock in the Community," Richard King uses the concept of role shock as a framework for studying the first two years of one band's experience with local control. The use of this concept enables King to identify reasons why the school failed to realize its original goals. What becomes clear is