Carlos Henrique Assunção Paiva's analysis of the Brazilian eminent parasitologist Samuel Barnsley Pessoa. Others adopt a social history approach that render more visible the voices of different actors, such as those who participated in the Cuban medical diplomacy in Nicaragua and the Puerto Rican Family Life Study. The book's emphasis on transnational movement and circulation of knowledge also dialogs with the scholarship on Latin American intellectual, cultural, and political networks by scholars such as Alexandra Pita Gonzales, Eduardo Devés Valdés, and Liliana Weinberg. In this sense, personal, professional, and institutional networks at the international and national levels were crucial for discussing and implementing specific health initiatives and policies in the region within and beyond the boundaries of the Cold War. The editors' epilogue summarizes the book's key points, reflects on legacies beyond the chronological end of the Cold War in the region, and suggests a number of fruitful topics and areas for further research.

In summary, the book's theoretical insights and solid empirical research not only provide a rich and nuanced analysis of the history of health and medicine in twentieth-century Latin America, they also open relevant comparative perspectives with other fields within the Latin American Cold War as well as other specific historiographies regarding politics, economics, science, culture, and international relations.

Jorge A. Nállim
University of Manitoba

Janigan, Mary – *The Art of Sharing: The Richer and Poorer Provinces since Confederation*. Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020. 496 p.

Historians who study the apparatus of formal democratic participation—the ballot, elections, political parties and the party system, taxes and the welfare state—walk a fine line. Do we engage with the public's often hazy or heated understanding of the material, in recognition of the importance of democracy as a social practice and in keeping with socio-cultural history's dictum of meaning-making from below, or with other disciplines' more technical work on these topics, where an instrumental orientation privileges the perspective of the expert? It's not our job to fact check our sources. On the subject of provincial equalization, though, most scholars would appreciate the first few pointed paragraphs of Mary Janigan's *The Art of Sharing*. She bluntly states that Premier Jason Kenney—an avid proponent of the idea that the province of Alberta whose budgets for which he is responsible suffers unfairly from equalization—knowingly misrepresents the nature of the program as part of a "gospel of grievance" (p. 3). It is an exceedingly well written and carefully argued account of the emergence of equalization over several decades leading to 1957, focusing in particular on the issues arising out of the Great Depression of the 1930s and underlining the instructive role played by early Australian innovations.

Much of the narrative is dominated by the drama and the intellectual heft of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations—the Rowell-Sirois Commission—that was appointed in response to several provincial loan defaults in 1937 and reported in 1940. It proposed introducing a significantly strengthened federal income tax, which was rejected by three provinces. While this is a somewhat obvious place to focus, and has been a touchstone of political history since the report was released, Janigan's account is resolutely transnational, opening with the presentation of L. F. Giblin, architect of Australia's Commonwealth Grants Commission, established in 1933, to the Rowell-Sirois Commission in the summer of 1938. From there, she goes back to Confederation, underlining the role of Nova Scotia in particular, both in the 1860s and in the 1920s, in forcing a reluctant federal government to develop a piecemeal system of fiscal transfers to the provinces. What emerges slowly is a more formalized system, free of the vagaries of personality clashes and political vigour, for transferring money to provinces on the basis of need, as determined by an assessment of their ability to raise revenue by way of provincial taxation. (Parenthetically, this is where Alberta, rich in resources and in high incomes, loses out: its governments opt not to use much of its vast fiscal capacity, effectively declining to tax enough to fund adequate public services, while its residents' contribution to federal taxation go to provinces with legitimate revenue challenges.) Australia, with a comparable historical tension between wealthy and poorer states, is shown throughout as an interested neighbour, comparing notes on how to address issues of fiscal inequality in a federation.

Janigan's prose is forceful yet breezy, and displays the writerly confidence of someone who trusts that her book might be read by people other than professional historians. A lot of research clearly went into the book. Its detailed tracing of the complicated negotiations that led to the establishment of equalization in the 1950s and of the connections between the Rowell-Sirois Commission and the establishment of equalization—not to mention the insistence on the Australian connection—are all markers of an important contribution to an understudied area of political history. Janigan arguably is too fascinated with the character and thoughts of individuals involved in the history, relying a lot on biographies and diaries of Prime Ministers, even ones like Mackenzie King, whose primary contribution to the development of equalization appears to have been delaying it. (Will historiography ever exceed the simple brilliance of F. R. Scott's poem describing King's political style: "Do nothing by halves/Which can be done in quarters"?) There is, in fact, a pronounced teleological current to the book, in which figures are either able or not able to see yet—a word Janigan uses a lot—the necessity of addressing fiscal inequalities. It is a narrative device historians often critique in popular histories that show the slow but steady realization of a nice idea that people might be tempted to take for granted. It is undoubtedly a convenient way to structure a story, but it tends to portray the economists and bureaucrats and politicians and journalists as either ahead of or behind the times, rather than as having coherent ideas and ideologies, or representing a wider community of meaning or interest.

Is equalization a story that Canadians as a whole were invested in or that only a select few understood and therefore cared about? Janigan appears to be uncertain.

The tension between telling a story about a small circle of donnish, grey flannel "Ottawa men" with expert knowledge of the constitution and the fiscal relations of the various provinces, or a story of Canadians, particularly postwar Canadians subject to taxes and dependent on poorly developed welfare state programs, runs through the book. She states bluntly that "fiscal and economic inequality among governments was an insider's problem" of which "Canadians did not understand the implications," (p. 134) a few pages before noting that "the times demanded change—and many Canadians knew it," citing a source that said, "The hearings have been followed with interest throughout the Dominion" (p. 137). Given that the change the times demanded concerned the fiscal and economic inequality between governments, and the hearings about this question had been followed with interest, the claim that people didn't understand the implications is not convincing. Later, after implying that in 1940 King was distracted from the release of the Rowell-Sirois report by recent events in the Second World War, she notes that, despite little comment in the press or action by officials, "many Canadians—and many Australians—were drawn to the report as a possible remedy for the divisiveness of federalism," (p. 176) suggesting that Canadians as a whole were less distracted from constitutional questions than the Prime Minister. Later still, Janigan notes that "very few recognized the huge impediment of fiscal and economic inequality," (p. 249) but also, after quoting from a letter that showed that the "postwar boom did not extend to everyone," reiterates that "Canadians were engaged in this debate" (p. 252). There is perhaps a distinction between general questions of inequality and poverty and more technical questions of fiscal formulas, or perhaps both claims—almost no one understood, almost everyone was riveted—are used more for drama than accuracy. It is not immediately convincing, however, that Maritimers in the 1920s or the 1950s, or westerners in the 1930s, would have had no understanding of how their provinces' fiscal capacity determined the availability and quality of public services and social programs, given their governments' loud insistence on the need for a fairer deal from Ottawa. And indeed, it's not clear that suggesting Canadians did not understand the importance of equalization helps to sell the ongoing importance of the story to current readers.

David Tough
Trent University

Gonzalez, Johnhenry – *Maroon Nation: A History of Revolutionary Haiti.* New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 2019, 320 p.

Publié dans la série « Yale Agrarian Studies Series » (dirigée par James C. Scott), *Maroon Nation* est un ouvrage stimulant et original. Au premier abord, le titre interpelle. Il renvoie à l'un des moyens de résistance utilisés par les esclaves pour échapper à leur subjugation ; il l'associe à une nation, ce qui est inhabituel et ne peut qu'intriguer le lecteur. Le premier chapitre de l'ouvrage, intitulé « The Maroon