

store and manipulate information and present it for publication is what awaits us, but, except for the Smithsonian's mechanised sort for the index to its guide, none of the publications here appears to have taken advantage of these possibilities.

Terry Eastwood
Provincial Archives of British Columbia

A Guide to the Holdings of Queen's University Archives. Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University, 1978. 132 p. \$4.00.

A Guide to the Charles Avery Dunning Papers, 1913-1958. Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University, 1978. 58 p. \$2.00.

Two University Archives in Ontario recently published guides to their holdings: Queen's University and the University of Western Ontario and sandwiched between them is the first volume of *Ontario's Heritage. A Guide to Archival Resources*. All three deal primarily with regional archival records. It is surprising therefore that the third, the *Queen's Guide*, learned so little from the errors and omissions of the first two.

A cursory look through the *Guide* indicates the tremendous wealth of regional, business and literary records housed at Queen's. Rightly or not, in the absence of provincially funded regional archival repositories, university archives in this province often collect material unrelated directly to their own "academic community". This surrogate acquisition safeguards archival resources from possible destruction, and institutions such as Queen's, UWO and Trent perform a useful role in this regard. At the same time, a university archives should be charged with responsibility for the academic and administrative records of the university. Where such a mandate exists, I would expect that any guide to the holdings which result from it would clearly demarcate those which are the records of the university community and those which are not. And, in addition, such a guide to a regional collection should reflect the variety of jurisdictions from which records have been received. The *Queen's Guide*, unhappily, does not fulfill either of these expectations.

A guide should not require a researcher to read from the A's on page 1 to the Y's on page 120 in order to prepare a list of records of banks, or legal firms, or Women's Institutes which are found in that repository but are not identified by jurisdiction. It would have been far preferable to have followed one of two other options. The *Guide* could have been organized by different jurisdictions of records, whether religious, municipal, educational, medical, legal or literary, all of which apply to Queen's holdings, and it could then have been tied together by a personal name and subject index. On the other hand, such a method might have been used in the construction of the index itself. In the present *Guide*, the index is clearly incomplete and does not reflect, as I assume it was intended to, the range of records found in the alphabetical listing.

The presentation of the *Guide* at first glance seems well considered, providing a map, locational information, and a good introduction on how to use the Archives. The actual listing, however, suffers from inconsistency and a puzzling and irritating method of entry. We are faced with an alphabetical listing of entries which can be personal, corporate, thematic, or conforming to some sort of subject entry. "Ledger", "Death Records" and "Fenian Raids" are found beside "CANADIAN WRITERS' CONFERENCE", "ENTERPRISE, Ont.—*Police Records*", "HUDSON'S BAY Co.—*Mattawa Record Books*" and "QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY—*Administrative Officers*." (Incidentally, is a subject approach to classes of university records the best way of identifying the range and type of records generated in a university community?) Nowhere is there some indication or rationale as to how rules of entry have been established. This is very obvious not just for

university, but also regional records found in a massive block under Kingston (pp 54-63) and also scattered individually through the *Guide* (pp 9, 10, 11, 13, 25, . . .). Only a search from A to Y will reveal the whole consolidation of regional records in the Archives. A further inconsistency is evident even within a type of entry, such as Bibliographic Society of Canada Records (p. 15) but Botanical Society of Canada (p. 16); one might question why the entry for a Tweedsmuir History of Amherst Island is under the name of the Island when it might better be under the Womens' Institute which created it. Throughout the *Guide* there are references such as "Anderson, J.S.M., see Lorne Pierce Collection". What purpose is served by one index within the body of a guide when a separate index has already been established? There are even cases when the entry in the alphabetical listing does not correspond to the entry in the index. In short, the method of compiling the guide seems confused and not as effective as it might (and should) have been.

It is easy to be critical; yet, this whole question of guides to collections and reference tools for researchers needs careful examination. I appreciate the need and usefulness of this *Guide* as it stands now but I am disappointed that it does not provide a better reflection of the different types of records which comprise the Queen's collection, and I am dismayed that it does not segregate and identify the records of the university community from those acquired from outside it. Unquestionably, we need guides of this type to complement union lists. For this reason, it might be argued that this *Guide* is better than no guide at all, that continual exposure will heighten the archival profile. I do not find that a convincing argument. How are we to convince our users of the need for consistent methods of citation when we do not reflect such a need for consistency in our own publications?

The *Guide of the Charles Avery Dunning Papers* is a nicely arranged and described finding-aid. Interaction of record series is well documented and any changes in organization from former systems is carefully explained. There are one or two stylistic problems (such as the filing arrangement of newspaper clippings), but they are small points in the face of an otherwise excellent production and prototype.

Robert Taylor-Vaisey,
University of Toronto Archives

Directory of Archives and Manuscripts Repositories in the United States.
NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION.
Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1978. 905 p. \$25.00.

In 1961 the National Historical Publications Commission produced *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States*, edited by Philip Hamer. This very useful publication contained information on 1300 archival repositories in the American states and territories. Such a guide inevitably requires periodic updating, and a revision of the Hamer Guide has been eagerly awaited by archivists and researchers.

The *Directory* which has just been published has certainly been worth waiting for. It contains detailed descriptions of 2675 repositories in the United States and American territories, including American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, and the North Marianas Trust Territory. There are also brief entries relating to a further 575 repositories that are listed in Hamer or in the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* but did not return a repository information form to this project. Thus, a total of 3250 archival institutions are included. Every imaginable type of repository is represented: federal, state and local government agencies, university archives and libraries, religious organizations, public libraries, museums, corporate archives, and the archives of organizations ranging from a Homosexual Information Center to the Sport Balloon Society of the United States of America.