

The account of the Settlement is only half of the 182 pages. There are two appendices—the history and regimental list of Runchey's Colored Corps who served in the War of 1812, and genealogical records for each of the original petitioners. Given the twenty five pages of footnotes and exhaustive use of archival sources, French's argument is difficult to dispute. His methodical, somewhat legal style is not particularly attractive, but his concern for accuracy is commendable. Perhaps owing to the inexperience of the publisher, the format lacks some of the professional details of a quality production. It is, nevertheless, well structured and offers all of the elements of a scholarly study. He includes an almost extinct phenomenon, an index.

In the preface, Gary French expresses "the hope that this book will be found useful, not only to the local historian, but to those interested in the history of Blacks in Ontario and the United States." One might add the wish that the quality of the research in *Men of Colour* would set the standard for all local history publications.

Su Murdoch
Simcoe County Archives

Ontario and the Canadian North. WILLIAM F.E. MORLEY. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, © 1978. xxxii, 322 p. ill. maps. (Canadian local histories to 1950: A bibliography; v.3) ISBN 0 8020 2281 2 \$25.00.

Local Histories of Ontario Municipalities, 1951-1977: A Bibliography. BARBARA B. AITKEN. Toronto: Ontario Library Association, 1978, 120 p. ISBN 0 88969 012X pa. \$5.95.

With the publication of these two volumes almost simultaneously mid-way through 1978, archivists, librarians, and researchers of whatever stripe have ended their long safari through the jungle of Ontario local histories. Admittedly at times the jungle has almost closed in and re-grown around these two heroic bibliographers, for both volumes represent a long and trying journey, with many tempting side-excursions which, if followed, would have led the authors into various Bunyanesque pitfalls. Perhaps Aitken or Morley could be tempted to write the history of their endeavours and some of the more fascinating and delightful aspects of the state of bibliography.

The "Great Divide" in Canadian bibliography the start of *Canadiana* in 1950 is observed in the chronological division between the two books. The effect of both volumes on the sources and treatment of Ontario's history will be profound, for the hitherto uncollected waifs and strays of bibliography, the local and parish histories, are finally collected, catalogued, and thereby enshrined in printed immortality. To merely say that these volumes are useful would be the banal understatement of the year; the toll of years of work extracted from each author will be repaid over the years by a continual demand for copies of the books and, in the case of the Aitken book, possibly a periodic update and revision.

Morley's book must be considered the definitive work on the period covered which, in effect, is one of the "closed" or finite periods in Canadian bibliography. Within the genre described, it is likely that nearly everything has been discovered which can be. One must avoid dogmatism on these matters, however, for Canadian bibliography is full of surprises, some of them pleasant, showing how truly lively and varied the book arts really were. Despite mechanization of the book production industry during most of the period covered by Morley, the book did not remain a static object. While there was any chance of human interference with the mechanical procedure of book making, which in letter press work could occur at almost any step of the way, the possibility of variants exists, to an extent which only Morley has truly plumbed. The best illustration

of this trend is, ironically, in the massive classic *Canada Past, Present and Future*, and in the *Canadian Gazetteer* (pp. 16-17), two seminal works produced by that most elusive of Canadian authors, William Henry Smith. The mere contemplation of the variants, which constituted for Morley a major mini-study in themselves, must bring tears to the eyes of the most hardened modern scholar, struggling through a set of computerized, sanitized galley proofs. While letter-press method provided the opportunity to influence output at the production stage, a century later Morley stands back scratching his head in helpless amazement at the depredations of modern reprint editors (otherwise known as “clip-and-paste artists”) who have access to large archival libraries, xerox machines and the wonders of offset printing. Vide, for example, his entry on page 55 concerning reprint of the Essex and Kent counties atlas, a volume for which this reviewer claims joint credit, error and all. Whether the entire entry required duplicating under Kent County on page 63 is perhaps debatable, but the Morley book has a preference for repeating entries rather than making a reference. The exhaustive nature of Morley’s bibliographical descriptions at any rate should make further investigation superfluous.

An interesting side effect of Morley’s publication for libraries and archival institutions which aspire to completeness in their area, should be a reappraisal of the prices placed on local histories by antiquarian dealers. In my opinion, not unchallenged by the bookselling fraternity, the price of many local histories has been pushed absurdly high. Noting the paucity of references in Morley to existing copies, it is apparent that a good many local histories are genuine rarities. On occasion, to his regret, Morley is forced to rely on a facsimile copy, or in rare cases, on the sacred word of a fellow research librarian. Alas, libraries and archives shall have to resort again to massive photocopying or micro-reproductions in order to fill the requests they are certain to have for the items Morley has brought to light. Reprinting can only cover a relatively few items: those county and city histories and, of course, the atlases where there is a widespread popular demand for personal copies, as well as library reference sets. One hopes that “not in”—the popular and accusatory phrase so much beloved of booksellers—will be applied to Morley *only* after the catalogue compiler has in fact read the introductory material to see what the exclusions are. Sabin, TPL, Peel, Watters, each take their licks from the “not in” designation, and the price is raised accordingly.

The Morley volume, following the style of the two earlier volumes in the series, is attractively produced and will stand up to the heavy wear to be expected in reference collections. Typography is clear and workmanlike, while text editing appears to be of outstanding quality. The only error of consequence noted was that which already has the publisher attempting to remedy: the text intended for page 268 was, no doubt by direct intervention of the printer’s devil, transported in paste-up to the lower part of page 276. While I cannot comment with any certainty on the Canadian North portion of the book, I notice that the division of the Ontario portion into four sections follows a logical and useful progression. It could be argued that the grouping of the material in sections 3 and 4 could have been usefully done in a single, county or city arrangement with the small settlements arranged by the larger subdivision; either way could have made use of a county name listing or an index. It is sometimes difficult, even as an archivist familiar with an area, to think of all the possible communities within a given county when assisting researchers in a particular geographical search. The public records, strictly tied as they are to incorporated geographical areas, are sometimes peculiarly unresponsive for the locating of tiny communities, especially if the community was never distinguished by having its own rural post office.

Barbara Aitken’s work demonstrates the on-going need for vigilance in the work of collecting and recording the increasingly prolific output of the local pen and press. Through the refinement of three previous editions she has produced this checklist which effectively takes up where Morley left off, chronologically. Similarities and dif-

ferences in approach and content are both striking and significant. The bibliographical depth of analysis is best compared by examining the treatment of county atlas reprints, since both cover these volumes fully. Aitken has wisely left it to Morley to make the definitive statement on the subject, for a duplication of his intensive effort would have been unnecessary. The descriptions are fully adequate for identification and collation purposes. The necessity for such a work despite its concurrent appearance with *Canadiana* is obvious when a spot check is made with entries in the latter source. My own previous estimate (in 1970) of the extent to which *Canadiana* successfully captured ephemeral and relevant local publications, was a five percent success rate. On the more restricted inclusions of the Aitken list, *Canadiana* scores somewhat higher. On a sampling of fifteen items in Aitken published in the period 1950-1962, seven were listed in *Canadiana* during the same period. Two further items followed in *Canadiana* for the period 1963-67; the greatest time span between publication and listing was 11 years (1952-1963). Six did not appear at all, though their fate, if any, beyond 1967 was not traced; in other words, in the category of area, and not minutely specialized histories, the lacunae in *Canadiana* could approach forty percent.

That there is more to the story than Aitken has discovered became evident with a spot check at the University of Western Ontario's Regional Collection of twenty two works relating to small centres in Western Ontario. It has fourteen items, lacked five, and revealed an additional three which appeared to merit inclusion in Aitken, though two were dated 1977. A further comparison with the 1976 edition of *Ontario History's* "Book Notes" showed a considerable dove-tailing with this careful production, though a few items were omitted which appeared to be relevant to the criteria of the *Bibliography*. The omissions were in the social and educational fields, and though I don't consider them serious, they do underline the necessity for further checking, perhaps in association with colleagues elsewhere, for further entries. The format and production of this volume make it apparent that it could both be updated and enriched by additional relevant entries, say at periods of three to five years. Any copies used by libraries, or subjected to heavy use, will have to be rebound in any event, since the paper binding is simply not adequate for reference use.

A major divergence from the format of the Morley book was the decision to list the entire contents in a single alphabetical organization, with cross-references. The status of counties, townships, and many of the towns and villages is clear, but the status and location of many smaller communities is not. Commendably, the county or district is indicated with the Tweedsmuir Book entries, though sometimes the published version of a volume compiled by a Tweedsmuir group leads to confusion: for example, some entries under Bayham Township, North Bayham, and Corinth (all in Elgin County), are related, though from the references this is not entirely clear, nor are the places linked. The entry for Mount Healy has the same problem. A microfilm of the Book shows the county name, Haldimand, which is not evident in the following listing for the published Book. It might therefore have been useful, since the Aitken book is concerned almost exclusively with county divisions and smaller units, geographically, for it to have been organized hierarchically by county and then by minor municipality or settlement therein. This would of course have necessitated a place name index. Another way would have been to include a county listing within the text, as a massive "see also" type of reference. Either way would have added to the length of the book, and perhaps the cost, but would have eased reference to the entries. The amount of possible cross-indexing is a conundrum which, of course, could be carried out ad infinitum, limited only by the time of the compiler and the resources of the publisher!

Both Morley and Aitken have shown us the untold and unsuspected richness of material which, in the words of Hugh Faulkner, quoted in Aitken "is basic, fundamental to the understanding of our national heritage." This is a challenge. The challenge to archivists and librarians individually is to search out and add to the knowledge of this

corpus additional material and to see that copies are placed in the relevant local, regional, provincial and national collections. The challenge to the "network system" of inter-facing libraries/archives/scholars is to encourage the collection of these raw and rare materials in microform to make them universally accessible. The challenge to librarians, upon receiving a copy of a local publication, is as prosaic as to encourage the deposit of the two copies required for the National Library. The specific challenge to the archival profession is to study the local outcome from the area and to ensure that original source material freely drawn on is not allowed to be destroyed because its apparent usefulness has passed, or to be returned to some hideaway in oblivion. Oft have I yearned for access to the records available to the writers of Ontario's first general local histories, in the original county atlases (1875-1881) which no longer exist in many cases, or the priceless municipal and court records so freely quoted in early, massive histories of counties such as Goodspeed's Middlesex (1889); let alone the newspapers now irretrievably lost!.

The source references in both volumes make note of various county and local bibliographies of varying degrees of coverage. It is obvious, both from the list of excluded topics in the volumes, and from the personal knowledge of archivists and reference librarians whose mandate concerns local studies, that a series of intensive and concentrated local listings of good bibliographical quality is an essential service leading towards the locating and describing of multitudes of locally-oriented publications, of which the church histories are perhaps the single largest group excluded from previous consideration. Printed municipal publications, from the archivist's standpoint, notably those generated in the last two decades, are another matter of deep concern. In the archival field, the first volume just released of the new *Ontario's Heritage* series, covering the Peterborough area, will serve as a model showing the richness of the available and, as yet, untapped resources. Archivists, librarians, local scholars, museum curators, and anyone interested in the preservation of our heritage, can take heart that their efforts are both necessary and valuable in the recording of our past, and in the perpetual updating of the record.

Edward Phelps
University of Western Ontario

Ontario's Heritage: A Guide to Archival Resources: Vol. I, Peterborough Region. Robert Taylor-Vaisey Regional Project Director, General Editor Victor Russell. Cheltenham: Boston Mills Press, 1978. 113p. ISBN 0-919822-85-1 \$6.95.

A guide is most welcome in the archival jungle of uncoordinated collections, institutions, and resources. Volume one of *Ontario's Heritage*, of a proposed fifteen, will go far in aiding the traveller in the Peterborough Region's jungle of resources. The *Guide* will open under-used paths leading, at least for the genealogist, to a shady rest under a well-foliaged 'family tree'.

Therein may lie a major difficulty with volume one. Genealogists being what they are, indefatigable when on the trail of information, they will undoubtedly demand access to every sort of record listed in the *Guide*. Yet the availability of the vital statistics and other material listed in the private records section is controlled by stringent provincial regulations. To encourage researchers to use vital statistics even for nineteenth century information, places curators, archivists, clerks, and perhaps even directors of funeral homes, in an awkward position. The compilers of the next volume in the series should consider the advisability of excluding such references from future publications. Certainly the editorial notes could be expanded to give more direction to the genealogists who will inevitably pounce on it.