

to him — and to the Association — and to you as its capable editor. *Hommage* too to our good friend, Dr. Wilfred Smith. He carried the ball for a long run!

F. Dolores Donnelly
Faculty of Library Science
University of Toronto

A Reply to Robert Hayward's "Counterpoint" on the Origins of the National Map Collection

In reference to Robert J. Hayward's "Counterpoint" article entitled "The Real Nucleus of the Map Collection": Charting Its Provenance" in *Archivaria*, number 14, summer 1982 which followed my article, "A Brief History of the National Map Collection at the Public Archives of Canada" in number 13, winter 1981-82, several comments need to be made.

First, I regret that the opportunity to respond to the "Counterpoint" article in the same issue was not provided to me; as the author of the original article, I would have expected the courtesy of being supplied with a copy, either by the editor or the author, and of being asked if I wished to respond. Unfortunately after the distribution of number 14, and because of the advanced stage of the next two issues, it was also impossible to include any comments in these.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate Mr. Hayward on the thoroughness of his research into the early history of the War Office plans in the period 1891 to 1907. Indeed, Mr. Hayward's research tends to support much of what Hensley Reed Holmden wrote in his 1919 manuscript. As noted by Mr. Hayward, "The existence of the former War Office map collection was known to many in Ottawa ... there were others ... however who did not know the whereabouts of the collection," and among the latter were Arthur G. Doughty and Lord Minto. Joseph Pope, acting on Lord Minto's behalf, indeed located the material in 1902, not 1905 as noted in Mr. Holmden's notes. However, Mr. Hayward's severe judgement of the ability of the first head of the Map Division — "may have been a good archival administrator" but "he was not a particularly exacting historian" — based on an error in Holmden's contemporary notes, is, in my opinion, unwarranted. Certainly, Mr. Holmden was presenting how he, and probably his contemporaries, viewed the founding of the Map Division, and it was in this context that I chose to quote him in my article.

The comments made in several of Mr. Hayward's footnotes also require clarification. I would dispute the fact that I used the terms "Map Division" and "National Map Collection" interchangeably in my article. My choice of designation was always determined by the date of the reference, and in the late 1960s and early 1970s period when indeed both names were in use — the first for internal matters, the second for external — the choice was reflected by the context. It is difficult to determine an exact date when the name "National Map Collection" began to be invariably used. Whether or not the name is "official" depends on Mr. Hayward's definition of the word. There is no legislative mandate, but the designation has been used in written form, by the Secretary of State, and by all levels of Public Archives of Canada management in official reports to central agencies, in communications, and in publications.

Mr. Hayward's comment "Surely, what happened in those intervening eighteen years [i.e. 1949-1967] is part of the context into which the history of the National Map Collection should have been placed" refers more to the history of what is now the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources than to that of the Public Archives of Canada. Certainly the topic is interesting but, in my opinion, not central to my article.

In another footnote, relating to the "Ordnance Office — Archives and War Office Plans — Canada" file in the National Map Collection library, Mr. Hayward once again notes his personal opinion: "where it has sat on the shelf little known, used or appreciated." Yes, it sits on the shelf but, in an informal survey of National Map Collection staff, I found most were aware of it and used it when it would be helpful in the context of their work. Perhaps Mr. Hayward's opinions are based on his years of employment in the National Map Collection, before his transfer to the Federal Archives Division (by the way, is this name "official"?) in 1977.

Finally, Mr. Hayward's suggestion that the War Office collection be reconstituted is certainly feasible intellectually, although not physically — but not as a 75th anniversary project. The National Map Collection acknowledges, as should many other archival institutions, that respect for provenance was lacking for many years but, in recent years, attempts have been made to reconstitute intellectually the maps from several origins, including the "Q" and "C" series. I would dispute, however, that the "multifarious filing system," necessary for physical control, is counter to control of provenance of records.

In conclusion, thanks, Mr. Hayward, for an interesting and important contribution to the history of the National Map Collection. I regret that with our mutual interest in the subject, you did not discuss your "Counterpoint" article with me during its preparation or after.

Betty H. Kidd
Director
National Map Collection

Robert Hayward Replies

I will deal with the points raised by Betty Kidd in the order she presented them. I strongly question that my not supplying Mrs. Kidd with a copy of my note shows a lack of courtesy on my part. I submitted my manuscript to the editor of *Archivaria* in August 1982 and heard nothing about its acceptance or rejection until I received my copy of *Archivaria* 14 in May 1983. My note was a communication with the editor and as such it was the editor's choice to run it. The editor could have requested major revisions or rejected the piece outright. If this had happened, the note would have been altered substantially or never have seen the light of day. The choice of material for *Archivaria* is for the editor to decide. The protocol the editor wishes to follow in producing the publication is for him/her to decide and live with.

Whether my judgement of Holmden is too severe and unwarranted, as Mrs. Kidd contends, is of course a matter of interpretation, but a few points should be kept in mind. My identification of the correct date Lord Minto "discovered" the War Office Collection (1902 — not 1905 as Holmden stated) is but one point that led to my