

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

conclusion. More important, and what my note attempted to document, was the provenance of the Collection from the War Office to the Department of the Interior and finally to the Public Archives. As archivists we go to great lengths to establish the provenance of our holdings. All the more effort is made when the documents in question have legal implications. Many of the items in the War Office Collection are the muniments of title relating to Ordnance Lands in Canada. This was the very reason that they were sought by the Government of Canada in 1890. Holmden claimed that the documents "had been bandied from pillar to post," implying that their movement had been haphazard which simply was not the case. Holmden may have been presenting how he viewed the matter, but it was not correct. Moreover, had he examined the records of his own institution or discussed the matter with the Dominion Archivist, Arthur Doughty, and the Surveyor General, Edouard Deville, he would have found the correct sequence of events. Furthermore, with regard to Holmden's 1919 manuscript, Mrs. Kidd's defence of the use of contemporary accounts of events without first verifying their accuracy cannot pass without notice. As archivists we chide researchers for not questioning the validity of archival source material: should we not follow our own admonitions?

The use of the designations "Map Division" and "National Map Collection" in Mrs. Kidd's article is confusing. For example, on page 11, events in 1968 involving the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources take place with the "Map Division" whereas, on page 12, in discussing the 1967 Centennial Celebrations, reference is to the "National Map Collection." What the "context" is that would account for this difference in appellation is difficult to fathom. Mrs. Kidd's statement that the designation "National Map Collection" came about through use and not by some administrative process was not dealt with in her article and is revealing. The significance of the appellation and the reason for the change would also have been worth exploring; indeed, even a "brief" history of the Division/Collection could hardly ignore such a central point, which was why I raised the issue in my note. (Regarding the name "Federal Archives Division", which Mrs. Kidd wonders whether it is "official," the issue of the names of the divisions within the Archives Branch of the Public Archives was discussed at a meeting of the Branch Management Committee on 11 March 1980 which Mrs. Kidd attended. Subsequently, a memorandum was prepared on 13 March 1980 by the Director, Public Records Division, stating that as of 1 April 1980 the title of the division would be the Federal Archives Division. The action was approved by the Director General, Archives Branch, on 17 March 1980. Source: Archives Branch, Registry File 1135-A1, vol. 9)

My reference to the 1949 proposal to establish within the Department of Mines and Resources a National Map Library is not just part of the history of that department. Government organization and departmental responsibilities are not static and changes do not take place in a vacuum. In the development of any organization, there is always "empire building" and its corollary "protection of turf." A case in point is found on page 20 of Mrs. Kidd's article where she refers to the National Librarian's report entitled *The Future of the National Library* in which it was argued that the National Map Collection should be transferred to the National Library and where she states that "this was not the first time the future of the National Map Collection had been openly debated." The objectives outlined for a National Map Library in 1949 sound very much like those which came about in the

1960s for the National Map Collection. The politics of how one institution succeeds where another fails is part of the history of both government bodies.

Concerning the claimed awareness of and use of the transcript of Ordnance Lands Branch file 2151 by the staff of the National Map Collection, attention should be drawn to the recent 75th anniversary exhibition and accompanying catalogue both entitled: "Treasures of the National Map Collection, Public Archives of Canada." This 1982 exhibition of "the most significant and rarest" cartographic works held by the National Map Collection contained one item from the War Office Collection: "Plan showing the Battle of Lundy's Lane, 1914" (exhibition item 37). If the Ordnance Lands Branch file is as well known within the National Map Collection as Mrs. Kidd would have us believe, one would certainly expect that the file would be consulted in the "context" of the work of preparing a statement on the provenance for this item. This is particularly true when the statement was for such a major map exhibition. The provenance statement for the plan, which is part of a set, reads: "The set of plans was transferred to the Public Archives of Canada from the Board of Ordnance in 1891." If the transcribed file had been utilized, the entry would (and should) have read: "The set of plans was transferred to the Public Archives of Canada from the War Office, London, by way of the Department of the Interior in 1907." I rest my case: the transcribed file OL 2151 is unfortunately little known, used, or appreciated.

The issue of physical and intellectual control of archival material is a matter of some debate within archival institutions. The point I made in the concluding paragraph of my note was that, although Holmden in his 1912 *Catalogue* had clearly identified the individual parts of the War Office Collection, no clear identification of this Collection now exists. I would suggest that the physical dispersion of the Collection during that seventy-year period has contributed to the loss of the identity of the Collection as a *fond*. In other words, there has been a loss of the intellectual aspect of provenance. I do not deny that maps, because of their physical characteristics, should be stored in different physical containers, but the provenance should be maintained. This, as Mrs. Kidd now acknowledges, was not done within the National Map Collection until quite recently. The efforts of the National Map Collection to reconstitute on paper the maps from "Q" and "C" series are to be applauded. My hope is that the same fate will soon befall "the real nucleus of the map collection."

Robert J. Hayward
Federal Archives Division
Public Archives of Canada

Reviewer is too Hard on Les Archives aux XX^e siècle

I read with interest the opinions of *Les archives au XX^e siècle* expressed by Gordon Dodds in the last issue of *Archivaria* and trust that you will not be averse to publishing another, quite different, point of view.