

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.

Certainly I would never claim that *Les archives au XX^e siècle* is perfect. The authors themselves do not hesitate to recognize its shortcomings in their foreword (“avant-propos”). This said, it does not deserve the harsh criticism of the review published in *Archivaria*.

The book was meant to be and is a successful manual. It ought not to be evaluated according to criteria which do not apply to the genre. It was meant to be comprehensive, describing as many of the areas and tasks implied in archival activity as possible. That is why there is a terminology section which, by the way, can only be considered a quick reference tool. Maybe there is a need for a separate more complete list of this kind, but to contend as much does nothing to take away from the inherent value of the one proposed.

Mr. Dodds finds the book “dour and dry ... clogged with sections and sub-sections.” The plan of the work is logical and coherent. The writing style is correct, straightforward, and concise as it should be in a manual. After all, how thrilling can one be writing about fumigation! I was looking at Schellenberg’s classics the other day and thinking that they do not read like novels either. The *Manuel d’archivistique* (Direction des archives de France, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1970) had its sections and sub-sections too and that format did not affect either its fame or its usefulness as a reference work. And I fail to see anything in the book or in Mr. Dodds’ review of it for that matter that justifies the use of so strong and so highly pitched a word as “perversity”!

The present state of technology being what it is, a small format is no longer harmful to graphic presentations. *Canadian Archives* is only fractionally larger and is full of easily consulted graphic material. The authors of *Les archives au XX^e siècle* chose to include a few appropriate “tableaux.”

If, as Mr. Dodds claims, the book could have come out in the mid-1970s, the obvious fact is that it did not and therefore there is still room for it. The fact that this is the first Canadian book of such comprehensive scope devoted to archives cannot be overlooked. Its authors deserve a great deal of credit for bringing the task to fruition. What flaws the book has are easily excused when one remembers how desperate was the need of such a publication. The book is selling well and there can be little doubt that it is fulfilling its objectives successfully.

A lot of room is left for archivists to publish other books and articles exploring particular areas, analyzing principles and “philosophical” aspects of archival work. Still I hope that archivists who might want to publish will not be hampered by the fear they might come out with a product which will not be absolutely perfect, or that they might be hit with harsh criticism.

Monique Boulet-Wernham
Centre de recherche en civilisation
canadienne-française
University of Ottawa

The Reviewer Responds

If Canada’s archivists are to be intimidated, as Ms. Boulet-Wernham seems to fear, by the likes of my review of the Couture-Rousseau manual, the future of archival