

Wet'suwet'en oral traditions that should have remained Glavin's point of focus.

On the sensitive matter of how to interpret oral traditions about Dimlahamid in relation to physical evidence, Glavin gives a reasonable account of current archaeological opinion, but on the even more sensitive issue of *halait* and *haldowdgets* power in relation to the court case, he might have done better to leave unsaid the little he had been told about these matters. The idea of *halait*s "working on" the Chief Justice during the course of the trial almost certainly should have remained within the realm of oral communication, particularly in light of the devastating decision against the plaintiffs that came down on Friday, 8 March 1991.

Overall, this book succeeds when its focus is local but goes astray when it loses that focus. It succeeds in familiarizing the non-Aboriginal reader with Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en place names, chiefs' names and oral traditions. It succeeds in describing the very personal struggle of determined individuals to follow their culture's ways in the face of powerful outside forces. I would recommend it for use in a Native Studies curriculum with the warning that some explanation and revision on the part of the instructor would be required. Most of the problematic passages could be avoided by simply deleting chapter seven.

Robin Ridington

Energy, Mines and Resources Canada. "Indian Treaties." *The National Atlas of Canada, 5th Edition*. Ottawa: 1991. Scale 1:7,500,000. Colour, 75 cm x 86 cm. Order no. MCR 4162F from Canada Map Office, Energy Mines and Resources Canada.

This is one of the latest loose-sheet maps produced as part of the fifth edition of *National Atlas of Canada*. This map was produced by the Geographical Services Division, Canada Centre for Mapping, but the research was carried out by R.S. Allen (Treaties and Historical Research Centre, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada) and R. Maquire (Treaty Policy Branch, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada).

This treaty map shows the area surrendered in southern Ontario before Confederation, the Robinson and Manitoulin Island treaties, the Douglas treaties on Vancouver Island in the 1850s, and the numbered treaties in western and northern Canada. The locations where the various Vancouver Island treaties were signed are also shown. The provinces of

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are shaded yellow to depicted peace and friendship treaties. Considerable text accompanies the map. This information provides a summary of some of the details concerning land surrenders.

Certainly, this map is a great improvement over the commonly circulated map put out by Indian and Northern Affairs and titled "Indian Treaties."¹ Cartographically, the *National Atlas of Canada* Treaty Map is more readable. Unlike the previous treaty map circulated by Indian Affairs, this edition does not highlight Lower Canada and claim that this area is excluded from the Royal Proclamation of 1763.

Nonetheless, a number of problems exist with this publication and a new map of the Indian treaties of Canada could have been imaginative. Many more details could have been handled by this map. For example, the information on adhesions is handled inconsistently and, in the case of the Treaty 5 adhesions, the manner in which the map conveys the data is misleading. The map refers to only one adhesion (September 1908). In fact the area adhered to Treaty 5 involved adhesions over three years (1908, 1909 and 1910) for different bands and tribes. The various adhesions in Treaty 8, especially for the British Columbia portion, are not indicated. Treaty adhesions are a significant part of the treaty process and these adhesions raise important questions about geography and territory. Many treaties and adhesions failed to identify each band's unique areas of land use and occupancy. In Treaty 6, signed in 1876, adhesions were signed as late as 1954. The information on this map about treaty adhesions and, indeed, the cartographic symbols used to depict treaty areas (border lines and area tones) convey an impression that is simplistic. It implies that all Indian bands in a treaty area have agreed to the surrender terms of a treaty. Currently, the McLeod Lake Band wishes to adhere to Treaty 8. The band's traditional lands are included in the written description of Treaty 8, but it was not party to this treaty. We can not learn from this map where the representatives of the Crown and Indian Chiefs met, negotiated and signed the numbered Treaties. Similarly, I think that the many surrenders and purchases of southern Ontario Indian lands could have been captured on a special inset map. The large area taken up by Greenland would have provided ample space to display the southern Ontario land surrenders.

Moreover, the map lacks imagination. Simple showing the approximate locations of treaty boundaries is not really good enough. A more precise map could have been produced. The dates and places where treaties and adhesions were signed could be shown on a map such as this. Research should have been directed to the territorial and geographical problems that were created when bands signed treaties, ceding areas that

were not part of their traditional land use and occupancy areas. Statistical diagrams showing the size of each treaty area along with the portion of land that became Indian reserves could have been worked into this map. A pie diagram showing the loss of tribal homelands would have a powerful educational effect. From a geographical point of view, Indian treaties are interesting topics. Yet this map from the *National Atlas* can not be compared to the innovative and scholarly work found in the first volume of the *Historical Atlas of Canada*.² The latter provides many interesting cartographic approaches to the geography of Indian and fur trade history. This work should be consulted when planning maps about Indian and Native history.

Maps are not, as we easily believe, objective forms of knowledge. Both the selection of information for inclusion on a map and the decisions made about cartographic design and presentation styles can combine to support subtly particular interpretations and to downplay alternate interpretations. Some of the information on this map was extracted from material prepared for the First Ministers Conference on Aboriginal Constitutional Reform. An example of how the sponsorship of a map might influence the presentation of information can be drawn from this Indian Treaties map for the *National Atlas*. The territories designated by the Robinson Huron Treaty (1850) and the Williams Treaties (1923) overlap. This map does not reflect or acknowledge the overlap between these two treaties. However, on some issues, such as treaty rights to harvest natural resources, the Robinson Treaty is far more favourable than the Williams Treaties. Yet the design of the map excludes the presentation of the overlap, and only the Williams Treaty is depicted.

This map will be a useful reference, and it will serve to inform the public about some very basic aspects of the geography of treaties. That the *National Atlas of Canada* now considers the treaties as a worthwhile topic should also be acknowledged.

Frank Tough

Notes

- 1 Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, *Indian Treaties*, revised October 1977 (Survey and Mapping Branch, Department of Energy, Mines and Resources). A disclaimer on this edition stated that "This map is an aide-memoire for normal research & merely attempts to show as accurately as possible the geographical boundaries of areas affected by the treaties."
- 2 R. Cole Harris, ed. and Geoffrey J. Matthews, cartographer, *Historical Atlas of Canada* vol. I (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).