DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 893 LI 003 396

TITLE	Co-operate??? Or Co-operate!!! A Symposium on the Need for Co-operation Among Ontario Libraries and the Development of a Network Library System (University of Western Ontario, London, 26 October, 1968).
INSTITUTION	Ontario Resources and Technical Services Group, Windsor.
SPONS AGENCY	Ontario Library Association, Toronto.
PUB DATE	Dec 68
NOTE	48p.; (4 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Libraries; Libraries; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *Library Planning; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	Centralized Processing; Forecasting; *Ontario

ABSTRACT

The five papers presented at this symposium are: (1) "The Librarian and the Porcupine; Experiences With Cooperation and Technical Services in New York State," by Peter J. Paulson; (2) "Interlibrary Cooperation; The Academic Areas," by D. A. Redmon; (3) "The Role of Urban Libraries in Cooperation," by John Dutton; (4) "Library Network; Observations on the Chicago Conference," by Clint Lawson and (5) "SCOPEing the Future of Librarianship in Ontario," by John Wilkinson. (MM)

C O - O P E R A T E ? ?

O R

C O - O P E R A T E ! ! !

A symposium on the need for Co-operation among Ontario libraries and the development of a network library system

sponsored by

THE ONTARIO RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES GROUP

Held at the University of Western Ontario, London
On 26 October, 1968

Windsor, Ontario
Ontario Resources and Technical Services Group
December 1968

C O N T E N T S

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the Council of the Ontario Library Association for the financial support which has made the publication and free distribution of these Proceedings possible.

Conrad Reitz, Chairman
Ontario Resources and Technical
Services Group
c/o University of Windsor Library
Windsor, Ontario

INTRODUCTION

JOHN PARKHILL
Director, Metropolitan Toronto Library Board

The obsequies marking the end of ORTSG were fully as lively as its life, and the symposium that marked the end was characterized above all by a concerned eloquence that ranged from the regional through the academic, the metropolitan, the pastoral, and the scholarly, in a five-sided look at the need for co-operation and the development of a network library system in Ontario.

PETER PAULSON brought news from New York, which never ceases to amaze us neighbours by the variety and fecundity of experiments and ideas being tried on state, regional, and community levels. Their continued sharp scrutiny of library practices, and the influence of the computer, have, on the one hand, produced a flood of surveys and reports, and, on the other, have severely reduced the number of small, inadequate, but independent units that still characterize our own operations. Technical services seem chiefly to have benefited.

DON REDMOND ably drew together, in brief compass, the diverse strands of influence on the contemporary university library--widening scope of service, student power, surveys and reports, needs of users. Particularly heartening to us non-university auditors is the fact of cooperation between his own library and other Ontario university libraries, New York reference and research centres, the Lake Ontario Regional Library System, the Kingston Public Library, a local high school. "Who" indeed "then is my bibliographic neighbor?" he asks.

JOHN DUTTON turned his wry eye on "cooperation" as an occasional Utopia for local politicians wanting to save money. We have, he feared, confused methods and resources--particularly harmful in an area and era of rapidly expanding population, changing educational and living patterns, immigration, economic mobility. What, for instance, in an area like Metropolitan Toronto, can be done to improve systems already complex, but reasonably efficient--unless by very sophisticated automated processes? Grave problems exist and persist: the variety of records

we all maintain; the seeming necessity, no matter what the coordination or standardization, of retaining runt TSD's; fixed costs that no manipulation is likely to reduce; the likelihood of red tape as bureaucracy flourishes; etc. Perhaps resources rather than processes, should be our concern, a systems approach to information and materials. Installation of a simple, even primitive, teletype linkup in the borough and City libraries of Metro Toronto has resulted in a quite fantastic increase in the interloan of materials by means of a simple, but daily, delivery of books and films--a couple of boroughs instituting a similar intraborough system had experienced similar increases. Patrons are finally coming to realize that their collections do not stop with the walls of a buidling or the lines on a map. Of course, increased strains and more evident gaps are also an aftermath, and some way must be found, through strengthened resources and cooperation, to meet needs, with no bounds, psychological or geographical, to the bibliographic search.

CLINT LAWSON brought a report from the 33rd Annual Conference of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School, "Library Networks: Promise and Performance" and, finally, a definition or revelation of the main characteristics of a network as geographical dispersion and dispersal of authority--without the latter, you have a system. A dilemna faces us all as, willingly, or unwillingly, wittingly or unwittingly, we pass from the world of books to a world of information, from the storage of information to its distribution, and the question is: Can librarians make networks move information? The Weinberg report was a vote of no confidence in American librarians; the Science Secretariat report will undoubtedly bring in the same vote with respect to Canada. The principal message of the Chicago conference was that library networks are made up of people--of librarians that need to be programmed, rather than computers, if we are to abandon our petty rivalries and work towards the larger goals of the profession.

JOHN WILKINSON led us on a tough, subtle, and closely-reasoned search of these larger goals. Even yet it seems that we do not have the sophistication of research and analysis to answer even this simple question: Do libraries still fill a need? We have not learned how to determine our market and ensure thereby that we do fill a social need and that "librarianship may well rank among the great responsive disciplines of the future". This future was delineated through a "SCOPE-ing" of librarianship in Ontario, setting, content, objectives, program, evaluation: the hallmarks of which will be research, computer analysis, and bibliographic investigation. Programmes will require networks and systems and every librarian will have a responsibility beyond his own library. Evaluation will have to be much more scientific than heretofore, and our own patterns will have to change, with the librarian more and more becoming a blend of researcher and administrator, and possessed of a total professional outlook.

The writing on the wall would seem to have been made clear again. And we have local and recent evidence of the shape and drift of things. The new universities and the CAATS got going, bibliographically speaking, through cooperation. Regional governments are being imposed, if not enjoyed. County school boards are rising, to challenge perhaps the whole concept of the public library. It would be a pity if, through tone-deafness and sheer stupidity, we went down with the ship, all bands playing--but different tunes of glory!

THE LIBRARIAN AND THE PORCUPINE

Experiences with Co-operation and Technical Services in New York State

PETER J. PAULSON
Principal Librarian for Technical Services
New York State Library

It has been said that librarians approach cooperation in the technical services in much the same way that porcupines make love--with great caution. In an article on "Why libraries Differ", three British authors have put standardization of library practices in the same category as sanctity: one of those "good things that no-one seriously expects to attain and few really want". I think that the question which we are asking today is whether cooperation and standardization in library technical services are really such impossible objectives?

One might begin an examination of this question with the observation that the idea of cooperation in the technical services is not really new. Sixty-five years ago, Charles Cutter wrote:

> "In the last two years a great change has come upon the status of cataloguing in the United States . The Library of Congress has begun furnishing its printed catalogue cards on such liberal terms that any new library would be very foolish not to make its calalogue mainly of them, and the older libraries find them a valuable assistance in the catalogue of their accessions, not so much because they are cheaper as because in the case of most libraries they are better than the library is likely to make for itself."

In the United States, we have had cooperation and standardization of sorts ever since the initiation of the Library of Congress card service, the publication of the first ALA catalogue rules, and the beginning of the National Union Catalogue. To the extent that the Library of Congress subject heading list,

the ALA and LC filing rules, and the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress classifications have been accepted by libraries, we can say that our practices have become standardized--and the interchange of bibliographic data (the essential condition of all library cooperation) has been made possible.

How far has standardization really gone and what are the conditions that determine its effectiveness and extent? Obviously it has been greatest where there has been some clear advantage in utilizing a service outside of the local library--the widespread acceptance of a standard format and a standard descriptive content in the catalogue card, for example, has been brought about by the availability of the LC printed card. Conversely, in those areas uninfluenced by the availability of outside services standardization has been weakest--as exemplified in the way we have assembled these cards in our catalogues, and the extreme permissiveness of the ALA filing rules. Moreover, many libraries have developed local variations in both cataloguing and processing, in spite of the availability of the LC printed card, and we have major libraries which still use their own subject headings. We even have groups of libraries following sharply divergent national norms, as where medical libraries use one form of entry for serials and most of the rest of us use another, or where one group of libraries use the LC and another the DC classification.

As we move forward to greater centralization, we will need to reexamine the cost, necessity, and desireability of these local variations in library technical services. Conformity and standardization are not unmixed blessings. An excellent example of the price exacted by conformity is available in the implementation of the Anglo-American Catalog Code, where even a new library (if it is to have the benefit of LC cataloguing) must accept the constraints put upon LC by its massive existing catalogue, to which the new rules cannot be fully applied. Nevertheless, it is clear that one of the requirements of centralization is conformity, that the efficient and economic use of a centralized product demands that there be fewer local adaptations and variations, and those local adaptations

that are retained will require sound justification.

Despite these difficulties, the years since World War II have witnessed the rapid development of a radical new kind of interlibrary cooperation through the creation of library organizations specifically designed to provide centralized services for local libraries. In New York State, this development has been exemplified by the remarkable growth of the public library systems, where we have moved from some 700 individual libraries carrying on technical services, to some 22 major acquisitions, processing and cataloguing centers. The success of these public library systems has undoubtedly inspired current activities in New York State directed towards the establishment of regional processing centers for school libraries. Today we are talking about further consolidation and centralization, and even about the creation of statewide catalogues, in an attempt to eliminate duplication of effort, to gain the economic advantages of large volume processing, and to create that common bibliographic access which is the prerequisite of common physical access.

A major step towards further centralization in New York State was taken in 1966 with the publication of Centralized Processing for the Public Libraries of New York State, a study prepared by the Nelson Associates (as part of an evaluation of the public library systems) for the Library Development Division of the New York State Library. This study recommended:

1. one cataloguing and acquisition center for all public libraries
2. three processing or book preparation centers
3. a union catalogue in book form, supplanting card catalogues in some libraries

It was discovered in the Nelson study that public libraries in New York State spend some 5 million dollars annually on technical services, and that of 262,000 titles processed each year only 45,000 are unique. Elimination of duplicative

efforts would result in an estimated annual saving of nearly $900,000. The Nelson Associates suggested that 3 to 5 years would be needed for implementing this plan, and that the following questions would need to be resolved:

1. organizational structure
2. financing
3. location
4. cataloguing practices
5. the extent to which old catalogues would be converted

The report also recommended that the cataloguing and acquisitions center utilize data processing techniques.

The outcome of these recommendations has been the formation of the Association of New York Libraries for Technical Services, an organization whose membership consists of the 22 public library systems in New York State. This group has developed an organizational structure, elected a board of nine trustees, chosen a director and a temporary office site, and is proceeding with the implementation of a computer assisted acquisitions system on a pilot or experimental basis.

One of the forces compelling libraries to give even greater consideration to centralization and standardization today is, of course, the promise and potential of computer technology. I should like to review briefly for you some of the projects currently underway in this area, with particular attention to New York State. In recent years, the emphasis in this field has changed from the more esoteric and sophisticated applications associated with information and text retrieval, to what is often described (somewhat inelegantly) as the "housekeeping" functions--by which is meant all of the tasks traditionally regarded as technical services. Research and development in information retrieval goes on, of course, as in Project INTREX at MIT, but in my opinion the most immediately realizable library applications of data processing will be in the area of technical services.

Fundamental to all other projects has been the initiation of Project MARC at the Library of Congress. MARC I was an experiment designed to provide catalogue data in machine readable format to 16 participating libraries. Catalogue copy, subject cross-references, and name cross-references were shipped weekly from LC on machine-readable tapes. These tapes were used experimentally by the participants to create accessions and selection lists, subject bibliographies, book catalogs, and catalog cards. The purpose of the project was to determine the usefulness and feasibility of providing machine readable catalogue copy, to test the adequacy of the record format and its content, and to promote discussion and obtain agreement amongst librarians on a standard format for machine readable copy. On the basis of the experience obtained in this experiment, a revised format (MARC II) has been developed, and MARC II tapes will shortly be available to libraries on a subscription basis.

In order that libraries in New York State might be able to utilize the machine readable catalogue copy which LC provide, the New York State Library has undertaken to sponsor the design of a general system for computer catalogue maintenence. This system was designed with the needs of several potential users in mind. These were:

1. the New York Public Library Research Libraries
2. the new central reference library of the NYPL Branch Libraries
3. the New York State Library
4. the public library cataloguing center proposed by Nelson Associates

As one can infer, a major criterion for this design has been sufficient generality and flexibility to meet the needs of these diverse applications--what it is hoped has been produced is a system sufficiently general to be used in many library situations. A statement of specifications and a detailed system design have been completed, and programming is already underway at the New York Public Library.

The system is capable of producing both book and card catalogues, and of accommodating variations both in the bibliographic data entered and in the content and format of the information printed out.

At the State Library itself, we have undertaken to develop a computer assisted system for serials control. This is a most ambitious undertaking, since it deals with one of the most elusive and inconsistent of the many varieties of materials acquired by libraries. This system will provide automatic follow-up for materials not received; will handle billing, posting, and accounting functions; and will produce printed outputs of holdings for staff use and for eventual state-wide distribution. The first application will be in the handling of some 8,000 currently received non-document serials; a pilot system involving about 1,000 titles has been in operation since February of this year.

The new technologies available to us pose some very serious challenges to librarians, and should cause us to reexamine some of our long-accepted practices. One of the practices we need to look at is in the area of filing rules--the extent to which it is possible to program existing rules for the machine to follow is unknown, although an LC study has been begun. Even in a large catalogue like that of the New York Public Library, as much as 80 o/o of present filing is strictly alphabetical, and we have to ask how much additional sophistication is really worth what we are paying for it. (Of course, the cost of complex filing systems is not a consideration in a machine system alone; we are paying for it now in the high cost of catalogue maintenance, and in the inconvenience to the reader of poor filing). Granted that the catalogue of a large library is an enormously complex body of information, and that our traditional filing rules seek not only to order information but to organize it (as in the chronological arrangement of some subject headings). But do we really need to interfile Mc and Mac, especially when we do not interfile other names which sound alike but are spelled differently?

I believe that we will also need to look again at our cataloguing rules, and, in particular, to seek to devise some method of identifying a work which is

more objective and certain than the present "choice of main entry". We will need to ask whether we are providing subject analysis in sufficient depth, and tied to this question is the need for further research and experimentation in classification systems (are either LC or DC satisfactory?). Is our thinking necessarily bound by past practices in both the content and format of our catalogues? At the New York State Library we found that our first design for a machine printout of our serial holdings looked remarkably like our present serials catalogue, the format of which is quite unique.

How much local variation in cataloguing is necessary? The picture here is mixed, because the computer gives us increased capabilities of rearranging and editing bibliographic data, provided that the data is in the record to begin with. Every variation and amendment, however, will add to our operating costs. We especially need to evaluate more carefully the utility of book and card catalogues, and to study, in quantitative terms, the relative efficiency (for both staff and parton) of various methods of disseminating catalogue information.

Filing rules, catalogue codes, unique bibliographic identifiers, local variation, depth of analysis, conservatism in format and content, book versus card catalogues--these issues are not new, but they are sharpened, made more urgent, and are given new dimensions by the machine technologies now available to us. Today, when so many libraries are considering the creation of new catalogues and the utilization of new methods of storing and disseminating catalogue information, we are offered an opportunity to reopen some of these basic issues in librarianship. The challenge to librarians to be imaginative innovators is no less now than it was some 70 years ago, when Dewey, Cutter, Hanson and others rose so admirably to that challenge. Let us hope that we can meet today's challenge with as much foresight, courage, and good sense as they did.

*****

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION: THE ACADEMIC AREAS

D.A. REDMOND
Chief Librarian
Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.

The October 1 issue of LIBRARY JOURNAL should have been MUST reading for this symposium. I want to mention some of the items in it, and you can start at the first page and work your way through.

A letter from Berkeley says, "Society and the management of information within that society are both undergoing drastic changes. These changes are exerting increasing pressure on institutions -- our libraries, library schools, and library associations, among others -- which were created in an earlier time to respond to earlier needs. ..." It goes on, "The old librarianship, with its emphasis on outmoded management techniques, semi-clerical use of librarians, and traditional patterns of service, will no longer answer to the needs of our changing population, the demands of our information explosion, or recent developments in research and education. A new librarianship is growing up and the libraries, library schools and library associations must all adjust to its needs."

A letter on the next page is from British Columbia, from the redoubtable Charles MacDonald at Simon Fraser University: "Central to the brief (on academic status) presented by our committee (at CLA in Jasper last June) was a change in the status of librarians to make it closer to that of faculty, changing the power structure of libraries from the prevalent hierarchical one to a democratically oriented one which would broaden the base of decision making and make use of the professional abilities of a much larger percentage of university librarians."

A few pages further is a news report headed "New York State Libraries Extend NYSILL Experiment" which says: "New York state libraries will continue to try to make a statewide inter-library loan network function efficiently despite mixed results in the first eight months of network operation ... Of the academic users of the NYSILL network, only one third reported satisfaction with the service, and one-quarter of the schools switched to nonparticipating libraries to avoid using NYSILL. Academic users, either students or faculty members, accounted for a substantial 41 percent of all requests processed. Of all the filled requests, 39 percent were for use in academic course work, 34 percent for independent research..." I would be tempted to read more of the article but the mechanics of cooperation, or more accurately the grit in the gears, is irrelevant to the theory which we are considering today.

Over the next leaf is another news item: "Colorado Processing Center to Get One-Year Trial. A cooperative book processing center serving six state-supported colleges and universities in Colorado will launch a one-year trial run early in 1969... A grant...from the National Science Foundation will

pay the tab for the year. Participating libraries have already paid $66,000 toward establishment of the center..."

I could belabor this theme of browsing through one issue of LIBRARY JOURNAL and I will desist with one more small item: The first two items in the LJ Checklist are a guide to sources of information in the area of centralization and cooperation, published by the Illinois library school, and our own Canadian (and U.S.) library telecommunications directory.

These things illustrate which way the winds are blowing, what a few of these drafts are, and perhaps also that the first reaction to a wind is that the dirty linen flaps in the breeze.

I should like to add my personal involvement in inter-library affairs -- neither to boast, nor to prove my expertise, but to indicate the extent to which a university librarian gets involved in cooperation. I am secretary of the Ontario Council of University Librarians (which includes the fourteen provincially-supported university libraries); I've just assumed the presidency, owing to the most regrettable resignation of Rev. Gib Hallam, of the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, and I am chairman of CACUL's Committee on Position Classification and Salary Scales. I am a member of the Committee on Library Services of the Ontario Council of Health, which is considering how best to bring health sciences information to the potential need across the province. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Graduate and Research Library Requirements, headed by Bob Blackburn, set up by the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Now what do all these things mean? What exactly are these pressures that increasingly mean, to a university library -- I can use the phrase "academic library" interchangeably I think -- that mean an academic library must be involved in at least a cooperative drift, if not a conscious thrust toward cooperation?

First, the scope of academic interests. This one is obvious. All knowledge, everybody's business, the government's business, is the province of the university scholar, teacher, researcher and consultant. No one library can hold everything these people want. The obvious answer, since none of us can grow large enough, is that we must cooperate, to make best use of the money we can spend and the collections we can gather.

Second, the thrust of student power. It is not a simple as that phrase sounds. Student power, a silly and misused phrase, is one manifestation of a dissatisfaction with institutions as they are. I expect you have seen LIFE magazine's October 18 issue, containing an analysis of the SDS movement as one of these manifestations. In short, a raw exposure of the things which were straws in the wind two years ago, six months ago, first in the St. John Report and lately in the Hall-Dennis

Report. In short, that all libraries had better cooperate, that all sources of information had better link themselves, not because a single library system is better administratively -- it is not -- or because a single government department will simplify things -- no government agency ever simplifies anything, that is clear according to Mr. Parkinson's Laws -- but all libraries had better link themselves in order to supply information more effectively to all users, all of Ontario, all of Porcupine Falls in the Northwest and all of the Spadina slums in Toronto.

All right, this causes consternation. I am not saying at this point that I advocate the system sketched by St. John in the first gospel, or by Hall and Dennis in their revised version of the gospel. I am not saying either that I take the opposite pole, as I know some of my university library colleagues do, here in Ontario, that our university libraries cannot be opened to high school students, and to public library patrons, or to the needs of the regional libraries. I ask, why not? The reasons I get are chiefly pragmatic and temporary ones -- that our library has no space, or not enough books, to serve its own students.

Fine, I say. Get more space and get enough books, and start cooperating with regional librarians and public librarians and high school students. Some of the high school students are younger and sillier and wear even longer hair than the university students, if that is possible, but few of them bite, and not many of them steal any more books than do our own students.

In short, our university libraries must cooperate among themselves, as a system or network, because only by pooling our resources will we have all the materials to satisfy -- if indeed it is possible to satisfy -- our own academic community, which is our prime duty. In order to do this, the Ontario universities are groping and planning toward an Ontario Universities Bibliographic Center, and intensification of the systems already operating -- first, speedy and effective interlibrary loan, or perhaps we should call it by a wider term such as interlibrary transfer of material. Second, communication by speedy modern means -- telephone, teletype -- computer links will be next, as soon as the benefits measure up to the cost. Third, interlibrary transport so that not only mountains of library materials may be brought to Professor Mahomet, and the Inter-University Transit System is already transporting between one and two tons of that information mountain per month -- not only that, but so Professor Mahomet may be transported to the bigger mountain, to dig in it at his pleasure.

But further than cooperating among themselves: the university libraries are already looking beyond provincial borders. We cannot become victims of provincialism in any of the senses of that word -- in financial or political limits,

in cultural narrowness, or in plain fear of distance. I had a telephone call the other day. It was an invitation for Queen's to join a group of university libraries which were setting up a computerized data bank, using files of some hundreds of thousands of items already available. So what was so novel about this? Just this: It was a phone call from a university library in New York State, and their thinking was running across provincial and national boundaries. So too, a representative of Queen's University joins a regional librarian from Ontario every month, and travels to the regular meeting of one of the New York State regional reference and research resources areas, as a welcome participant and valued contributor to discussion.

That same Queen's librarian, or perhaps I should just say our reference and research division, works closely with the regional library, the Lake Ontario Regional Library System, based at Kingston. So does it also with the Kingston Public Library. If patrons cannot obtain what they need at the public or regional library levels, those librarians bring their problems and needs to the Queen's libraries.

As the largest library in the area, how could we afford to refuse them?

And what effect does this have on us? How does it overload us? Not at all. When our regular operating load is about twenty thousand transactions a month, counting open-shelf use of material probably over a thousand a day, neither our formal interlibrary loan traffic, in and out, of about four hundred a month, nor the few dozen requests from the public and regional libraries,matter at all. Indeed I hope and think they generate more interest and goodwill for the university library, and result in our locating more material for our archives, and as other donations, than they cause workload or occupy seats.

Even the much-maligned high school students are no excessive problem. Once a year when exam fever strikes the campus, we may have to restrict high-school students to a specific area of the library because they tend to gather in corners, whisper and giggle. Fortunately their exam period comes when ours is over, so they become the intense ones using our seating when the university's slack June season arrives. But just across the street from the Queen's campus is one of the city high schools, which this year is in the agonies of remodeling and expansion. Their own librarian has been transferred bodily to another high school. They have no lockers, no study halls, no cafeteria, no offices for the principal's staff, nothing but some makeshift classrooms and concrete dust. Should the university library refuse to allow these students access to its hallowed halls? Especially when some hundreds of them will be coming across the street in the following years to attend this same university and read in this same library? Don't be foolish.

One of the exciting developments under our wing and

roof in the past year has been John Archer's impact on our University Archives. We were most fortunate to attract John when he left the Presidency of CLA, and the librarianship of McGill, as an Associate Professor of History and University Archivist. He has traveled the breadth of Canada, and the back roads of Ontario, and has garnered tons of unique and irresistible material of historic value. He has incidentally turned the provincial and national archives slightly green with envy and jealousy. He has made it clear that the business of a university library, and of a university archives, is the business of recording a nation, a culture, a society, of delighting in these records, and of making them available for use. Is this outreach not also cooperation?

This then is a capsule of my philosophy not only of a university library, but of interlibrary cooperation as it extends to the university library: It can be expressed pretty much in the Five Laws of Library Science, those cryptic words of Doctor Ranganathan, which I fear most librarians on this continent tend to rank beside the annual Sadie Hawkins Day predictions of Old Man Mose -- confoozin' but amoozin', and take warnin' that if you ignore them something dire will happen, but what, because it hasn't happened yet? And I will add to the Five Laws of Ranganathan the motto of -- with all due respect to OLA -- my favorite library association, the one from which I try to recruit dynamic staff members, the Special Libraries Association. Here are the five laws:

Books are for use
Every reader his book
Every book its reader
Save the time of the reader
Library is a growing organism

And here is the motto: Putting knowledge to work.

Whatever the reader, and his problem, and wherever he be; if the answer to his problem is in my library, and he cannot find it elsewhere, these laws indicate my duty as a librarian. Who then is my bibliographic neighbor?

****

THE ROLE OF URBAN LIBRARIES IN CO-OPERATION

JOHN E. DUTTON
Chief Librarian
North York Public Library

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I feel very much like the ham in the sandwich; the middle speaker in a panel of five is not an enviable position. It is extremely easy to feel self conscious on a panel consisting of strong academic types, a representative from another country, and an honored member of the teacher fraternity.....Come to think of it I am self conscious Mr. Chairman, but for all that I am glad to be here to add something to the discussions on what must be one of the most important questions occupying todays Librarians -- cooperation.

One of the characteristics of the day is the coming and going of ideas and styles. Today systems approach "cooperation", the magic key which will unlock the door of a library utopia. You help me, and I'll help you, and together we conquer all. Such is the impact of these ideas that it will only require a little effort on the part of some wise colleague to pen a sort of Hippocratic Oath for librarians which shall go something like this:-

> "I believe in Motherhood, the sanctity of multi media collections, the pill, and do solemnly declare that through all the frustrations and necessitudes of my professional life; I shall cooperate, cooperate, cooperate, cooperate --------"

What a lovely world it will be, and me I'll be dead I guess!!!

But lets not dwell on the facetious. Ours is a serious question of the day.

The information I received is that we are to talk of the necessity of certain things like cooperative book selection, ordering, catalogoing, processing, and card reproduction and the O.R.T.S.G. are to be commended for bringing us together for these discussions.

There has been a great deal of talk about cooperation in these areas - talk that has sometimes resulted in misinformation being acquired by those responsible for our library systems, our Boards, and those who pay the price - Our Local politicians. Too often we have got the idea across that cooperation particularly in the field of technical services will save money and thus control budgets. Or, in the book selection process an opinion has been left hanging that cooperation will in some way reduce something called duplication which in turn means that money can be saved in some miraculous fashion. In my own experience in the Metro area I have had to spend too much time correcting some of these false impressions - impressions that we ourselves have undoubtedly created because our phrasing has not been precise, and we have seized on any argument to justify a case.

I am not interested in cooperative projects that save money per se. This reason may be the last reason for going cooperative as far as I

am concerned whatever methods one uses it is going to cost money, likely more than we have and regardless of how much cooperation we have in our book buying program I can see only a continuing shortage, and possibly an increasing shortage of books in Metro as the years go by. Which means obviously more and more money will be required to do the job.

There seems to have developed a certain magic about cooperation, and bringing things together under one roof, which has distorted some of the basic facts of life in our profession and perhaps even started us down the wrong path in many instances.

In terms of the cooperative movement I would like to suggest that there is a confusion or a fuzzy thinking in our minds between the methods we use on the one hand, and the resources which we are gathering around us on the other. Granted these two facets of our work come together in terms of service to the public, but they may be considered separate in terms of areas of mutual cooperation. This confusion I feel is made even worse when we tend to take a generalization and apply it to all levels of our endeavor as a great and immutable truth.

Let us therefore stop for a moment and examine these two areas of library activity, and ask some questions about them with a view to clariying our thinking in terms of areas of cooperation. I want to use as my point of reference the Metro area for two reasons; one is obvious and

that is that it is the area about which I am most familiar; the other is that I am convinced in my own mind that each area may have its own uniqueness and please don't anybody rise up in indignation and talk about Torontonians being superior, goody goodies or what have you. I am merely trying to express facts of life.

In the Metro area there are seven public libraries, five of which in Canadian terms are large, and two are in the average or slightly larger bracket. In three of these five large libraries we are trying desperately to keep up with very rapidly expanding suburban populations. In all libraries involved there are several factors at work which include a fantastic pressure to meet new demands created by formal and compulsory education patterns, the tertiary level of education which has expanded so rapidly and includes so many thousands of people on a casual or part time level; the fantastic change in living patterns created by more leisure, wealth and generally higher educational levels; the influx of citizens of other countries; and the change in social and economic conditions throughout the area. These changes are placing demands on our libraries that can be met only by providing vastly increased quantities of library materials. Thus our technical processing departments are working to meet constantly increasing demands on a variety of levels. Most libraries have made some significant efforts at reducing the amount of time spent in the various processes. The introducation of machines for making cards, xeroxing cards, photographing

L.C. copy, simplifying records, less checking etc., and a wide variety of small changes made in an effort to speed up the flow of books. In other words the picture I am trying to paint is of a group of T.S.D's working to capacity in their own areas to meet in all instances specific demands of their systems. A successful cooperative venture must have one result and one result only and that is for at least the equivalent total cost more books are made available, and the end product meets the requirements or standards of each library. Can cooperative cataloguing achieve these results? In an urban setting I question it unless there is a very sophisticated automated process which to be successful would likely require the reprocessing of all existing collections.

In smaller libraries where the T.S. work is done in conjunction with a variety of other jobs, and likely in space that is far from efficient, I am sure centralizing is a boon, a dream come true.

I would like to add too that for a large library with many branches and departments we have convinced ourselves of the need of a variety of records in order to know where material is. These records are expensive to service and I frankly have mixed feelings about them, but as yet we at least have not had the courage to discontinue them. The servicing of these records will still have to be done, necessitating at least a rump (if you'll pardon the expression) of a T.S.D. in a library such as our own.

And then too the fixed unit costs of handling a book are often overlooked. The process of gluing, stamping jacketing, lettering etc., all these things are unit costs which are not materially reduced by a larger operation.

Dare I add that in all this is also the fear of red tape in bureaucracy. That service is not good now but with the increased amount of handling required it could be worse rather than better. So, Ladies and Gentlemen I am convinced that creating one large T.S.D. is not necessarily the answer at this time in the present state of development of our knowledge and expertise.

Looking at the other area the question of cooperation on resources is something else again. The question in Metro has been clouded by the existence of one library with a well developed collection relating to several other libraries most of which are involved in a daily battle to acquire books for new collections in new libraries which are over worked and under stocked within minutes of opening. But to my mind our resources must be the focal point of our concern even if to date we have done little to meet the challenge being presented. This however is not a positive approach to cooperative enterprises and does not reflect the real progress that is now being made in the Metropolitan area. Now that there is a Library Director for Metro,

and the Metro Library Board has undertaken the functioning of a library system the stage appears to be set for something resembling a systems approach to information and materials in the Metro, City and Borough Libraries. One of the hurdles that has been overcome has been that the Metro Board and Director can act and does act as the liaison, a sort of honest broker who tries to do the best for all parties. Our first steps at cooperation have been tentative and by no means spectacular. Recognizing the new ideas of the multi media nature of public libraries we tackled aspects of film use first and as an aside I can perhaps mention that for one year what was formerly known as the Metropolitan Film Library, a subsidiary of the Toronto and District Film Council was run by a duly incorporated non-profit company comprising the public libraries of Toronto. The Chief Librarians were the Directors of the Company, and we ran it very well - increased budget, more films, more staff etc. However, in July the Metropolitan Library Board assumed the assets and the control of the service, and it is now running under its direction. But service to the borrower improved considerably and demand rose rather remarkably as we worked out a system of interchange, rapid transit, and perhaps the crowning glory, free film distribution in Metro.

One of the most interesting aspects of this film cooperation has been the mutual stimulation of effort brought about by meeting and discussing

together in a formal setting the needs of a good contemporary film service. I might even go so far as to say that there is a healthy competitive spirit, the beneficiary of which is the public. We talk about getting together and exchanging ideas, but how often do we do it regularly. At the present time the film service is on the agenda of each Chief Librarians' Meeting - held monthly, and to assist in the operation of the central service there is an advisory committee of Audio Visual Librarians. We all hate to go to meetings but this structure approach has certainly done a great deal to develop mutual cooperation

Currently our attention has been turned to the question of cooperation on our book materials. Traditionally we have had a form of Union Catalogue in terms of the Metro Bibliographic Centre, but access to, and use of its bibliographic resources tended to be tied up in traditional and extremely slow methods of elliciting information. In October, however, we started swinging and introduced a Metro wide teleprinter hook-up with daily book pick-up and delivery service between Borough libraries. Talk about a flood of paper. The response to this communication system has been three to four times what was expected and the forecast is for an ever increasing response as the weeks go by.

The same type of reaction took place this past year when we in North

York connected our large Branches by teleprinter. Statistics always look good on a paper like this so I'll toss in one here for good measure. In 1967, in ten months one library handled 675 system loans, that is sent out or received 675 books. In the same period in 1968 the figure jumped 244% to 1,645 books, and the only changes were the introduction of a better communications system and a simplification of procedures.

From this activity pertinent questions are beginning to emerge, and these do relate to the questions posed initially in these discussions. To my mind the biggest and most important question is that relating to book stocks and the book selection policy. Lack of funds has always given us an excuse for not having materials, but this situation is not as serious as it once was and with demand being met more promptly and efficientiy there is no doubt that even greater demands will be placed on our materials. I am not sure centralized book selection or acquisition enters into this but certainly the question of agreed responsibility for individual libraries to specialize in certain subject areas for the benefit of all libraries in a given area is most important. This implies a much more clearly defined policy of stock building devoid perhaps of many of the generalities of book selection policies, if this is possible. This question of agreed areas of specialization has been broached in our Metro area and I think has been met with a certain apprehension as we survey the vast gaps in

many of our collections and yet somewhere a start must be made regardless of our state today if we are to achieve objectives in five or ten years from now.

One area that I have not touched on and upon which I am not very conversant is the question of cooperation between libraries. Scarborough is leading the field in Metro, and is to be commended on its interlocking system with the Community College and other Institutions. But, obviously the inter-relationship of institutions dealing with people and education is becoming more complex and more interdependent.

Expermental work has also been done in bibliographic, searching for book information. A pilot project was demonstrated this Spring in which remote consoles were used in one library to obtain bibliographic information in another. The test demonstrated the feasibility of the approach, and of course raised the possibilities of facsimile transmission and other wonderful visions.

Perhaps Metro has a unique position in Ontario. It is large, it has a wide variety of libraries giving service on every conceiveable level and by this I am not rating this service. It is in a wonderful position to try out new ideas, and new methods. The expertise is available on a variety of levels if we can only obtain the necessary financial backing to unlock the resources we have to build for the future.

Mr. Chairman I have not answered any great questions but rather have tried to cast some attention on specific areas of this large and complex question of cooperation.

To my mind the future can be in one direction and one direction only and that our patrons are not the people living in arbitrarily defined geographic boundaries. Our materials are not those which are psychologically chained to shelves in another arbitararily defined geographic area. Rather our thinking is to be directed to every man regardless of his street address, and to every book regardless of the ex libris book plate, concepts of service not merely concepts of organization of work. The latter may come as we learn more about the service needs. It looks good for the future in Metro.

****

LIBRARY NETWORK
OBSERVATION ON THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE

CLINT LAWSON
Head of Processing
Midwestern Regional Library System, Kitchener, Ont.

I was both puzzled and flattered when the Secretary, Mr. Phelps, invited me to participate in a program which, in my estimation, already had an overabundance of first-rate speakers. Then I recalled an incident at the OLA annual meeting in Hamilton that seemed to throw some light on this invitation.

John Wilkinson and I were pacing about looking for the action when it came to our ears that our honorable chairman was behind locked doors in one of the hotel rooms with several enterprising members of the opposite sex. Rumor had it that the ORTSG was having an executive meeting!

As befits those concerned with the good name of our profession, we decided to investigate. Wise in the ways of the world John made a phone call, "We're coming up", was the gist of the conversation. A few minutes later Carolyn Pawley was barricading the doorway to her room.

"But we're having a meeting!" she protested.

"But we're thirsty!" responded John.

That seemed to get to the heart of the matter. The barricade stepped aside. We entered. Sitting on a bed with a glass in hand, and surrounded by three or four starry-eyed females was our illustrious chairman.

Our intrusion was scarcely noticed; they carried right on with what they were doing, namely, having a meeting! Needless to say that wasn't exactly the kind of action John and I were looking for.

Before we left, however, Conrad said something to the effect that he wanted to make this last meeting of the old ORTSG a real humdinger. It would go out, not with whimper, but a bang. The ORTSG would be laid to rest with proper ceremony.

And so we are gathered here today to bury a faithful friend who has served us well. It is fitting that this be done with dignity. It is equally fitting that it should be done by someone who has had experience in these matters. As one possessing the necessary credentials for a commital service my appearance on this program seemed perfectly logical! (A few weeks ago a phone call from Windsor suggested that my attendance at the 33rd Annual Conference of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School might also have something to do with it).

Out of my past comes the story of an Anglican bishop peacefully reading his Bible in a compartment of an English train that was taking him outside of London to officiate at the dedication of a new church. At one stop a drunk stumbled into the compartment. Only momentarily awed by the sight of this distinguished cleric regaled in the costume of his office, the drunk decided to initiate a little conservation: "I don't believe in the Bible", was his opening thrust. The Bishop cocked an eye, and kept on reading. Not to be discouraged the drunk decided to thrust a little deeper: "And I don't believe in the Church", he added.

The Bishop turned from his book and gave him a look that would have silenced better men. He then returned to his reading. But the drunk was not to be put off. "And furthermore", he shouted, "I don't believe in God".

"In that case", replied the Bishop, "would you mind going to hell quietly?"

With five speakers line up between 10.30 lunch it is obvious that the ORTSG isn't going to hell quietly!

Well, what did I learn at Chicago this summer that might be relevant to technical services librarians of Ontario? the theme of the conference was "Library networks: promise and performance".

Networks has become a very common, and a very important word in library circles. Unfortunately none of the experts at Chicago bothered to define it, at least not until the end of third day when Ruth Davis of the National Library of Medicine at Bethesda, Maryland- the only woman on the program, her paper was one of the best - she suggested that one of the main characteristics of a network is distance, <u>geographical</u> dispersal. I venture to suggest another, and probably equally important characteristic, and that is a dispersal of <u>authority</u>. To eliminate this characteristic by the imposition of a unified administration is to reduce a network to a system. Beyond this suggestion I leave it to you to decide what is meant by a library network.

At this juncture in my preparation I was tempted to explore something of the background of network thinking within the Province of Ontario. My mind wondered back to the 1965 St. John Report - that ill-documented but perhaps prophetic survey of library development in Ontario - and to Francis St. John's recommendation that the public and school libraries should resolve themselves into a network whose focus would be a cataloging center functioning out of the Technical Services division of the Toronto Public Library. A similar network for colleges and universities was proposed to operate out of the University of Toronto.

While I have nobly resisted this temptation in order to get us to Chicago with no further delay, permit me in passing to point out a connection between networks and centralized cataloging that squarely puts the issue into the technical service's camp. Many of us are prone to think

of networks as something that chiefly concerns reference and public service librarians. Well it just ain't so!

Anyway, I started out for Chicago full of expectations of what I would hear and learn about all the marvelous technological advances that made networks a joy to behold. Telex and TWX invaded my dreams; telefacsimilie transmission, and computers loomed large in my thoughts, probably because so much library literature talks about automation and networks as if they were but different facets of the same subject. For example, the opening paragraph of the section dealing with Systems and networks in the Downs' report talks about "one total information system using computers"[1] And so it goes; by association of ideas we hear "networks", and think of computers or some other electronic gadgets.

Towards the end of the third day of concentrated lectures and discussions it dawned on me that my dreams and expectations of the Chicago Conference were not going to be realized. And this was good, because something better had taken their place - something much more basic. The dominant concern of the Conference was neither the techniques of network management, nor the technology that makes it both possible and imperative. The dominant concern was people, librarians, to be exact - librarians wrestling not so much with the how of their profession, but with the why - trying to discover what their role is in the latter half of the 20th century.

---

1. Downs, Robert, Resources of Canadian Academic and Research Libraries Ottawa, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1967, p. 158.

Please don't misunderstand me; there was an abundance of concrete problems and effective solutions. The papers dealt with politics, finances, and cooperation between libraries of all kinds and sizes. No time was lost on gloomy professional introspection. But there was a mood of concern, a mood reflected by Dean Swanson in a personal anecdote:

> Neal Harlow was driving him to Rutgers where he was scheduled to present a paper. After several odd turns on cloverleafs and highways Neal casually remarked, "You know, Don, we are going in the wrong direction, but it's the only way to go!"

I suggest that much of the anxiety and apprehension concerning the role of the librarian in the 20th century is a product of the ambiguity generated by the fact that we are going in the wrong direction because there is no other way to go.

For me the Chicago Conference was a sobering experience, because it put into clear perspective the dilemma which no thoughtful librarian can avoid - it is the dilemma created by the extension of librarianship from the world of books to the world of information. And not simply the storage of information, but the distribution of information.

In an article entitled "Teenagers read anything and everything" in the summer issue of Index, Joan Laird puts her finger on the problem when she quotes the reaction of one student who was questioned about getting books from the library. "The library! Come on, man - who goes to the library for books. You go to find out things"[1]. She goes on to suggest that

---

1. p. 12

"teenagers tend to consult hardcover books, and they read paperbacks".

So this is our problem - the shift from books to information. And what are we doing about it? In the September issue of Quill & Quire, Diana Mason tells us what we're doing about it: "The business-industrial world", she says, "needs librarians to assist it in collecting and disseminating information - it has the material and we have the know how!"[1] Unfortunately for Mrs. Mason the typesetter had a different view of the role of librarians; instead of disseminating, he came up with decimating, which somehow gets painfully close to the truth!

And it's this truth, the truth that librarians have been rather effective at decimating information, that gave a certain edge to the Chicago Conference. Networks exist to move information. Can librarians make them work? Mrs. Mason seems to think so. I have my doubts. A growing body of professional people, variously known as Systems Engineers or Documentalists, says we can't. And the State of New York is spending a large chunk of money to find out.

In 1963 Alvin Weinberg tabled the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Science, government, and information recommending the establishment of special information centers to serve the complex needs of a technological society. It was, as far as U.S. librarians were concerned, a vote of no confidence at the highest level.

In case you have forgotten, let me remind you that a special Study Group of the Science Secretariat is on the verge of submitting a report to the Privy Council office that will probably be nothing more or less than

---

1. "Canadian Librarian Association Meets in the Mountain", Quill & Quire, v.34, no. 5, Sept. 1968, p. 27.

a Canadianized version of the Weinberg report. I hope I'm wrong, but the mood of technocrats and politicians is not favorably disposed towards libraries, public or academic.

In an article prepared for publication in the Ontario Library Review, Stan Beacock concludes, "It will be most unfortunate if, as a result of the report of the Study Group of the Science Secretariat, the decision is made to duplicate Federally what is established, at least embryonically, in the Provinces."

Whether or not the Federal Government can afford to wait the birth and development of these "Provincial embryos" is a question I gladly leave for you to answer.

There is a great deal which could be said about the Chicago Conference. I could tell you about an excellent paper that sketched in graphic detail the political chaos in, through, and over which library networks must operate. The librarian of Wayne State University described eight distinct areas of cooperative ventures among libraries of different types, the conditions that made these ventures possible, and the gaps and failures that remain. The concerns of Public, University, and Special Libraries were well presented. Perhaps the most encouraging and stimulating papers came from Gilbert Prentiss and John Cory of New York State.

But all these lectures will be available in the annual publication of proceedings. I commend them to you. While these papers will not give you the atmosphere of the Conference, they will testify to the fact that some tremendously capable people had come together to wrestle with a crucial library problem. What a pity that only three Canadian librarians attended!

With time running out on me I return to the one most important thing that I learned in Chicago; I learned that first and foremost library networks are made up of librarians. Not hardware, but people. Communications have to be established between librarians before communications between libraries can be effective. It is librarians, not computers, that need to be programmed if there is to be a transition from the decimation of information to the dissemination of information.

It is librarians who must abandon their narrow institutional interests and loyalties in order to discover a purpose, a goal, that embraces the whole community. Only as we are able to rise above the petty rivalries that afflict our profession

- only as we are able to meet as librarians, not university librarians, not special librarians, not public librarians, not children's librarians, but as LIBRARIANS

- only then will we possess that one ingredient apart from which all efforts to establish library networks are an exercise in futility.

The story is told of a wealthy southerner who was sailing his boat with the help of an old negro servant. As night came on he grew weary; turning the tiller over to his servant, and pointing out the north star by which he was to steer the boat, he went below, climbed into his bunk and fell asleep. As the hours wore on the old negro began to doze; his head would nod, then he'd awake with a start, search out the north star, and bring the boat back on course. Several times this happened, till at last he slept a little too long. When he woke up the sky was a mass of glittering stars. Where the north star was he had not the faintest notion. Being a resourceful chap he went below and roused his employer, "Wake up, boss, wake up," he said. "Point me out another star; we done passed that one by!"

And the moral of the story? There is no other star available to the profession that falls asleep on the job.

****

"SCOPE"ING THE FUTURE OF LIBRARIANSHIP IN ONTARIO

JOHN WILKINSON
Professor, School of Library and Information Science
University of Toronto

It is a truism that prediction is all too often an exercise in futility. Even the most learned forecast may be rendered twaddle by the unforeseen modification of one basic variable. Yet there is in librarianship, it seems to me, a logic implicit in our present position which, if extrapolated, allows us to suggest what our position should be in the future. Indeed, it may not be too pessimistic to wonder whether -- unless we as librarians do soon learn to act upon, and plan in terms of, that implicit logic -- the 1999 edition of Webster's may not define librarianship as "a sub-category of information science, in common use until the last quarter of the twentieth century but now obsolete."

To be logical, then, let us begin by recognizing that any social organism is only viable if it answers a recognized need. Libraries exist through no inherent right or cultural axiom. They exist because they have in the past formed an acceptable response to a social challenge. The earliest universities, for example, did without libraries, and the universities of the future might do the same if the audience they represent finds a preferable alternative. It is, therefore, for all types of libraries, a matter of sheer survival to join together in investigating--and, if desirable, applying--possible alternatives to our present level of social response. Otherwise, society itself may find an alternative which excludes librarianship from consideration. To find any valid response, however, we must objectively understand the need. Particularly must we be alert to potential changes in that need. And the only consistent method of analyzing and evaluating audience

needs is through research and analysis at a level of sophistication generally beyond our present powers.

Moreover, our stress upon research into the sociology and psychology of the need we must supply will have to pre-empt to a very considerable extent our traditional pre-occupation with the supply per se. We have, it seems to me, placed ourselves in the wholly illogical position of marketing a multi-million dollar product, without having first determined (through the library equivalent of a scientific market analysis) just what the market for our product is. Thus, in the future librarianship will have to, as Daniel Bergen has written, "abandon its historical-bibliographic emphasis for a base in the social sciences."[1] To which base may be added a strong underpinning of computer science.

The future of librarianship in Ontario, as elsewhere, depends, upon our ability to research our actual and potential market; to develop and administer an acceptable product; and to justify to society (including ourselves) the critical path we have chosen to use from the investigated need to our researched response. If we can do all this, then the logic of our position presents us with an opportunity to legitimately fill a social need of such importance and urgency that librarianship may well rank among the great responsive disciplines of the future. To start at all, however, we must find a framework for our analysis of the future needs which we will meet. As an example of what I mean, let me now apply Pierre De Serres' 'scope'ing technique as he developed it in the July issue of the IPLO Newsletter.

---

[1] Daniel Bergen, "Librarians and the bipolarization of the academic enterprise". p. 479.

To 'scope' a process is simply to examine it in terms of its five basic components-- setting, content, objectives, program, and evaluation. To 'scope' the future of librarianship in Ontario, therefore, we must forecast the probable evolution of these components as they apply to the interaction of the three elements of the library process--the user, the material, and the service. I cannot do it, of course, nor perhaps can any single librarian; but librarianship as a whole, if it is to survive as a profession, can and must apply this, or some alternative technique, to the logical implications I have postulated. Driven, then, by the challenge of this panel (and by the belief that one way to get action is to incur reaction), I will for the next fifteen minutes suggest a very tentative, and very inadequate example of the 'scope'ing approach.

With respect to setting--and by 'setting' I mean 'background or surroundings'--the future of Ontario librarianship will hopefully change in degree but not in kind during our lifetime. I do not myself envisage, for example, any radical change in the geographic area of our Province. Nor, barring such variables as nuclear annihilation or a major depression, do I expect the economic or political settings to alter their basic nature. I suspect, however, that government intervention in all phases of our lives will increase. The educational setting will be modified by a continuation of the trend towards a better educated 'common man'. This 'man' will demand more of his information services, and will procure an increasing amount of that information from centres other than libraries. However, the library in the educational setting will remain the basic repository of primary data upon which other

information systems will draw. Indeed, the need to further the democratic library's traditional role of permitting access to all points of view will increase as the trend towards automated preselection of data increases. For let us never forget, however we may predict our future, that it is and must remain the basic mission and faith of librarianship in a democratic society to provide the free access to uncensored knowledge without which democracy cannot survive. If such a mission sounds naively idealistic, let us also remember that idealism, truly held, has always been a hallmark and a rallying point for professionalism in a pragmatic world. In this respect, then, our future must not be allowed to change.

However, although in some respects I do not see any radical change in our setting, and although I do cling to at least one of our basic and traditional functions, I do predict, in turning to the content of librarianship, that the relationship between the user, the material, and the service will undergo important modifications. Again, I am in part conservative. I believe, for example, that sources of information will remain essentially print oriented (after all, microform--which many in the 1940's thought would replace the book--now appears to have settled down as a useful adjunct). Furthermore, I do not believe that the proportion of regular library users in the population will necessarily increase significantly. On the other hand, I venture to predict that those who do use the library will more and more expect what we now refer to as 'liberal' reference service, and that peripheral sources of information--both automated and manual-- will multiply very rapidly to increase the effective depth of such service. In other words, there will be, in the future

of librarianship in Ontario, a very significant change in the relationship between the user and the material; and the corresponding change in our library service must involve highly sophisticated socio-psychological research and computer analysis, as well as a level of bibliographic investigation much deeper than that in which we now engage.

If follows, if I am predicting reasonably accurately thus far, that the objectives of Ontario librarianship will also undergo sharp modification in the next few decades. Indeed, some would argue that the operative word here should not be 'modification' but 'formulation' In truth, it is difficult at times to determine what our present objectives are. Admittedly we have our "do's and don't for librarians" as set forth for the IPLO six year ago; but few of us seem aware of them, and the philosophy we do subscribe to seems at times to amount to little more than an endoresement of virtue. As Neal Harlow told us over a decade ago (and his warning is still applicable), ". . . we have generated no distinctive hypothesis concerning ourselves and our mission, established no theoretical base, no prototype upon which to pattern education and practice. We have been content to do what comes naturally."[2] But opportunism can not substitute for objectives. "Doing what comes naturally" will not do instead of user analysis, market research, and feasibility studies. We must and, I believe will, develop generally acceptable objectives in three distinct areas of our field: the input area (which encompasses the general functions of selection and acquisition); the storage area (which includes the organization function); and the output area (which includes all public services).

[2] Neal Harlow, "The education problem". p. 87.

With respect to input, we will develop objectives which must include full co-operation not only between libraries of a given type, but also between different types of libraries. Such objectives must satisfy not isolated individual or institutional egos but the integrated total of social demand; and, insofar as we have thus far failed to generate a theoretical base for our profession, it may be in part because we have failed to recognize a claim higher than that of the institution we serve. Too few of us have had the time or the inclination to view our input role in its broadest sense.

With respect to storage, I predict that we will formulate objectives to meet the stringent requirements of information retrieval from the documents which will continue to be our main storage component. The cost and expertise involved in such 'in-depth' retrieval will force us to both share and standardize our storage resources. Our objectives will reflect this necessity for a shared response, again not only within a type of library but between types of libraries.

With respect to output, our objectives will grow out of an identification of the valid needs of our society; and out of a determination to meet those needs regardless of cost, simply because we believe and can show that the needs are valid and must be met. Here, I am convinced, we must develop an ethical and emotional creed similar to that embodied in the Hippocratic oath, we must seek the social validity of our output in the basic need of a democratic society for an active and untrammeled system of total information dissemination. It is perhaps pertinent to my predictions in this

area to note that discussion in some quarters of library education appears already to be centering less upon the teaching of the traditional 'type of library' approach, and more upon the 'type of reader' orientation. Every type of library has its 'research' oriented user, its casual or recreational user, and its non-user (who might find library services useful if he did use them, or whose needs simply are not being met by present services). I suggest that our output objectives in the future will concern themselves more with these categories than with such divisive and essentially unrealistic delineations as 'school children', 'university students', or 'the general public'.

With respect to the future programs for librarianship in Ontario, the modifications already predicted in the setting, content, and objectives of our profession lead inexorably to even greater changes. A 'program' is a systematic series of steps to a pre-defined objective, and these steps will have to be taken in concert by many libraries of different types. Moreover, in a total systems approach which concerns itself primarily with the broad problems of social need and only secondarily with details of local administrative feasibility, it will become increasingly difficult to separate internal and external programs. Thus considerations of regional input-output programs will provide the matrix for all individual library programs in the region. The distinctive parameters of the two types of programs will become increasingly difficult to disentangle. The day of the individual library's domination of an isolated sub-region is already passing, albeit not without traumatic shocks to the individual library and the individual chief librarian. It is no

longer possible to regard a librarian as having responsibility only to his own library. Conversely, every librarian in a region, such as Ontario, should have, and hopefully will eventually have the acknowledged right to interest himself in the acquisition and dissemination of all relevant information resources of the region. It is not so much that the advent of automation will require broad systems approaches for optimum efficiency (though the computer's coils cannot be disregarded); but it is rather that modifications in our setting, and changes in the content and objectives of librarianship, will require co-ordinated and co-operative responses. The day of petty autocrat is drawing to a close, and our future problem in this area will be to prevent similar autocratic tendencies from developing at the regional or national systems level.

There will, therefore, be predictable changes in the future of all four 'scope' elements thus far discussed--setting, content, objectives, and program. It is not, however, until we turn to the fifth and final element--that of evaluation--that we find, I think, the most personal and difficult changes of all. The program--progressing within its setting towards its input, storage and output objectives, and utilizing its content--must be subjected to constant evaluation lest the critical path be lost or avoided. But 'evaluation' in this context involves much more than mere description. It involves normative surveys and research. Thus the evaluation of any program depends upon the systematic observation and recording of relevant data within stated parameters. It involves the scientific analysis of that data. And it leads to the knowledgeable implementation of decisions resulting from the findings--with all the necessary

judgement and initiative in decision-making that such implementation implies. Moreover, because the constant evaluation of many major programs will necessitate the constant involvement of most if not all of the qualified personnel on the library's staff, it seems to me that the very nature of librarianship will have to change. No longer will we, as professionals, be able to afford the restful luxury of carrying out set routines. Our new role will become increasingly that of researcher and decision-maker or manager. Much that has previously pre-occupied our attention will have to be delegated to such supportive staff as library technicians and clericals. Much that we now regard as bibliographically respectable will have to be shared with, even turned over to, subject specialists untrained in--and perhaps uninterested in--the administrative facets of librarianship. The librarian as such will become, I predict, largely a blend of researcher and administrator--though his research will still, of course, be based upon the relationship between 'books and people'; and his administration is to be interpreted in its widest sense as any supervisory activity.

This then is the future and the challenge of librarianship in Ontario. Coupled with the implicit logic of our position as a social response and our consequent need for socio-psychological research to validate that response, the implications of such a future involve the reshaping of librarianship as we know it. The loyalty of tomorrow's librarian will be primarily to his research field rather than to his administrative superiors; his rewards will derive from his approximation to the goals of his discipline and from the approbation of his peers rather than from management approval;

and his outlook will be that of the total profession rather than of any institutional segment of it. In this respect librarians in every type of library, as well as members of library school faculties, will approximate more closely to the academic outlook which remains the truest measure of any first class educator. Such an outlook or ethos, transferred to librarianship, will have direct implications for inter-library relations, systems development, professional associations, and internal management.

It no longer seems feasible to me to postulate the development of completely non-hierarchical, problem-oriented task forces as the basis of future libraries; but it still appears probable that present trends towards decentralized, expertise-oriented management will continue and accelerate. Such management will be, by its very nature less autocratic, less rigid, and less lonely than its arbitrary, power-based counterpart. The librarian of the future will have to develop aptitudes for problem-solving and persuasive leadership to a much greater extent than in the past. If, in order to do so, he has to relinquish some of his technical and even bibliographic competence the price may not be too high to pay for a meaningful professional response to a changing need which we are in danger of completely ignoring. Needless to say, the response will not be easy. None of the forecasts which I have made this morning will be realized without soul-searching and further education on the part of many of us. However, and let this be my final forecast for today, I predict that our profession <u>will</u> meet the challenge of the future; that we <u>will</u> analyze and fulfill our heritage; and that we <u>will</u> give to librarianship in Ontario a true social validity.....a true research base....and a true democratic scope.

****