

Learning Exchange Systems, (Learnx is its larynx-testing contraction), funded by the Toronto Board of Education, Canada Manpower, and Wintario, among others, attempts to provide easy access to public information by preparing guides and directories for the Toronto area. Its latest product is described as essential to a local history studies programme. It is not. It contains three readily-available free handouts: the usual brochure introducing the Ontario Archives, a similar page on the Toronto Board of Education Archives, and the excellent guide to federal and provincial historic markers and museums in Ontario prepared by the province's Ministry of Culture and Recreation. The kit's one original contribution is a fifty-five page booklet entitled *Discover Your Neighborhood Heritage*, but half of this work is also a compilation of materials from other sources: descriptions of two local history projects in Toronto-area schools illustrate typical assignments but provide the reader with little opportunity to assess the reaction of or value to students; a bibliography of historical works adds only four recent references to the list taken from Stevenson and Armstrong's *Approaches to Teaching Local History*;¹ then, to extend the reading audience, a list of Ontario's historical societies and archives, (the latter reprinted from the *Union List of Manuscripts in Canadian Repositories*), is appended. The other half of the booklet contains a brief but pleasant introduction to the chief repositories of historical materials in Toronto, to some of the principal printed sources, to several agencies with allied interests, and to three other types of historical source—cemeteries, architecture, and recorded interviews. Despite its pretensions, the kit will be an inadequate guide for teachers in Toronto and in other parts of Ontario; the sum of the kit's many parts is "small change."

Mary Fredrickson's booklet is at once more sensible and more stimulating. It contains a good introduction to the use of local studies in classrooms, brief sections on people, artifacts, and the environment, dozens of project ideas, and useful annotated bibliographies. It is a model of its kind and will serve Atlantic Canada well.

The two publications merit the attention of archivists because they raise matters which will become increasingly important in the next few years. Who is responsible for the collection and preservation of documents related to our "neighbourhood heritage"? Who is going to "bell the teachers" by requiring them to undertake a reasonable portion of the research before they unleash their students? Is it not time to campaign for "community archives," perhaps operated in conjunction with school or public libraries? Should school boards be required to fund the creation of "duplicate archives," (microfilm copies of local newspapers, photographic reproductions of significant maps and census tables, and copies of directories), before launching local history projects in secondary schools? The demand for service, as foretold by the appearance of these two works, will be insistent; the archivist must be among those taking the lead in raising and answering these questions.

Gerald Friesen
Department of History
University of Manitoba

The Central Records of the Church of England: A Report and Survey Presented to the Pilgrim and Radcliffe Trustees. London, CIO Publishing, 1976. iv, 100 p. ISBN 0 7151 3678 X £3.00.

Since the end of World War II, accumulations of Church of England records belonging to dioceses, archdeaconries, cathedral chapters, and parishes have been deposited in local record offices throughout Britain and have been accessible to the public. Whereas the archival needs of parishes and dioceses have been served at the local level, records of

¹ F.H. Armstrong and A.J. Stevenson, *Approaches to Teaching Local History, Using Upper Canadian and Ontario Examples* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969).

national Church of England agencies and organizations have not been under the care of trained archivists and can be consulted by the public only with difficulty. Except for the limited amount of material held by the Lambeth Palace Library and certain missionary societies, no action has been taken to preserve records of the central agencies which administer the policy and property of the Church of England, nor the numerous Church societies and religious communities which have been established to promote church causes.

Composed of clergy and laity, and financed by The Pilgrim and Radcliffe Trusts, a Survey Committee appointed Dr. C.J. Kitching, Assistant Keeper of Public Records and an ecclesiastical historian, as Investigating Officer and Secretary of the Committee late in 1974. On loan from the Public Record Office for eleven months, Dr. Kitching conducted an enquiry into the state and disposition of the national Church of England records. His conclusions and suggestions, along with a lengthy appendix listing the record-holding bodies investigated, constitute the bulk of a report presented to the Trustees in 1976.

Initially, Dr. Kitching prepared an inventory of records held by the central bodies to determine their nature and extent, and to see how far their management, custody and accessibility stood in need of improvement. This preliminary survey proved extremely beneficial, for although many owners were aware of the value of their holdings, it alerted them to the importance of caring for their records and making them accessible, areas in which they needed guidance. Others contacted were not aware that their records had permanent reference value, that they needed special treatment, or that they could be of interest to researchers.

In order to bring about greater uniformity of care and accessibility, the Survey Committee recommended that all non-current records should be kept in a central repository, perhaps using a renovated Church House as a records centre, under the management of a full-time professional archivist. If this recommendation were not adopted, the Committee suggested that the Church of England seek alternate lodging of its central records in the Public Record Office. (It is interesting to note that such a move would probably entail amendments to the Public Record Act so that non-government records with which the Public Record Office has no formal concern may be deposited there.) While the Committee was not opposed in principle to such action, it was adamant in declaring that Church of England records by the act of deposit should not be allowed to become state property or lose any form of independence.

A need for some form of records management was vaguely expressed in the report, but details regarding its scope and format were omitted. It appears that the Investigating Officer and the Committee members were primarily interested in preparing an inventory of all records, bringing them together and making them accessible to scholars. Little emphasis was given to the continuing records problem confronting the administrator once existing records have been transferred to the archives. If the Survey Committee's recommendations are implemented, one can only hope that the archivist will give special consideration to records retention and disposal so that administrators as well as scholars may benefit from the new archival programme.

For those interested in the collection and preservation of religious records, this report on the central records of the Church of England should underscore some of the problems encountered in trying to organize a large body of analogous records long under the custody of different owners. Given the general reluctance of church bodies to allow consultation of their records, let alone to part with them, it will be interesting to see how far the Survey Committee will be permitted to go in carrying out their recommendations. Nevertheless, the survey work accomplished so far is a big step in the right direction.

Trevor J.D. Powell
Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan