Towards a Vision of Archival Services

by **IAN E. WILSON***

The 1980 report entitled *Canadian Archives*[1] endeavoured to substantiate and articulate a widely shared vision for the evolution of archives. This was founded on the concept of a system of cooperating archives, mutually committed to preserving the Canadian documentary heritage by coordinated action, linked as much through shared values and practices as by an information network. In the decade since, thanks to our collective endeavours, much has been achieved. The National Archives has given life to the system through the grant programmes and other inter-institutional activities of the Canadian Council of Archives. Provincial councils and professional associations have provided the focus for a series of cooperative projects in both sharing resources and gaining publicity, and some have succeeded in obtaining provincial grant programmes. The Planning Committee on Descriptive Standards (Bureau of Canadian Archivists) is in the process of providing the intellectual framework and practical guidelines for consistency in descriptive practices across institutions. New archives have been established and assisted; attitudes among archivists have changed. While much undoubtedly remains to be accomplished, the animating goal of an archival system has helped provide the rationale and context for a host of developments in the archival community.

The SSHRCC report ended on an optimistic note, affirming that "Archives collections can indeed become the recorded social memory, comprehensive in scope, growing systematically, and accessible to all who want to draw upon it."[2]

When I agreed to the request from the programme committee to speak on the broad questions, "whom do we serve and how do we do it?" I blithely assumed I would expand upon that 1980 statement with "director-generalities." Instead, upon reading, reflection and discussion I find myself rather uneasy about certain aspects of the SSHRCC report's approach and vision. I believe it is now time to modify that vision by modifying our approach. The report, like the individual provincial needs surveys and the cumulative 1989 report on national needs and priorities,[3] begins and ends with the perspective of archives and their institutional requirements. We would benefit, and our vision for archival services in the next decade would grow, by changing our perspective. We need to find a different vantage point. We must increasingly view archives through the eyes of society, not just our sponsors, narrowly defined as governments or institutions, but all whom they in turn represent: the Canadian public, with their largely inarticulate, often

© All rights reserved: *Archivaria* 31 (Winter 1990-91)

unrealized and seldom expressed needs for archival services. By the end of this paper I would like to venture the opinion that in a democratic, information-based society, there exists a basic social right to equitable and free access to archival services. Archives in turn must restructure their services to respond to this right.

I would like to develop this theme in several ways: first historically, then by exploring the approaches of other institutional information providers — museums and libraries. This year we mark an archival bicentenary — the 200th anniversary of archival legislation in this country. In April 1790, the Legislative Council of Québec passed *An Act for the Better Preservation and Due Distribution of the Ancient French Records*.[4] This made it an offence for any individual to retain "papers, manuscripts, and records, anciently appurtenant to any Public Office or deposit, prior to the conquest." The rationale for this measure outlined the continuing basic premise of archives:

> . . . it is expedient that [the records] be kept in a state of preservation and safety [and further] that measures be pursued to make them known and useful, [and] to give cheap and easy access to them.

The first report on the work of an archivist, submitted by Joseph F. Perrault to the lieutenant-governor of Québec in the last month of 1799 touches on themes not unknown today:

> He will not give you any elaborate details of the putrid state in which he found some of those documents, of the rank odour that they exhaled, of the damp air that he breathed in those vaults, at the risk of his health; of the researches that he had to make in order to have a general knowledge of what those vaults contained; of the plans that he formed for the putting in order of the whole mass; of the difficulties that at every instant he had to encounter; of the discoveries of files of Acts belonging to unknown notaries that he made; of the nights, the trouble and the care that he gave during three years; of the persons he had employed; in fine, of the money that he spent whether for assistance, or for paper, thread and binding material of several registers and repertories.
>
> The desire to gain for himself the recognition of the Government and of his fellow citizens, more than any reward that he expected therefor, caused him to overcome all the repugnance and all the difficulties that necessarily accompany such an undertaking.
>
> Having, at last, put the finishing touch on that work, your suppliant hastens to humbly submit to Your Excellency and to Your Council the result of his labours, in the tables and reports hereunto annexed; and he has no doubt that, if it be deemed well to have the said Archives visited and examined, a favourable report, as to the manner in which your suppliant proceeded, of the scrupulous exactness with which he classified and arranged everything, as well as of the order and neatness of all things confided to his custody in the said vaults and comprising the Archives, will be made.[5]

Perrault, of course, was asking to be paid for his three years' work — also not an unfamiliar theme. And, like countless archivists in generations since, Perrault was informing his sponsor that the archives had been sorted and arranged, finding aids were ready, and the records were available "to be visited and examined."

As archives were formally established, the emphasis on use and access continued as a dominant characteristic. Until the last two decades, most Canadian archives were established for cultural rather than administrative reasons. They did not find their origins in a chancery office or begin as a public record office but, like the Public Archives of Canada, they came into being in response to the expressed needs of historical research. To the extent that there is a distinctive Canadian archival tradition, it melds the "total archives"[6] approach with a dedication to advance historical scholarship and to promote use of the holdings. This approach and commitment reflect the origins of archival service and continue the initial motivation. The SSHRCC report boldly asserted that "Canadian archives have inherited a proud tradition of service to scholarship and public accessibility."[7] This is a tradition in which we take considerable pride; it may be part of the reason why many of us chose a career in archives; and, being so familiar, it is a matter we tend to take for granted. It seems to be a 'given', seldom analysed.

A number of useful articles have appeared in both the *American Archivist* and in *Archivaria*[8] advocating and refining the methodology for user surveys. Others present the case for marketing archival services, or report on initiatives for taking archives to a broader public. Little has appeared exploring systematically our assumptions about and our approaches to archival public service. The principles underlying such service do not seem to have been defined or discussed. The standards and criteria needed for effective programme evaluation are not clear. We bear out the observation, made in the Society of American Archivists' report on goals and priorities, that

> Archivists tend to think about their work in the order in which it is performed. Inevitably, use comes last. Since use of archival materials is the goal to which all other activities are directed, archivists need to re-examine their priorities.[9]

The environment in which archives function is change. Where once we structured archival services for a predominantly scholarly clientele and expected others to adapt to this model, genealogists (some extraordinarily professional, some decidedly amateur) comprise over 50 per cent of the researchers at most archives. They are joined by community historians, heritage activists, writers, school students, journalists and a continuing core of, at most, 25 per cent academic researchers. Within the last group, needs vary, from the beginning graduate student to whom an archives can seem a daunting place indeed, to the social and quantitative historians exploring detailed sources in new ways; as well as scholars in the social sciences, law, education and social work — all drawing on the archival record in challengingly different ways. At the same time, the archival record grows both more voluminous and more complex, challenging information appraisal and limiting any archivist's field of expertise. Freedom of information and protection of privacy laws give archives expanded social responsibilities. And the proliferation of computers generates higher expectations from an increasingly information-literate public. Our institutions are responding to this changed and changing environment. At some of our large institutions, most researchers now meet specialized public service staff rather than the scholar specialists of old. Others are improving publications or developing informative exhibits, yet few have really analysed the range of services offered, their audience, structure and purpose, or their success.

Archivists proudly explain to visitors that the holdings in their care are unique: not duplicated and not replaceable. This implies that in service terms, each repository has a monopoly on the resources in its keeping. There is a tendency in all archives to act like most monopolies, requiring anyone wanting access to conform to the services offered. The most successful organizations, public and private, today place the highest importance on customer service, re-evaluating, rethinking and re-engineering all processes, procedures and organizational shibboleths to place the needs of customers foremost. Yet for an archivist, use cannot take precedence over conservation of the materials. Therein lies the public service dilemma of archives.

Our colleagues in other information-based institutions have been pursuing new markets, with marked success in certain instances. To help understand both the potential and the limitations of archival services, I would like to compare these services with those now provided in museums, which ostensibly share many of our concerns.

Like archives, museums have large, multi-media holdings to maintain, frequently including documentary materials. Many emphasize research and scholarship. Provenance is important, and for archaeological artifacts *respect des fonds* and original order are vital to the intellectual significance of each item. Most museums take as one of their first responsibilities the conservation of the artifacts in their care. We share much, therefore, yet museums draw far more visitors than archives. At the community and regional level, their economic role in attracting tourists has been recognized, and a major museum development, such as the Tyrell Museum in Drumheller, can change the economy of a community. The most successful become "destination points" in tourism jargon, drawing people from a distance just to visit them, and competing with other attractions for the entertainment dollar. I am not sure we can yet say the same about archives.

Museums have been able to deal with such a use-level largely because the experience they offer the typical visitor is a preplanned, highly structured one. Visitors are shown, or allowed to browse, through defined exhibits. A limited number of items from the museum's holdings are selected, placed in an interpretive context and offered, with related tours or publications, to the public. The most successful modern museums add video or film presentations as an extension of the exhibit experience, and some now integrate limited interactive functions. The objective is to present authoritative information in an engaging way. The result should satisfy intellectual curiosity, or at least provide a pleasant afternoon's experience. No other product results from the visit. Visitors read labels, view artifacts or reproductions, watch a film, toy with the interactive elements, have coffee, buy a souvenir and leave. Other museum experiences are similarly structured for various age levels or interest groups. The typical museum visitor has no notion of the extensive research holdings backing up the proffered exhibits, nor is he/she invited to enquire. It is only the specialist scholar, or the after-hours museum volunteer, who has access to the full holdings of the museum. If every museum visitor were able to request all the artifacts from this site, or expect to see a specific tool recovered from a shipwreck, the museum could not cope. And if every visitor were presented on arrival with a complete set of finding aids to the museum's holdings and asked to choose which to see, use would drop dramatically. This, however, is the typical archives experience.

The archives experience is, for most visitors, largely tailor-made and, with consultation, self-directed. In a sense, the archival finding aids are our exhibits. They structure and present information in its context, but from these cursory exhibits visitors expect, indeed are encouraged, to call on the original materials behind the finding aid.

This process is collaborative and interactive among researcher, finding aid and reference archivist. Depending on the research skills of the visitor, it is also more or less mutually time-consuming.

Our exhibits change gradually, as institutional guides, thematic guides and inter-institutional guides respond to the changing needs of our research clientele.

Pursuing the analogy with museum service farther, many of the researchers with whom we spend so much time become like museum curators, taking our extensive original sources, selecting, interpreting and offering their own "exhibits" to a wider public. Such exhibits may well be the many museum exhibits, historical restorations or historic sites which rely for their authenticity on archival research. Others, of course, take the form of books, theses, articles, plays, films or genealogies. Such products, shaped by and dependent on the archival record, are presented by their authors or another institution, yet they can also be claimed as an exhibit of the archives, as meaningful and as publicly accessible as the holdings of any museum. Invariably, credit to the archives is obscured. An essential aspect of any archival public service strategy, therefore, must be to re-establish the link between the archives and the public "exhibits" or products drawn from it. Various archives provide a display of recent books based on their holdings, or offer an annual lecture by a frequent user, or attempt a symposium for researchers to discuss work in progress in a given field. Archives devote the major part of their effort to assisting researchers with such self-directed use. We must devise ways to ensure that the archives gets full credit, in the eyes of its sponsor if nowhere else, for the results of this service.

There is, however, no reason why archives cannot emulate museums and provide structured, even entertaining, historical experiences for visitors. Some of the most innovative archival public service initiatives reflect the museum potential to attract and deal with a more numerous public by offering more standardized fare. If archives wish to increase use without substantial staff increases, we must devise ways of making the archival experience less staff-intensive. Exhibitions and publications in all their variety, guides to using different source materials, and classroom teaching kits provide structured access to an archives.

All of these activities more or less involve archives to some extent in the historical interpretation of their holdings. Many of us hesitate. We recall the oft-repeated admonition of Douglas Brymner, first Dominion Archivist, over a century ago:

> As an archivist, he has to collect the rough material to be formed into structures of exquisite beauty in the hands of the skilful workman, or to be raised by the dishonest and incompetent into unsubstantial erections, which crumble into ruins before the first rude blast of adverse criticism.[10]

Brymner's successor, Arthur Doughty, and his colleague, Adam Shortt, concurred, publishing extensive documents without commentary to allow students to draw their own conclusions. They overlooked the fact that in selecting documents they were imposing an interpretive framework. The exhibits presented now by most archives are inescapably interpretive, but seldom have archives placed major emphasis on them. Where is it written that the major national or provincial or community heritage interpretation centre must be a large museum? Given the range, variety and intrinsic interest of archival material, could not this function reside equally well in the archives?

We tend to emphasize the record and to focus our energies on arranging, describing and conserving it. The public service and exhibit functions often seem an afterthought. I suspect, however, that an analysis of the budgets and staff allocation of major museums would show that exhibitions provide the crowds, attention and economic justification that allow the scholarly and scientific activities of the museum to flourish quietly behind the scenes. This is a constant tension in museums, and public programming can overwhelm other aspects, but clearly, by developing a strategy for structuring visitor experience, museums have proliferated and prospered. How far can we exploit this technique to introduce a broader audience to our documentary heritage?

While museums are our institutional colleagues, as curators of often unique heritage resources, libraries are our colleagues as custodians of information resources. As in archives, library holdings are multi-media and documentary in nature. Their information usually comes in a more packaged, processed format, reflecting consumer taste and needs discerned by the publishing or database industry. Electronic media defy a simple distinction between archives and libraries as unpublished and published materials, demanding a clearer understanding of the structure, context and *raison d'être* of the information recorded. Yet within the library, user experiences are more similar to those in archives than museums, most researchers working with the catalogues, databases and reference staff to structure the response to their own enquiry.

One of the major differences between archives and libraries in their approach to information lies in the archival insistence on conservation. Public libraries have thrived on the basis of stacks open to people of all ages, and automated bibliographic databases listing holdings, supplemented by an inter-library loan system to provide long-distance access to those holdings. Within the public library system, and I suspect in most academic libraries, materials are consumable. If necessary, lost or destroyed copies can be replaced by purchasing another, or a reprint edition or by copying from another library. The immediate needs of the user are foremost, and libraries have prospered. Within archives, however, primary concern with the record and its availability for use both now and in the future, limits the services we are able to provide. The demand for provincial or national archival databases has not been so strong, nor the expense so justifiable because, for archives, the database of holdings is not a direct path to the source document. A research visit, or often a major photocopying order, remains necessary. Until this link between the researcher and the information itself can be made, archival databases will remain more in demand and more used by archivists than by our research clientele.

As librarians have advanced in the information age, they have rekindled a lively debate on charges for library services.[11] Information is power; information is a commodity. Given the broadening range of possible "add on" information services, advocates of a user-pay system in libraries argue for a tiered approach, with a basic, defined, free service supplemented by a wide selection of priced enhancements. Given the competition for public funding and the more general public policy debate on a user-pay principle for public services, various types of library user fees appeal to local and provincial governments. For many librarians, justifiably proud of the long tradition of free public library service, such suggestions verge on the unthinkable. They point out that an educated, creative society is founded on free access to information, without regard to ability to pay. New technology expands the range of information available, but should not limit access through its cost. The recent strategic plan for public libraries in Ontario expresses this view cogently:

> Therefore, in order to preserve our free, open and democratic society, the public library as a tax-supported institution providing equitable access to information and knowledge must be protected.[12]

If we advocate the principle of free access, particularly to public archival services, and if we believe such access is a vital function in a democratic society, we must ensure that these services are both free and equally available. Human rights codes state explicitly that every person has a right to equal treatment with respect to services, without discrimination.

If asked, most public archives will respond that their services are free, except for copying charges, and that these services are distributed to all who ask. It is at this point that I think we need to shift perspectives. Some years ago, Professor Tom Flanagan presented a paper giving an economic analysis of archival services. He noted that with free services and no limit to demand, archives should be overwhelmed. What he politely did not observe is that we covertly impede and ration access to archival services.[13] Archival services were originally structured to respond to the needs of academic researchers. By continuing this approach, and for the comfort of our traditional clients as much as ourselves, we have erected systemic barriers to limit demand.

In publicity, for example, we tend to address the traditional clientele. By distributing newsletters to historical groups, placing exhibits in archives or museums, giving speeches to the converted, we reinforce a message already sent. As an administrator, I often feel I am walking a fine line, keeping the archives visible but not issuing a genuine invitation to visit for fear of being overwhelmed. One recent attempt at mass marketing of archives, by the National Archives in several magazines and during hockey telecasts, resulted in an extraordinary response. For fear of embarrassing ourselves and our sponsors, we seem hesitant to tell the public about the extent of the resources available in archives.

Many archives limit use by continuing to set their reference and retrieval hours to coincide with the working day. This is reasonably convenient for university researchers and those who are retired, but it effectively eliminates a substantial portion of the population as serious users. Some repositories, of course, maintain supervised reading rooms for extended hours, but few are aware of this service. The usual lack of reference service during these hours limits its usefulness. Offering reference and retrieval from about 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and on weekends would not add considerably to staff time, but would permit more users to avail themselves of archival services.

There are also psychological barriers to access. I am not aware of any studies regarding the popular perception of archives; but I would venture that few members of the general public have any real conception of the role of archives. If pressed, the great majority would revert to a stereotype, using the familiar adjectives "old" and "dusty" while respecting the scholarly aura. Dare we ask, would they, as citizens, feel comfortable going to an archives? Are our buildings not just barrier-free but architecturally open? Access to archives can also be far from free. Many graduate students, genealogists and others cannot do the archival research they would like. The cost of travel and of staying near the major public archives is significant. Once at the archives, we also tend to charge researchers for a most precious commodity — their time. Our finding aids are, as the term implies, imprecise. We forewarn researchers that they often must review extensive records series to garner the information they seek. This treasure hunt, guided by clues in a finding aid, may have been suitable for old-fashioned scholarly research, but there may now be instances where researchers would rather pay for improved services and more precise finding aids, in money rather than time. The recent trend of the SSHRCC to increase photocopying budgets while holding down travel costs, and the researchers who glance at a file and order a complete copy to read at home later, confirm that for some money is less important than time. Similarly, for those at a distance access to an archives can be a slow, frustrating process. In dealing with written enquiries, some major archives have in fact instituted unofficial quota systems, limiting the amount of research done and sometimes discriminating against those not linked to the archives' sponsor. And what have archives done to offer service to those who are visually impaired, or who, like 22 per cent of the population are functionally illiterate? The result of these policies, of limited publicity, of restricted research hours, of effectively costing researchers' time rather than money, of preferring to deal with researchers in our reading rooms, is that archival services, viewed by the majority of the population, are neither free nor equitably distributed. Our services are frequently structured to suit those living nearby, or they favour those rich enough or with access to research grants for travel. They respond best to those able to use the archives during regular business hours, and they help those with the time to explore the record. Distance alone can be a significant barrier to the young, the elderly, the poor and the handicapped. I am not aware of any profile of the users of Canadian archives. Some years ago, a study of public libraries concluded that library users tend to be well-educated and in higher-level occupations, and that as income increases so does the percentage of respondents visiting a library.[14] If this is true of libraries, given their convenient location, just whom are we serving? Our services are neither free nor equitably distributed across the population.

I began by referring to the 1980 SSHRCC report and its optimistic summation, including the phrase about our documentary heritage being "accessible to all who want to draw upon it." We tend, I feel, to interpret this ambition in passive terms, claiming that we provide free services, distributed to those who enquire. In the process we overlook the systemic barriers we have left in place limiting those who might wish to enquire and rationing services to those who do. As we enter the 1990s' we need a larger vision, one shaped as much by contemporary society's ideals as by our own view of our role in society. I would like to see us develop a National Archival Services Strategy to guide the evolution of the full Canadian archival system into the next century. The archival literature on documentation strategies and even national documentation strategies is growing; and a CCA Committee is already considering archival acquisition strategies. This will be an essential component of an archival services strategy. I have in mind, though, a broader approach viewing archival service not just as acquisition and appraisal, but as a continuing interaction between the archives and the community it serves. It is an approach that would emphasize the needs of society as much as the requirements of archives holdings.

A National Archival Services Strategy would begin with a clear statement and justification of the principle that the preservation of and access to information and knowledge is a basic necessity for participation in a free, democratic society. It would define the special role archives play in managing the information resources of their governments and institutions, providing the basis of public accountability, documenting the rights and obligations of citizens in society, and establishing the foundation of Canadian studies and heritage activities. The statement of principles would be supplemented by a commitment by the Canadian archival system to work towards providing equitable access to these resources for all Canadians. I omitted the word "free," as the professional debate has not achieved any consensus on the matter of user charges for certain types of service. The strategy would need to address this issue directly.

Following a full statement of principles and commitment, the National Archival Services Strategy would proceed to consider how best to achieve its aims. It would examine in greater detail than the SSHRCC report the concept of regional and community-based archives, considering ways to encourage the establishment of such archives where there is a suitable local base of support. This in turn would depend on broader public knowledge of archives, our role in society and the intrinsic interest of our holdings. We can learn much in this from museums, helping us to develop a range of archival experiences structured to address the interests of different audiences.

The strategy would need to reaffirm, and wherever possible strengthen, the traditional collegial relationship between archivists and the researchers who interpret and creatively disseminate archival resources to the public. The linkage between historians' publications and the archives on which they are dependent should be reinforced. Descriptive standards, their development, confirmation and implementation would be essential to the strategy, providing the basis for automated inter-institutional databases. Equitable access, though, will only be achieved when the public can begin with such databases and access the information they require. Inter-institutional loan of microfilm is already in place to accomplish this for a small portion of the holdings of some archives. But to achieve this goal in a more general manner, the National Archival Services Strategy would need to consider strategic alliances with other information providers. Public information networks or electronic information grids are evolving in a number of provinces, each in their own way. These are exploring the public potential of information created or scanned in a digitized format, coupled with a fibre optics network and satellites for rapid transmission. Institutions and businesses are already linking into such networks, and in due course home access will be common.

When coupled with high-definition television monitors, this may be the means of achieving equitable access to our extensive resources. The full potential of such information networks is only dimly glimpsed, but with transmission capacity increasing and costs decreasing, these information highways await the creative user. Public libraries are already positioning themselves as key public entry points to such information grids. In most provinces they are strategically placed in every community, staffed by information professionals, and, with the right tools, accustomed to assisting the public in accessing information resources. The archival services strategy would need to reinforce and develop local archives so that they can play an appropriate role in the network, contributing unique information resources and in turn accessing them to benefit the community. Public libraries are not the most appropriate institutional home for new archives, but considered as dispersed franchise outlets in an information network, they are well placed to provide access to whatever information archives can make available through the grid.

The National Archival Services Strategy would include a strategic partnership with other information providers who share our goals of open and equitable public access to society's varied and extensive information resources. Archives would contribute a unique, valuable and intrinsically interesting body of information. They in turn could draw on and make accessible such information from other, distant sources. A comprehensive public information network would exploit the potential of new technology to the full, enabling archives to conserve their holdings while actively opening these resources to their full potential public.

The concept of a comprehensive National Archival Services Strategy raises issues both professional and practical. Developing the strategy will not be easy, and implementation would be a gradual process. The strategy would, however, provide the broad pattern, ensuring that, as pieces of the mosaic are put into place, they would collectively and in due course form a sensible, planned pattern. The strategy would provide the long-term vision, one which by its scope, the synergism of partnerships and its confident assertion of the contribution archives should and can make to an information society, provides the inspiring vision or imaginative spark to garner the support necessary to make it a reality.

In conclusion I can do no better than quote again our first Dominion Archivist. Sitting in his basement room, Brymner advanced his vision for the national archives and observed,

> It may be a dream but it is a noble dream. It has often spurred me to renewed effort, when the daily drudgery — for it is drudgery — was telling on mind and body.[15]

I trust you may find in these ideas for a National Archival Services Strategy a similarly noble and refreshing dream.

Notes

* This paper was presented to a plenary session of the Annual Conference of the Association of Canadian Archivists, Victoria, B.C., 31 May 1990.

1 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada: Ottawa, 1980.

2 Ibid., p. 106.

3 Canadian Council of Archives, "The Canadian Archival System: A Report on the National Needs and Priorities of Archives," summary report (August 1989).

4 Lower Canada. *Ordinances Made and Passed by the Governor and the Legislative Council of the Province of Quebec and now in Force in the Province of Lower Canada* (Quebec, 1795), pp. 191-192: 30 George III, c. 80.

5 As quoted in "Canadian Archives in 1787," in Public Archives of Canada, *Report*, 1905, p. 170.

6 By "total archives" I mean the Canadian practice of selecting and acquiring documentary material in all media, and from both official and private sources, to document the development of a jurisdiction, an institution or a community.

7 *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

8 See, for example, Paul Conway, "Facts and Frameworks: An Approach to Studying the Users of Archives," *American Archivist*. Vol. 49 (1986), pp. 393-407; Diane L. Beattie, "An Archival User Study: Researchers in the Field of Women's History," *Archivaria* 29 (Winter 1989-90), pp. 33-47.

9 Society of American Archivists, "Planning for the Archival Profession," p. 23.

10 Public Archives of Canada, *Report*, 1889, p. xiii.

11 See Stan Skrzeszewski, "User Fees: the Time has come to face the issue," *Canadian Library Journal*, Vol. 42 (1985), pp. 137-141; Eric Bow, "Fee vs. Free," *Focus* (Summer, 1988), pp. 27-32; United Kingdom. *Financing our Public Library Service: Four Subjects for Debate: A Consultative Paper* (London: HMSO, 1988).

12 Ontario Library Association, *One Place to Look : Ontario Public Library Strategic Plan* (Toronto, 1990), p. 58.

13 "Archives: An Economic and Political View," *Archivaria* 8 (Summer 1979), pp. 91-101.

14 Skrzeszewski, op. cit., p. 140.

15 Public Archives of Canada, *Report*, 1889, p. xv.