

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

December 30, 1922

The meeting was called to order at ten-twenty by President Utley.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Will the Council please come to order. I am going to ask the members of the Council please to arise so we may be sure we have a quorum.

... A quorum was present ...

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Since the opening of our meetings here in Chicago, a very important matter has been brought to my attention by Dr. Bowerman, a matter which has recently come about, and it is of such importance to the American Library Association, and a matter which should be considered by the Council, that I have asked Dr. Bowerman, although our program is rather full, to present the matter briefly to us so that we shall be cognizant of it and so that it may be placed in the records so that what Dr. Bowerman does not have time to present to us this morning can be in your hands to read and held for future consideration.

DR. BOWERMAN: Mr. President, Members of the Council: I have asked the privilege of making a brief statement to the Council concerning a proposal just made to me in my capacity of Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Relations. Inasmuch as the proposal is a request for the cooperation of the A. L. A., the acceptance of which would involve a matter of policy

and is of far-reaching importance, it is appropriate to present it to the Council. The proposal has the approval of the two other members of the Committee on Civil Service Relations in attendance at these meetings, Messrs. Roden and Windsor, and I have also had a letter this morning from Mr. Ferguson giving his approval. There has been no opportunity to present the proposal in its present form to the other two members of the Committee so that this is not a Committee report, but a statement for the information of the Council and to get the matter on the record for full consideration. It is fair to state that an earlier form of the proposal lacking the clarifying details with which it is now made was sent to all members of the Committee on Civil Service Relations, and in the incomplete statement Messrs. Belden and Jennings have expressed dissent.

The proposal: The Institute for Government Research, an agency of high standing, has recently organized a Bureau of Public Personnel Administration, for which it has an assured income of \$25,000 annually for at least three years. Dr. W. F. Willoughby, Director of the Institute, informs me that he has begun his organization with two highly paid men, an efficiency engineer and a psychologist expert in the application of intelligence tests to personnel matters. This bureau would operate under the direction of an advisory board composed of representatives of the National Assembly of Civil Service Commissions, the National Civil Service Reform League, the United States Civil

Service Commission, and the National Research Council. There is, therefore, every expectation that its work will be of the highest character. This bureau plans to study the whole field of public personnel administration, federal, state, county, and municipal. The scope of its investigations would include library service. The American Library Association is invited through its Committee on Civil Service Relations to cooperate in this study so far as it affects our own work.

The proposal has been made in a broad and liberal spirit of helpfulness and should, I believe, be welcomed as an opportunity rather than be resented as an intrusion. The proposal is so recent that it is difficult to take in its full force, but, as I understand it, it is in effect an offer to make practically under the direction of the A. L. A. itself a survey of the entire personnel side of library work without cost to the Association and to give us the results of such study in printed form. The gist of the proposal of the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration is given in these extracts from the memorandum submitted to me.

"The proposed procedure is to conduct, with the cooperation of the American Library Association, such a study as not only will enable civil service commissions to give better tests for specific library positions or classes of positions, but also to definitely discover and formulate such standards as ought to be recognized by legislators in appropriating public money for

library purposes, by librarians in exercising the functions entrusted to them, by men and women embarking upon a library career, and by any agency or person given the duty of selecting library workers of high or low degree.

"A study of this kind which could be successfully carried on only with the cooperation of those engaged in library work would, it is believed, lead to the definition of the various classes of library positions and a statement of the qualifications which may properly be demanded of those seeking appointment to each class of positions. Then and only then would it be possible to work out suitable tests. The formulation of standards and the use of these standards in selecting employees, however, may reasonably be expected to call for upward revision of the rates of pay for many, perhaps all, library employees, and a more general recognition by the public of library work as a profession." (They have our viewpoint very definitely.) "In a word, the purpose of the study would be as much to help librarians to purchase recognition for their profession, to raise the standards of library workers and to secure adequate financial support from reluctant appropriating bodies as to aid civil service commissions in filling a relatively small number of positions.

"The study would probably include first the securing of information showing for a large number of libraries, the organization, income, expenditures, work, and other pertinent facts."

... Omission here ...

"In general it seems clear that the librarians should furnish the professional guidance, pass upon matters of policy, and not only review but have a pretty active part in preparing the definitions of classes of positions, the statements of qualifications to be required of applicants, and the devising of tests to determine the extent to which applicants possess these qualifications. The civil service people would have to be consulted with regard to the tests. The bureau, it is presumed, would serve as a clerical, secretarial and technical staff to do most of the detail work in accordance with the policies and methods determined by the librarians, its work, of course, subject to review by them."

I have been reading from the memorandum submitted by the efficiency engineer who would be directly in charge of this investigation, his memorandum to Dr. Willoughby, the Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research.

Dr. Willoughby in his letter to me making it over and transmitting this memorandum, says, "I should be glad to have your Committee consider this matter with a view to assisting the Bureau in the study it must make." (It is going to make the study in any case.)

"With the assistance of your Committee, the study may well cover a broader field than will be possible if the Bureau works alone. Your aid would also give assurance of better re-

sults. I would not care to commit the Bureau to any definite course until your Committee has had time to go over the memorandum and make such changes in the plan proposed as seem to be desirable." (If we don't like the terms in which it is offered to us we make our own terms.) "I am prepared to say, however, if your Committee and your Association desire to take part in such a study, the Bureau will gladly provide for the detailed work to any reasonable extent and also for the publication of the results."

Inasmuch as this proposal is so broad as to cover part of the work entrusted to the Committee on Library Survey, I suggest that the proposal be referred to that Committee as well as to the Committee on Civil Service Relations.

This is the continuation of the report: "That the proposal as a whole, which, of course, is subject to such modifications that may in more final form meet the objections already raised against certain aspects of the proposal in its present form, be considered by the two committees and that action by the Council be deferred until the annual conference in April."

I am glad to have this opportunity to present this matter.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: This matter, of course, is too important a one for us to take action on without further consideration, and as Dr. Bowerman has said in his last paragraph, it is recommended that action be deferred so that this is brought before

the Council as information, and what Dr. Bowerman has told us this morning, together with more facts, will be placed in print for the information of the Council before we meet again.

I think with this short presentation we must be content with the presentation at this time.

DR. HILL: Do I understand that without vote this is referred to the two committees? Unless it is so understood, I would like to make a formal motion that this communication or report be received and referred to the committees named, with a request that the members of the Council be furnished with a report previous to the annual meeting in April.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: I think it would be a very good plan to place that in the form of a motion.

... The motion was seconded and carried ...

PRESIDENT UTLEY: The first matter on the docket this morning for the Council to consider is a report from Dr. Raney as Chairman of the Bookbuying Committee, on the question of Copyright. Since the last report of that Committee, several new developments have taken place, and Dr. Raney has been asked to bring us up to date on the subject. We also hope to have Mr. Wyer say something in regard to this subject from his point of view as Chairman of the Committee on Federal and State Relations, but he feels that Dr. Raney has the facts fully in hand and it is unnecessary for him to participate in the statement.

I am sure, without my saying so, that we all appreciate

8

the amount of work that Dr. Raney as Chairman of the Committee on Bookbuying has put into the subject of Copyright, and how well informed he is on the subject and how capable he is to bear the Association's interests on this matter. So we are very glad indeed to have Dr. Raney report to us briefly in regard to what has transpired since his last opportunity to address the Association and the Council.

DR. M. L. RANEY: Mr. President, a year ago, the Council adopted unanimously a set of resolutions in regard to a subject that is covered by a pending measure in Congress. I say in regard to the subject, not in regard to the measure, for at that time the measure had not been introduced. Our action was based on the printed report of proceedings of the Publishers' Copyright Organization just before it became the Copyright Bureau of the National Association of Book Publishers. Those proceedings had been published in the Publishers' Weekly and gave us our first knowledge of the fact that a copyright measure was pending.

The result of early protests on the part of the Bookbuying Committee to certain feature of the proposed measure resulted in amended proposals placed before us by an official representative of the publishers at the time the Council's action was taken. Since that time, the measure has been introduced in the House this past April, and now, under date of December 6th, it has appeared in amended form in the Senate. The announcement is made that hearings will be pushed, and the supposition is that

we shall have to present our case shortly after the holidays. Personally I very much doubt that any action may be expected in the present very crowded session of Congress, and that would mean probably passing over until after March and maybe until the following December. It has certainly been the history of such projects always in the past of not merely a few weeks nor a few months but years have been required to put a copyright measure through both houses of Congress to the point of the President's signature.

By virtue of the Council's resolutions it was laid as a joint duty upon the Committee of Federal and State Relations and the Bookbuying Committee to uphold the action of the Council. They have been both busy in the meantime and this has been quite evident in the Senate measure the patent effects of these discussions.

Copyright, as you know, is a constitutional device to foster the progress of science and arts, in other words, to enhance the education of the people. The device adopted in the constitution is to give to authors for a limited period the complete control over the publication of their work. When it has served its immediate purpose, the work falls into the public domain and anybody may reprint. That period of protection in the United States is an initial twenty-eight years and this may be enlarged to twenty-eight years more if at the end of the first period the author himself applies for renewal, or any mem-

ber of his immediate family. After that point it falls into public domain. It has served its immediate purpose of encouraging the author to do his work for the public and has given a need of compensation for the support of his family. It is then recognized virtually the world over that those who are kin to the author in spirit have a greater claim upon that work than those who are kin by blood.

The odd feature about the United States Copyright Act is that at the present, however, we do not recognize the British author's work until it is sent here for manufacture. Preceding 1890, we did not recognize anybody's right except one resident here. In 1909 we amended what is now the present provision so as to apply solely to those writing in the English language. This was, as you know, at the demand of the typographical and other unions. They came forward, in connection with the present tariff measure, with a proposal made by the Authors' League that they would assent to the repeal of this manufacturing clause provided that could be well cared for in the tariff.

The very interesting fact that needs wide publicity in the ranks of the American Library Association is that if this bargain is to hold and they are to assent to the repeal of the manufacturing clause without opposition, it will be due solely to the action of the American Library Association and not to the Authors' League by whom the proposal was made. For it was the committees of the American Library Association in emergency

action forty-eight hours before the bill came out on the floor of the Senate that resulted in the adoption of a compromise safeguarding the interests of the public completely while at the same time presumably satisfying the interests of the typographers and allied unions. That was based upon a late discovery that their purpose in selecting a virtual embargo upon imported publications was based solely upon their desire to prevent the leaking of American contracts abroad. Our proposal, therefore, to the Senate Committee on Finance, forty-eight hours before the bill came out on the floor of the Senate, was that after having secured the continued free admittance of books in foreign languages and those in the English language published as long as twenty years, there should continue the usual fifteen per cent Underwood tariff rates upon bona fide English books published within twenty years, but that they might place as high a rate as they liked upon those of American origin upon which, of course, there would be no duty unless they had been manufactured abroad and were returning to America, so that while the Authors' League made no statement at all publicly or privately during the tariff hearings, it is the gift of the A. L. A. to that discussion that the copyright measure is in its present favorable position due to our having unlocked that door without sacrificing the public interest as would have been true had the original bargain been carried out.

The measure as introduced in the Senate shows some improvement, but the vital objection still stands. The improvement

lies in the fact that the publisher's proviso of controlled importation shall not apply to books in languages other than English or to second-hand books. The publisher's proviso amounts to a revolution in the method of marketing English books in the United States. Stripped of the long verbiage of a very lengthy section, the proviso is simply this: that if an American publisher or agent makes an arrangement with a British publisher for the handling of his work exclusively in the United States, it shall be called an infringement of copyright and, therefore, made a penal offense punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, if the order for such work is given to any other than said agent.

It wouldn't be stated in quite that form if a publisher were making it, but that is precisely what the bill finally amounts to, for the word "publication" is not defined, and the requirement of the copyright office is completely satisfied if two copies of the British original are placed on deposit in the Library of Congress and the application is duly registered under the name of this applicant. That is an American edition and need be the only one sold. He then, by that simple act of deposit of two copies of an original work published abroad in the English language, becomes the sole source of entry into this country of that publication, and, of course, upon his own terms. We do not have to guess how that might work out. We have the printed evidence of how it does even now work out in the case of those who do not know how to import.

I have checked up the London and the New York catalogs of a very prominent international publisher, the Macmillan Company, and the first five hundred titles in those catalogs show the average price in New York of these London importations of British works not reprinted in this country to be at the present time thirty-eight and three-tenths cents per shilling. A library, of course, gets some discount, and, too, the thirty-eight and three-tenths cents includes the ten per cent duty. The individual, however, does not get the discount and pays the thirty-eight and three-tenths cents. In any case, even under the most favorable circumstances, the gap is wide.

If the bill were passed, we should then, in order to escape fine and imprisonment, have to order such publications from this American registrar, in this instance the Macmillan Company. But that is to put the case in its least harmful form, for anybody, not merely a company of such prominence as this, may make this exclusive arrangement with a British publisher and quietly in Washington register his ownership, and the public, wholly unawares, may be thought guilty of violation of copyright act and be subject to the penalties of infringement by ordering frequently from abroad a copy.

Therefore, to keep safe in every instance, it would prove necessary for an individual or an institution, in order to escape these penalties of the law, first to make inquiry at the Copyright Office in Washington whether there were such registry

there of ownership, and then to proffer the order to that registrar.

It would be unsafe, furthermore, to make that inquiry until six months had expired after publication abroad, for there is provision under the present copyright law, not changed in the present proposed bill, whereby a person may make an arrangement on this side of ad interim copyright; that is to say, if within two months after publication on the other side he places one copy of the British original in the Copyright Office and registers the possibility of his publishing such a work, he then becomes from that point for four months afterwards the American copyright owner. His decision at the end of four months may be not to print. His decision at the end of that time may be to import sheets and bind. His decision may be to print. But no matter what that decision may be, for this period of possibly six months he holds automatic control over that publication, and it would be unsafe, therefore, at any time in that period for you to make your inquiry at Washington for fear the next day after you had made your order such an application might be made and by the time your book arrived you would be guilty of infringement of copyright.

Therefore, it has seemed necessary for the Committee not to suggest to the Council any modification at all of the action it has already taken.

In furtherance of this view, it has freely presented

the case far and wide for support, and I have to date presented our position to seventeen different national organizations, not one of which has to date turned a deaf ear to us.

I have just this morning returned from a delightful session with the American Economic Association where I had the honor of presenting our case, and the gratitude that comes from these national organizations to us whenever their eyes are opened to the perils of this measure I think would increase the pride and warm the cockles of the heart of the Association members were they present to get such reactions.

It is certainly true that there is no national organization at the present time that has more completely the confidence of the large educational, artistic, scientific and other organizations in this country than the American Library Association, and certainly to none do the doors of official Washington, whether on the floors of Congress or in the Departments, open more easily than to us when we make our representations.

I can give the assurance that before the hearings occur in Washington this case will have been personally presented to each individual member of the Senate and House Committees on patents, and we have already gone pretty far that way.

I cannot but feel that it is well worth unusual efforts on the part of the Association to stand up very clearly and staunchly in behalf of these rights of ours, now once more for

the fourth time in thirty years put in jeopardy.

I want specifically to suggest that there shall be sent from Headquarters a communication composed jointly by the Committees on Federal and State Relations and on Bookbuying to every member of the American Library Association, setting forth clearly the issue and asking that they have their Boards pass resolutions which will be transmitted to the Congressmen from their individual states at as early a date as possible.

Finally, I want to not let this opportunity pass of expressing my very keen and heartfelt appreciation for the general spirit of cooperation accorded us in these difficult tasks by the Chairman of the Committee on Federal and State Relations. It is a matter of some embarrassment to me that on each occasion he has declined to participate in the statement of our case before the Council and elsewhere when he is so amply able to do so. Our relations with that Committee have been thoroughly delightful. We are working in the closest harmony, and what we have been able to accomplish in the matter of amending the tariff act, in the matter of setting aside the inequalities of the marking law, and now in protecting the interests of libraries in the matter of copyright is the result of our most cordial relations, and we have, I think, because of that friendly spirit, been able to do such unusual things.

Let me not ever on any occasion fail thus to accord the appreciation of our Committee for that of our fellows. (Applause)

PRESIDENT UTLEY: You will notice that Dr. Raney in his statement recommends that the action previously taken by the Council a year ago stand. I think he recommends no additional action at this time.

He recommends that a statement be sent out to all members of the American Library Association asking librarians to communicate with their trustees and with the members of the Senate from their state, informing them of the situation.

MR. BOSTWICK: I move you that the Council express its desire that Headquarters shall send out such a communication as has been outlined.

... The motion was seconded and carried ...

PRESIDENT UTLEY: There are two communications to come before us, both brief in nature, from the Committee on Public Documents. I wish to ask if Mr. Meyer is ready to present them.

MR. MEYER: As a member of the Committee on Public Documents, I will present the matter.

This is a communication from that Committee to the Council of the A. L. A.

"The Committee on Public Documents respectfully requests approval and authority of the Council to address a letter to the state libraries throughout the country, asking them to prepare a check list of all the documents issued by the various state offices of their respective states for the year 1922, and beginning with January, 1923, to prepare a monthly check list of

the same character."

In explanation of that I would like to say that this is not any attempt to do away with the monthly list of state documents published by the Library of Congress. That is a list which gives full bibliographic entries and then a comprehensive subject index at the end of the year. We find it very difficult, in spite of our immense resources there in Washington, to get complete files of state documents. The only way we can hope to make our collection complete is with the assistance of the state libraries.

It appeared last evening at the meeting of the Committee that some of the states are already doing this. Whether the list is prepared in typewritten form is immaterial. This letter is one which will probably be considered a suggestion to the state libraries to do something of this kind, and if it only meets with a partial result immediately it will be worth doing. It will assist us in Washington to check up our receipts to see whether we have complete files, and the supposition is that a list of this kind will go to the various state libraries and the public libraries throughout the country.

We feel that the matter is of such importance that we would like the authority of the A. L. A. back of us, granted by the Council, rather than to have the letter go out merely as a communication from one of the Committees of the A. L. A.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: You have heard this communication

from the Committee. What action do you wish to take in regard to it?

DR. ANDREWS: May I ask of Mr. Meyer if they considered securing the support of the National Association of State Libraries? If we could add their own association to our request, I think perhaps it might intensify the effect. I am a member of the National Association of State Libraries, or my library is, and I feel rather certain that if we could secure the cooperation of that Association we might get several people to attempt to do this.

MR. MEYER: I think I am quite safe in saying for the Committee that they would welcome any such support.

DR. ANDREWS: Then wouldn't you modify your motion to include requesting the National Association of State Libraries to make the same request or to indicate their support?

MR. MEYER: That would be a matter that the Chairman of our Committee could take up with the President of that Association.

DR. ANDREWS: My idea was that this Association should ask that Association.

MR. MEYER: And have the request come from Headquarters?

DR. ANDREWS: Yes, with the authority of the Council. This should not be addressed to the state libraries individually alone, but to the National Association of State Libraries, asking their support.

MR. BOSTWICK: I also want to call the attention of the

Committee to the fact that unless they word this alternatively in some way or other they are not taking care of the whole subject, because some states do not have state libraries and some states that ostensibly have state libraries do not in effect have them. For instance, although there is a so-called state library in Missouri, it is simply a law library, and the librarian probably would not be able to give any assistance in the matter. Wouldn't it be better to say "state authorities" than "state libraries".

MR. MEYER: It would, and we will be glad to accept that amendment.

MR. WALTER: That is particularly true of the state universities, whose publications are state documents and which very often do not get to the state libraries, and yet on so many economic and sociological lines they complement or supplement the official state documents and really should be included in this list. If it included research and other such material of the state universities, it would be valuable.

MR. MEYER: We naturally should want to reach the authority in the state that has charge of the distribution of documents.

MR. WALTER: I question whether in Minnesota there is any single state authority that would give a complete check list. I very much doubt, for instance, whether the university publications get over to the state library very much quicker than to the

Library of Congress.

MR. MEYER: This is a movement which will secure us a list prepared by the state authorities themselves. We selected, of course, the state libraries because they would probably be most in sympathy with this move, but if there is some other body in the state that could do the work better, that is the body that ought to do it, and I think ultimately we will have our request meet that body. I am perfectly willing that all these modifications should be embodied in the report of the Committee.

MISS TYLER: May I suggest that this measure, which we all feel most favorably toward, be postponed until this afternoon to give Mr. Meyer an opportunity to consult with two or three state librarians as to the best form to present it for approval. Would not that be a little better?

MR. MEYER: That could be done very well indeed. For instance, there are state librarians here who might be able to help formulate that so it would carry through both this organization and the organization of the state librarians.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: As no resolution was made to adopt this resolution, Mr. Meyer, I think possibly your Committee in considering this motion might take into consideration the remarks of Dr. Andrews incorporating the assistance also of the National Association of State Libraries.

We pass now to the next topic on our Council program. Those of us who were at the meeting of the Council in Detroit

will recall the very able paper presented by Miss Rathbone on Standardization in Libraries. Her paper was so well received and so provocative of discussion and thought that we asked her to head a committee to study this matter further. The committee has been appointed. Miss Rathbone is prepared to make a report upon it, the subject being a continuation of what she reported to the Council.

It was believed that the purpose of the Committee could better be phrased by calling it a Committee on Schemes of Library Service, and that is what you will see it is called in the program.

We will now hear from Miss Rathbone as Chairman of that Committee.

MISS RATHBONE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, and other friends: I am glad Mr. Utley referred to the paper so it is unnecessary for me to do so further than to hope that many of you may have read it simply that you may know what the subject of the discussion this morning is about.

I feel like apologizing, in a way, for the difficulty that you may have found in discovering what I intended to say in some cases in the paper. My own very poor handwriting proved too much for the printer in one or two sentences.

In undertaking this study of standardized schemes of library service, I discovered and encountered a good many difficulties. As those who have read the paper know, I found that

while a large majority of the larger public libraries in the country had adopted some form or other of graded service, practically no two of them were alike, either as to number of grades, the length of grades, qualifications for the grades, or anything of that sort. Therefore, comparison between them was very difficult; but the more I went over the subject the more I became convinced that here was a matter of real importance. It seemed to me that in its relation to certification, which is not necessarily an organic relation but a potential one, it was not until we had something like uniformity in the grades and of library service that we had any basis whatever for certification of the assistances of larger libraries. So bringing about such a uniformity seemed to me desirable not only as a possible basis for future certification, but also in order to compare the work of different libraries of different sizes and types, one with another, and also to facilitate the work of the personnel departments in large libraries and to facilitate the movement of assistants from one system to another.

When Mr. Utley asked me to take the chairmanship of the Committee on Standardization, I stipulated that if I did so the work of the Committee, as long as I was Chairman of it, should be concerned with this matter of standardizing schemes of library service for public libraries.

The university problem is one I do not feel myself competent to approach in any way. Should later on it be deemed

desirable to undertake that in university reference libraries, another committee will, of course, be appointed to go into that matter, but the present Committee will confine its energies and activities entirely to the field of public libraries.

The Committee presents as its first action the following definitions.

In the last line of the first paragraph, it should be "or characteristics" instead of "of characteristics".

... Miss Rathbone read the first four paragraphs of the Definition of Standardization ...

MISS RATHBONE: I wish to make very clear in the beginning that it is the fourth point, the consideration of standardizing the schemes of library service, that is the point at issue this morning. We are not concerned at present with discussing whether or not graded schemes of library service as such are desirable. As a matter of fact, there is very little literature on the subject, but practically all of the larger libraries of the country have adopted some form of graded service.

We admit, of course, that there are certain things that can't be graded. Personality is one. Always there will be some assistants of more use and of more value than other assistants, even though they be doing the same type of work. Nobody claims that a graded service can take into account all of the elements that make for efficiency or desirability in assistants, but by and large practically all large libraries have found it

practically necessary to have some sort of impersonal way of grading their assistants and of providing for their promotion, so that there has been an almost universal adoption among the larger public libraries of the country of some form of graded service. The interest of this Committee is in bringing about a greater uniformity among those schemes so that Grade 1 won't mean a branch librarian in one library and a junior assistant in another, so that there may be a general understanding as to what the position in a given grade means.

I think a further argument in favor of that kind of work has been furnished by the report that Mr. Bowerman made this morning. If outside agencies are beginning to consider the subject of library service, it seems to me it is time that we met that situation by a well thought out, well formulated scheme.

I am also going to ask that this idea be considered this morning quite apart from the subject of certification. It may be, as I have said, a possible basis for a future certification, but I feel that there are reasons enough for unifying our schemes of library service quite apart from the certification idea, and I think so much dust has been thrown up around that subject that it will be very much easier to consider this subject entirely apart from it, however close in the future their relations may come to be.

The Committee is firmly convinced of the possibility and the practicability of working out schemes that will fit

different sizes of libraries and at the same time will be so related that the grades will correspond in libraries of different sizes, but it hasn't any desire in the world to enter upon the immense amount of work involved and entailed in the planning of such schemes unless it is assured of the desirability of such action on their part as voiced by a large number of the profession. It is perfectly futile to spend a lot of time doing something that nobody wants. We hope this morning to present to you some of the reasons why this thing is desirable as we see it. If it does not meet with your approval, if you don't think it is worth while going on with, it is up to you; you can vote down the resolution and that is all there is to it. If you do consider that it is worth while for the Committee to continue its labors, our next step will be the publishing of a tentative plan we have already worked out, but I thought it best not to put it before you this morning for fear of distracting your attention from the larger thing to the details. We have already worked out a tentative plan in outline. That, if you consider it desirable for the Committee to continue its work, we will publish immediately for discussion, and hope to have the whole matter brought up for further discussion and further criticism at the next meeting of the A. L. A. In the meantime I hope this morning's discussion will bring out all the objections you have, and if you don't think it is worth while to go on with it, vote against the resolution.

We decided that the first thing to do was to stage a meeting for the discussion of the subject, and we decided upon a program which should present a number of different points of view. Afterwards, the whole subject would be thrown open for discussion.

The subject is to be introduced first by Miss Florence Overton, of the New York Public Library, who has charge of the personnel of that library and who will present it from the point of view of the personnel director of a large public library.

MISS FLORENCE OVERTON: Mr. President, Madam Chairman and Members of the Council: The advantages of a uniform scheme of service are so very obvious to the personnel department of a large library that I am afraid we can only see the advantages. There must be disadvantages, I feel sure, and I hope they will be brought out in the discussion this morning.

It is quite true that all large libraries must have some scheme of service, and I can see no disadvantage in making these schemes uniform provided we can formulate one that will work no hardship on any one of the group.

The one big practical advantage to the personnel department of such standardization would be the help that it would bring to the task of engaging assistants -- assistants that come directly from other libraries, or outsiders -- and also in the exchanging of assistants, and that is a practice that we are using more and more in New York, we think to the mutual advantage

of all concerned.

It is a very difficult matter, as things are at present, to decide in just which grade and at what salary these new applicants may enter, and to be perfectly sure that we are playing fair with our own staff in so deciding.

During the present year in New York we have made eighty-eight appointments, I think, and of that number forty-nine came from other libraries. That isn't counting the number of people that come to us in the summer for a month or two experience, nor the number that come in the winter for from three to six months, usually at the time the library school is holding its open courses.

We have four grades of service, technical service, in the New York Public Library. Grade 1 is junior assistants; Grade 2 is senior assistants; Grade 3 is special assistants that are doing advance work; and Grade 4 the branch librarians. The supervisors are in an ungraded group.

We hold examinations for entrance and for promotion from grade to grade, and we try to make the examination from the junior grade to the senior grade as difficult as the final examinations in the library school.

The library school graduates, without any former experience, enter immediately at the minimum rate in the senior grade. With experience they can enter at a higher rate in that grade or with special experience in even the higher grade, but

our chief difficulty comes in deciding how much we can allow for the various training classes and apprentice classes plus experience in other libraries. We want to allow all we can to the training that is given in other libraries, in justice, as I say, to our own staff, but until library training classes and apprentice classes are appraised, I feel we are going to continue to meet this difficulty.

We have an examining board to decide on all cases, and, among other things, to decide on the cases that do not fit easily into our scheme of service. That board is composed of the chief of the circulation department, the various supervisors, one branch librarian, the principal of the library school, and a representative from the state association sent to the board to act for one year.

The board prepares all examinations for entrance and promotion, and puts the final approval on all efficiency ratings and does, as I say, decide on the cases or applications that do not fit in easily with the scheme of service.

This morning I thought I would bring just a few of the applications that have come to us during the past year that seemed difficult in fitting in. I thought they might be of interest to you.

This girl came from Portland. She had the apprentice course training in Portland Public Library and was in the Portland Library for nine years, but had no library school training.

This girl had had the Dallas Public Library apprentice training and had been in charge of the children's work in Dallas for three years.

The next one had had the apprentice course at the Carnegie Library at Fort Worth, Texas, and had had four years' experience in the library.

The next had had training class work in the Pittsburgh Public Library and had had one year's experience in Pittsburgh.

The next had had one year's experience in Chicago without any previous training.

The next had had eleven years in the Newport Public Library without any previous training.

This girl had had three years in the art department of the Minneapolis Public Library without any previous training.

The next one had had the Riverside, California, Library School course and three years' work in Miles City, Montana.

The next had had the Detroit Public Library training class and one and a half year's experience.

The next girl had had one year's training in the Toledo Public Library and a year and a half experience in the library.

The next had had the Springfield, Mass., training and one year's experience.

The next had had apprentice course in the Free Library of Philadelphia and four years' experience there.

The next had had the Los Angeles Public Library Train-

ing School of 1911; it was just a training class at that time.

The next had had nine months' training in library work in the University of Texas and then experience in the San Antonio Library.

The next had had three months' apprentice work in the St. Louis Public Library, and training class and a summer course at the Library School at the University of Wisconsin.

This last one was one that I thought was quite interesting because she had had our training and having finished our training class went to Cleveland and entered the Library there. She was promoted from one grade to another after she arrived in Cleveland because her work had been satisfactory, and then she came back to us and wanted to enter our second grade, but as we require difficult examination between the first and the second grade, we could only admit her to a grade that was lower than the Cleveland grade, which seemed rather disrespectful to Cleveland; but at the same time we had to be fair to our own girls who had passed the examination, the girls who had been in the same group with her.

MISS RATHBONE: Do you feel the need of grades?

MISS OVERTON: Yes. That is the point I am trying to make. If we had a uniform scheme of service we wouldn't be meeting this difficulty.

MR. SANBORN: Do you mean that all of those girls were put in the same grade?

MISS OVERTON: No, they were put in different grades. We had difficulty in deciding which grade they should go into. It took considerable correspondence with these different libraries to get the rating of the girls in the libraries, but they did not fit easily into the scheme of service. With a uniform scheme it would have been perfectly possible for each one of these assistants to come with the simple statement that she had passed the qualifications for the junior or senior grade of library service, and all we would need then would be a recommendation on her principal fitness.

You see, I am assuming that if we do put through this uniform scheme it will have to bring with it in time an appraisal of the training classes and apprentice classes and will lead eventually to more definite organization for educational work than we have at present. It also would lead to uniform standard of examinations and some definite form of efficiency rating.

I hope if the day ever comes that we have a uniform efficiency rating, I may endorse Miss Topper's wish that there will be some provision made for that most desirable qualification for a librarian -- the ability to read and read effectively. I think the service ratings emphasize too frequently the qualifications needed for clerical work, and, of course, that ability to read and read effectively isn't always brought out in examinations.

I have touched only on the practical side of the work, because that is the angle that we look at it from. Those that are

in favor of certification might easily consider this the first step, but if there are any that are firmly against first certification, I think they must all agree that it is only a sensible plan to work out a better business relation between libraries than we have at present.

The uniform terminology, of course, will be of inestimable value. We would hope the Committee would work out some scheme of titles that would give some indication of the duties and responsibilities of the different positions. Other organizations have done that, and I think that libraries ought to be able to do it too.

New York had just a little experience in working out a uniform scheme of service, and Dr. Hill spoke of it the other night at the meeting, but I would just like to touch on it briefly before I sit down, because I think it is an experiment that does prove something. In 1917, when the three library systems in greater New York were making concerted effort to get better salaries for their employes, the Bureau of Standards in the city some time previous to that had drawn up specifications for all civic positions and had taken into consideration the salaries paid in the business world at that time and the fixation of the salary rates. The librarians were not included in that group, and the question came up making specifications covering the library positions. I think it would be interesting for you to know that the Committee on Education at that time, wishing to get in-

formation to compare New York salaries with those paid in other cities, made every effort to get data that would help them, with the same result that Miss Rathbone reports in the returns of her questionnaire. There was such a difference in nomenclature that it was impossible to compare salaries of corresponding grades because, of course, the grades didn't correspond.

The Bureau of Standards met the same difficulty when it came to work with the three library systems. We were all working under different schemes of service, and we soon found we were not getting any place. It was finally decided that the three libraries should work out some scheme of service covering the rules government appointments, promotions, eligible lists, and so forth, and there should be standard examinations used by all the libraries, and a certain form of efficiency rating that would be satisfactory to the libraries and similar in scope to one used in the city for other positions.

We had several very interesting conferences, and we were able to work out a scheme that speaking for New York we like very much better than the scheme we had been working under, although we don't claim it is perfect by any means; in fact, we know it has a great many faults and we would be very glad to change it for a better uniform scheme if one could be devised. It makes very little difference to any of us whether our schemes run up or down or whether the grades are numbered or lettered as long as we can have one that guarantees a high standard of

service recognized all over the country.

MISS RATHBONE: The question will now be discussed from the point of view of the smaller library. Miss Grace Rose will discuss the subject as it appears from the angle of the smaller library.

MISS GRACE ROSE: In calling upon a library assistant in the hospital a few years ago, I found that she was registered on the hospital register as Librarian of the Public Library. She was an unclassified assistant who had no training whatever outside of a few weeks of supervised work and training in the library itself. She was what might be classified in a larger library as a filing clerk or a mechanical worker. It made me realize that the classification of the library staff in the minds of the members of the staff was very indefinite, that they had no idea of ranking themselves in regard to their staff relations or positions. The more I thought about it, the more I felt it was quite necessary to define different kinds of library service even in a library where there were only eight or ten or perhaps twelve or fifteen members on the staff. I think we had ten or twelve at that time.

We commenced grading our service to a certain extent. Our beginners were known first as apprentice workers. Next they became junior assistants. After that there was rather indefinite promotion according to qualifications, so that we had no very definite grading under those who had distinct titles, like the

reference librarian, the head of the loan desk, the cataloger, and so forth, and these various assistants did what they could in the various departments and were often transferable from one department to another but without any very clearly defined duty except to learn to do the clerical work in all departments.

Occasionally it was necessary to leave them at an important desk over a noon hour or over a period of time when it was not very busy. That, of course, gave the workers themselves the impression that they were doing a higher grade of service than was really true, because they were merely substitutes and were always instructed to refer any questions to the head of that department or to the one in charge of the desk upon her return.

There is also, in the smaller city, a very great misconception of the duties of the assistants in the library. They are all recognized as librarians. I have been asked a number of times not how many assistants or how many library workers there were in the library, but how many librarians. Any one who comes in is supposed to be a professional worker and a librarian. It would help very much to have some such classification or some such scheme of library service in a smaller city as soon as the staff organization grows large enough to need various types of library workers.

It would help not only in the recruiting for library service in giving definite ideas of the needs of the educational qualifications and other qualifications for promotion even in a

small library, but it would likewise help them to know what they must do to provide for advancement if they wish to advance in the profession or if they wish to work in a larger library or prepare to attend a library school, because most of the positions in the smaller cities are filled from local applications and often it is the policy of the library board never to employ any one aside from the head librarian from other cities. That, of course, is changing in a good many places, but in a state where there are a good many very good, well organized small libraries, as there are in Iowa, I am quite convinced that a scheme of library service which would classify the staff and give them a definite standing in comparison with the staff in the larger libraries would be a very great advantage not only in the staff organization but in the professional standing of the librarians and their assistants in the various cities.

MISS RATHBONE: The Committee felt it would be well to have this subject discussed from the point of view of libraries already under municipal control. It therefore asked Mr. Roden to take up the subject from that viewpoint.

MR. CARL B. RODEN: I am afraid I have very little to say, and I am going to take a very short time to say it, because there seems to me to be absolutely no room for difference of opinion as to the desirability of the classification of library employes. I don't think there can be any two minds about that. Neither is it thinkable that we are going to disagree very seri-

ously when we come to devising a scheme of terminology. If one library's grade begins with seven and another begins with one, I suppose we will all be able to reconcile such discrepancies as that, and any definitions that fall between such extremes.

I don't know that I have anything to say except to go into the experience in Chicago, which is hardly applicable and is only local. We should be glad to submit our scheme to the Committee when it comes to devising a scheme, but I don't believe it would be profitable to describe our plan now. It works admirably, and it has been in course ever since the Civil Service Law of Illinois was adopted in 1895. It was amended at the request of the Commission with the cooperation of Mr. Legler and myself in 1910, and it can be amended again any time we want to enlarge it or extent it or vary it in any respect.

I can only give the assurance that when it comes to reconciling our Chicago plan with any other that the Association may adopt, there will not be the slightest difficulty in the world so far as any legal or official objections might go. Unfortunately we never find ourselves in Chicago in the predicament of New York in having a great number of applicants with preparation of various kinds to choose from and to assort and insert in the staff. Such few as come to us with preparation of any kind can be very easily allocated by a reference to our schedule and by pointing to the job and saying, "There is the job and there is the price. They go together."

After appointment there is always the probationary period, and we find no difficulty eventually in determining exactly the qualifications of an employe. I hardly think that any scheme of classification could be made elastic enough automatically to allow such determination.

I am afraid that is all I have to say, because it seems to me that a profession which already is uniform in so many things, that has a classification or at most two classifications for books and admits that books without classification are utterly unusable, which has agreed substantially upon methods of cataloging and upon all other methods of library routine, and which welcomes every attempt to uniform standards in such things as indexes to magazines and to other common subjects, can not hesitate or spend very much time deliberating over the advisability of classifying its own personnel. (Applause)

MISS RATHBONE: The Committee felt also it was wise to consider the angle from the Chairman of Salaries who has wrestled for sometime with this problem of comparing conditions to recompense for library work in different libraries. Mr. Compton will take up this subject.

MR. CHAS. H. COMPTON: We haven't any reasonably late collection of salaries of large public libraries, medium sized public libraries and college libraries. We found a great deal of difficulty in classifying the positions so that they would mean the same thing. Before sending out the questionnaire we spent a good deal of time with the different members of the committee in trying to define these positions and we weren't very well satisfied with the definitions, and when the answers to the questionnaire came in we were less satisfied. We found that to take a definition like junior assistant, for example, it had a widely different meaning in the different libraries and that it might mean that a junior assistant had had no apprentice training or it might mean that she had had considerable.

I would like to take one or two definitions that were used. We used in the classification the positions which are given in the revised form of the A. L. A. statistics.

In defining children's librarians, of course you might say that any graduate of a course in children's work in recognized library school would be classified as a children's librarian, but for our purposes we did not think that was the right classi-

20

fication. We stated only those should be included as children's librarians who had special training or sufficient experience to qualify them for this classification, usually limited to those in charge of children's rooms or children's work in extension departments.

When the answers to the questionnaire came in, we found that in a great many libraries they had included in this classification also the heads of their children's department. It is perfectly natural, and still it wasn't what we intended.

In the question of catalogers, for example, there was a good deal of difference of opinion as to what a cataloger is. I suppose that some librarians might think that it would be impossible to find one to define her.

But this is the definition we used: "Under this head should be included only those fitted for and actually doing expert cataloging and not including typists or others doing clerical or routine work in the catalog department."

I think this suggests what work or some of the work the committee would have to do in defining positions. It would be a very difficult work to do, although I think it could be done, and the Salaries Committee has recommended that salary statistics of this kind which I have mentioned should be published annually, and if we could have standardized schemes, certainly the comparison would be much fairer. It is pretty difficult now to make a fair comparison.

One of the plums in drawing up a scheme of library service is to find a method for making salary increases, and I should like to mention a few questions which might come up.

On what basis should increases be made? If based on efficiency, how determined? Our efficiency record as now maintained actually used by executives in recommending increases. Should length of service in itself be taken into consideration in making increases? How to prevent the natural increases to be granted.

All these problems it seems to me would be ones which such a committee might consider.

In going over the schemes of library service in a number of libraries, I have been impressed with the fact that in a number of cases differences were more apparent than real. For example, in Miss Rathbone's paper on Standardization before the Council, the fact was brought up that in St. Louis there were three different grades, Grade B for first assistants, catalogers and children's librarians. As a matter of fact, all of these grades receive the same salary and the examinations are the same; that is, examinations for children's librarians and first assistant are the same except that there is an alternate question on children's work for children's librarians, and, of course, the ones taking examinations for children's librarians are required to have had experience and natural aptitude for that work. So I don't think there would be the difficulty in drawing up these

4d

schemes of library service that might seem apparent. I think it could be made uniform for the different libraries. (Applause)

MISS RATHBONE: The subject is now open for general discussion.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Before we enter the general discussion, I think it might be well for us to have before us the resolution which the Committee has prepared, so I will ask Miss Rathbone, as Chairman of the Committee, to read the resolution into the minutes and move its adoption, and then we will consider that we are ready for general discussion.

MISS RATHBONE: The resolution offered by the Committee is as follows:

"RESOLVED, that the Council of the American Library Association recognizes the desirability and practicability of standardized and related schemes of library service applicable to the needs of libraries of different sizes and directs the Committee to proceed to formulate such schemes to be presented for discussion at a future meeting of the Council."

I, therefore, move, as Chairman of the Committee, the adoption of the resolution.

... The motion was seconded by Dr. Hill ...

MR. BOSTWICK: A committee of Socialists once called on Professor Giddings of Columbia University to find out whether or not he was a Socialist. Professor Giddings answered them substantially as follows: "If sympathy for what Socialists are

doing as opposed to the methods by which they are trying to do it makes one a Socialist, then I am a Socialist."

I have the greatest possible sympathy with what is being attempted in this study of the Committee, but it seems to me that we might go about it in a little different way, and I have listened carefully to everything that has been said for some indication that the necessity of going about it in this particular way was recognized. It seems to me obvious that such recognition ought to be universal but I can't find any symptoms of it. It seems to me that the way in which one should go about it is this: First, what is the criterion of the desirability of standardization in the various things that libraries are doing? Second, do schemes of service fall within this category? If so, your question is answered at once.

You have got to decide those two different things. It is perfectly obvious that some things should be standardized and some things shouldn't. For instance, you know the work that the engineers under Mr. Hoover's Committee have been doing on standardization where there have been something like perhaps one thousand kinds of screw sizes and they reduced them down to twenty-five, and something of that kind. The desirability of that sort of thing is perfectly obvious. If on the other hand you try to standardize the sizes and methods of construction of portable buildings, I doubt whether that would be desirable, because not the same kind of building is desirable

for southern California and northern Wisconsin.

Again, if you attempted to standardize the method of writing poetry and of painting pictures, of course the mere statement of that makes it obvious that such a thing is undesirable and impossible.

What, then, is the criterion of desirability of standardization in the things we are trying to do? It seems to me that is the first question we ought to tackle. It is perfectly obvious to me in this particular case that the schemes of service in the three libraries in New York City ought to be standardized, and I don't see how on earth they are getting along without such standardization.

DR. HILL: We are not.

MR. BOSTWICK: It is obvious you ought to have it. I don't think anybody would doubt it. Is it equally obvious that the scheme of service in New York and the scheme of service in Seattle ought to be standardized? I confess that is not now obvious to me. I am sorry this resolution was worded in this way, because I believe it is very desirable to have a unanimous vote back of the Committee in the study they are going to make and I can't vote for the resolution as it stands, because I don't believe the Council is in a position just now to recognize the desirability and practicability of standardized and related schemes of library service.

If the resolution were worded this way, "Resolved,

7c

that the Council of the A. L. A. recognizes the desirability of a further study of" and so on, then you could go on with the resolution, and it seems to me that the Committee would be in a perfectly good position to present whatever results it wanted to under such a resolution. But with the resolution as it stands, although I am in sympathy with it, I shouldn't vote for it.

MISS RATHBONE: All that the Committee had in mind in the resolution was to make sure that the Council and those represented within had sufficient sympathy with the idea before it would be worth while for the Committee to go on with it. We don't want to go on and spend a lot of time drawing up plans which aren't wanted, which nobody thinks are worth while and which are going to be voted down when they are presented. We are all busy and we have got other things we want to do. At the same time we have got to know that there is some recognition of the desirability of proceeding with this work, and some possibility, not that our results would be accepted as we present them -- we don't expect that for a moment -- but some possibility that the end we are aiming for is something, the desirability of which is recognized.

MR. BOSTWICK: Would you accept an amendment of that resolution?

MISS RATHBONE: I would have to consult the Committee. I couldn't do that on my own authority.

MR. BOSTWICK: Is it in order to present an amendment? I want to word this thing so the Committee will accept it and so it will cover my objection. It seems to me that it goes a little too far. We all sympathize in the work of the Committee, and want them to go ahead with it, but it seems to ask us to adopt this now is tantamount to asking us to approve a great part of what the Committee is going to do.

"RESOLVED, that the Council of the A. L. A. recognizes the desirability of a further detailed study of standardized and related schemes of library service," and then go on with the resolution as it stands; "recognizes the desirability of a further detailed study" instead of saying "recognizes the desirability and practicability of standardized and related schemes".

DR. HILL: Would it not be well to withhold that substitute motion for a little while until we can get the voice of some of us present? This is the most important matter that has come before the Council in a great many years. Miss Rathbone has hit the nail on the head when she says that we must standardize positions before we can give certificates to individuals. Of course, we may give individuals certificates who come from library schools, but we ought to give certificates to those who come from training classes and perhaps apprentice classes. We can't do any of that with satisfaction to the graduates or to librarians until we first standardize the work which is done in the different libraries throughout the country. It makes no

9c

difference whether it is a library with sixteen assistants or sixteen hundred.

The classification scheme is one which can be worked equally well. The importance, the desirability of such classification ought to be manifest to every one who has applications from individuals in the various libraries throughout the country.

If we could agree upon a graded system showing that the work done in the St. Louis library, in the Chicago library, in the Seattle library, in the Portland library, or in a smaller library, in each and every case is the same, and I believe that such a thing could be worked out by this Committee, then we would know at once just where to place that individual and we wouldn't have the trouble which Miss Overton has shown exists in New York and which I am sure exists in many smaller libraries than New York.

There is one other important thing to be remembered, that the adoption of a uniform scheme of service will save librarians a great deal of trouble. There will be less attempts to influence a librarian to place a person in such a grade when it is known that she doesn't belong there. That influence is felt more in the small library than it is in the large library, because if we are not under a municipal civil service system we are under what some of us think is better, a merit system, and we get along comfortably there when the small library suffers. I close by saying again that this is the most important subject

10c

that has come before the Council in a great many years excepting, of course, our annual visitor and friend, the Constitution.

MISS TYLER: Mr. President, I am much interested in that clause in the resolution stating "applicable to the needs of libraries of different sizes". That, it seems to me, is the question that ought to be considered. I think it is obvious to all of us that these schemes are absolutely essential in the large library. I can't see that any one would question it. But when you come to a small library with probably one trained person and a few assistants who must work in all departments and take responsibilities of various kinds, I can't quite see how that could be fitted in to this graded service. It would seem to me that this plan as it is being presented so ably by Miss Rathbone is of the importance that Dr. Hill claims for it for the large libraries. It would seem to me that this whole matter would swing over into the group that had the meeting here a day or two ago, considering the problems of the large libraries. I confess I can not see how this could be applied to the scores and hundreds of small libraries, and I would question whether that clause should be there.

MISS RATHBONE: It doesn't say all sizes.

MISS TYLER: No, but that word "different" might seem to indicate that it might go down the scale to small libraries. I happen to know more, I think, about small libraries than I do about city libraries, and I can not think of this scheme as

11c

applying to the scores of small libraries with which I am intimately acquainted.

DR. HILL: May I answer that statement? Probably nine-tenths of the libraries represented here today are using the Dewey decimal classifications. That is so arranged that the largest library in the country uses it, or the smallest. It may be used in its full classification or in its modified form. I believe it is possible to work out a scheme of service which will fit the small library just as well as the large library when this Committee or this Council or this Association has defined the positions and stated the work connected with each position. The possibilities of the plan are so great that there isn't a library so small but what it could come within its scope. We are making only beginnings here, and I am thoroughly convinced that the small library would be benefitted just as much as the medium sized or the large sized one.

DR. ANDREWS: I think that the Committee forgot to put in the word "public". They said distinctly they were not going to study the needs of special and university libraries and yet, like Miss Tyler, I read in it a statement which applies to all of us. If it applies to all of us, I shall have to go against it, because I agree with Mr. Bostwick that I don't think a scheme can be made to apply to all libraries.

MISS RATHBONE: You are perfectly right. The Committee has no idea of attacking anything but public libraries.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Do you wish to amend by the insertion of the word "public" so that in the fifth line it reads, "needs of public libraries"?

MR. DUDGEON: Following what Miss Tyler says, it seems to me there is a very distinct difference that it is somewhat difficult to recognize to try to class small and large libraries together. As Miss Tyler will bear me out, the average person in the small library knows something about everything in the library. They work at all sorts of things, and they know their education and their training are very general compared, for example, to a person who is put in a special room for a special lot of books to meet a special kind of people in a larger public library, and it seems to me -- I am not discouraging an effort to classify them -- we are going to meet with a good many difficulties when we come into that sort of thing.

For example, it might be that a person in Grade 3 from a small library who knows something about everything would fit into a large library, but if you can imagine the reverse and a person in Grade 3 who has been in a special room dealing with special people with special problems and try to put them in a small library in Grade 3, they would be simply utterly treading on unknown ground.

It seems to me there may be one other difficulty that we want to avoid. I think all of us have agreed in talking of certification that we want to recognize personality as much as

possible. I do not think that this classification is going to solve Miss Overton's troubles. I can not imagine her taking that list that she read and simply glancing at some certificate or credential and saying, "You are in Grade 3. Jump right into Grade 3, you can have that salary." It isn't going to do so very much for us after all, I don't believe, in the shifting of people from one library to another, because the question of personality not only of the individual, but the personality of the chief under whom they have worked and the personality of the library in which they have worked, if you please, is going to make, in spite of all we can do, Grade 3 in one library very different from Grade 3 in another library, and it will be only just a mere suggestion as to where that person belongs rather than a certificate of their absolute ranking.

MISS DOWNEY: It seems to me the discussion so far has only referred to two different things to consider which we have always seen in this discussion. It is the standardization of work but not the standardization of classes of people. I believe the work itself can be standardized but you can't standardize people.

MISS RATHBONE: I just simply wanted to say to Mr. Dudgeon that every large system has small branches and in the small branch the assistants do all kinds of work, so in the larger system there is something quite analogous to the positions in the small libraries.

MR. DUDGEON: Would you have different classifications

for those who work in branch libraries and those in large libraries?

MISS RATHBONE: That is a matter of detail.

MR. DUDGEON: There you have the trouble within your own library, I think.

MISS SARGENT-SMITH: Speaking of the large library, I am rather puzzled how the Committee is going to get a means of coordinating, as it were, for example, the Los Angeles library and the New York public library in their different grading characteristics. Their standards in themselves are just as high, but they must differ.

DR. HILL: Isn't that something which the Committee is going to work out between now and the next meeting if we find that it is desirable to do so? I am not on the Committee, so I am not speaking for it, but I presume that the Committee would attempt to define the duties in each grade so that it would be possible to find in Los Angeles and Seattle and Cleveland and so forth, if they should agree to these gradings, people who would fit into each other's libraries.

MR. BOSTWICK: We all hope, I am sure, that the Committee will be successful in this effort, but why vote in advance that we think they are going to be successful? Why not wait and see whether they are going to be successful?

DR. LOCKE: As a person who is a radical and generally opposed to anything that looks like anything that looks like

standardization of any kind, I have great sympathy with Miss Rathbone's Committee's report today. I was for nine years a member of the Entrance Board of the University of Chicago, examining candidates from other colleges. If there is anything more weird and uncanny than the persons who come up from all sorts of colleges for entrance into a university, I have yet to see it. All the persons coming up to apply to the New York public library wouldn't equal half a dozen of those with whom we used to deal. In dealing with those people we have to work out from time to time a general working idea of standardization to see if they wouldn't come under certain classes, otherwise we would have to deal with each individual and we wouldn't do anything else during the college year. We gradually began to slide one chap into one class and another class that didn't fit, but none of us fit any of our jobs. We would be funny looking people if we did.

We got a general working agreement as to standardization, and that, I think, is what Miss Rathbone's Committee is trying to do. I have no idea that when the Committee reports a standardized scheme that I will adopt it, but I have no doubt that I will get a whole lot of ideas from that Committee that will help me to make my scheme better, or if I think the scheme will fit me, I have all the Englishman's right to take everything that is laid down loose. (Laughter and applause) And that is exactly the feeling I have with regard to it.

Therefore, I would like to see this Committee continued even though I think Miss Rathbone didn't do me the honor of putting me among the large libraries to investigate me, which I appreciated, because I suppose she thought it wasn't necessary to investigate me.

Here is the point: If we keep this continued from year to year we approach something like a standard that will enable us to work. I can see why I can take a person out of one of my departments, a person I am thinking about now, and I couldn't fit her into any scheme in God's earth, but that isn't going to destroy the value of a committee that we have appointed to discuss general matters, so I am heartily in favor and trust and hope that the Committee will be continued and the work will be continued and each and every one of us will try to do something towards it and see if we can't reach something that will help us all.

MR. WRIGHT: I think it would be a crying shame if the work of this Committee shouldn't be continued. I am not concerned very much about what the language of the resolutions is just so the Committee goes ahead. I have been trying to work with Miss Rathbone and the Committee, and they have taken a load off of my shoulders. It is seriously needed. One of the great troubles that I have tried to work out is to find, for instance in Des Moines, Iowa, one trained librarian and in Sioux City two, and another just north of it with none, and I am wondering

how they can all be graded to fit. If you took Miss Rose out of Des Moines and put in somebody else that nobody knew, I wonder what her grade would amount to.

That is one of the troubles I find. They are just as inarticulate. I begin to get benefits from the Committee's work already, and as Dr. Locke has just said, we may not get something that all of us can adopt but we can all get a tremendous amount of help. I hope that the Committee will go ahead in its good work.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: The motion which is before the Council is a motion as made by the Committee with the substitution or with the addition of the word "public" before the word "libraries". Dr. Bostwick a few moments ago moved certain modifications of this resolution. I do not find that they have been seconded. Does any one wish to second Dr. Bostwick's amendment?

MR. BOSTWICK: In presenting this amendment I want to say that I don't believe everybody has quite got hold of my idea. My idea is that we shall have a unanimous vote back of this Committee in doing this work. We all want them to go ahead just as they had planned and present their scheme, but I don't think we are in a position now -- I certainly am not, and I don't want to be the only one to vote against this resolution as I perhaps will be if it is presented in this form. I don't recognize yet what they want us to vote in this resolution, "the practicability of standardized and related schemes of library service applicable

to the needs of libraries of different sizes." I can not yet recognize that. I have a perfectly open mind and I hope the Committee will bring forward material that will convince me of the practicability, but why ask me now to vote on the practicability? Why not just cut that out and say, "recognizes the desirability of a further detailed study of," and then go on with the rest of the resolution?

MISS TYLER: I second Dr. Bostwick's amendment.

DR. HILL: Wouldn't Dr. Bostwick be satisfied if the word "practicability" be left out and if it read, "recognizes the desirability of standardized and related schemes of library service"? Unless we are sure of the desirability of such schemes, the Committee wouldn't feel justified in spending its time and the time of its different libraries in trying to work out schemes. Wouldn't that be acceptable?

MR. BOSTWICK: I have no desire to quibble over words, I don't suppose anybody has. In accepting that, as I am now doing, I reserve the right to make my own definition of the word "desirability".

DR. HILL: So will we all.

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Either as Chairman of the Committee or as members of the Council, do you accept that?

MISS RATHBONE: I am perfectly willing to accept that. If there are any members of the Committee here who object, I should be glad to know it. Personally, I am willing to leave out

the words "and practicability".

The resolution will then read: "RESOLVED, that the Council of the A. L. A. recognizes the desirability of standardized and related schemes of library service applicable to the needs of public libraries of different sizes and directs the Committee to proceed to formulate such schemes to be presented for discussion at a future meeting of the Council."

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Does the second endorse those amendments?

DR. HILL: Yes, I do.

... The motion to adopt the resolution as amended was carried ...

PRESIDENT UTLEY: Before we adjourn I will ask if the Committee on Public Documents who has a resolution to present to the Council is ready to present it? (No response)

... The meeting adjourned at twelve-fifteen p. m. ...

ADJOURNMENT