

## Paralibrarians?

The Australian literature on Library Technicians is replete with references to the inadequacy of their title, and the lack of any good alternative.

The issue is raised yet again in the forthcoming monograph *Sharing the challenges: library technicians in the 1990's* edited by Jean Bailey (Auslib Press 1993).

I propose Paralibrarian—logical if Library Technicians are paraprofessionals who support and work with professional librarians. Strange to the ear perhaps, but no more so than paramedic and paralegal.

An article in a US journal for library support staff *Library mosaics* July/August 1993 pp8-11, 'Who is a librarian' by Shannon Hoffman (copy available from me if anyone cannot locate it, fax (08) 302 6756), sustains well the case for the title Paralibrarian. What do Australian Paralibrarians and Librarians think?

Alan Bundy

University Librarian, Uni of SA

## Libraries as car parks

If I may offer a student perspective on the car-parking debate now raging at UNSW, it seems to me that the simplest solution would be to convert the Library building to a multi-storey carpark. Its central location makes it ideal for this purpose, and any overflow could easily be accommodated on the present Library lawn.

Such a move is not only cheaper than 'going underground', it also employs one of our most prominent structures for what is undoubtedly (if Feedback is any guide) this University's most important function.

Alternatively, we could keep the Library and actively reduce the need for car parking. This would result in improved efficiency and aesthetics of the campus, reduced impact on the environment and local community, better public transport and a healthier workforce.

Unfortunately it would also consume fewer resources than the original problem—hardly what a good technocrat would call a 'solution'—so, as a technology-based in-

stitution, we have to ignore it. Sorry.

Michael O'Brien

(excerpted with kind permission from *UNIKEN, the UNSW newspaper*)

## Librarians and library technicians

The actions of the Board of Examiners and of the General Council in relation to the qualification of librarians over recent years seem to offer confirmation of the view of the early Greeks that those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad. In a time of credentialism for a professional Association to equate the qualifications of graduate librarians with those of the holders of technical college certificates is to give away the benefits which accrue to the former and to lower their cash value industrially.

None of this is to undervalue the role of the library technician or to deny the merits of their qualifications, nor is it intended to deny the need for the Association to recognise and acknowledge the desirability of providing an appropriate award for the more talented. The damage done to job prospects and salary rewards of graduates and certificate holders however, is such that even my mean intellect can recognise it. Is it too late to step back from the brink or must we wait for the republic to sweep away the imperfect Royal Charter?

Allan Horton

## The date of the Charter

In her farewell Direct Line (*inCite* 28 June 1993 p.8), Sue Kosse referred to the 'granting of the Royal Charter in 1964'. This is incorrect. The Association was incorporated by Royal Charter in 1963, a fact which is stated on the title page of every *Handbook* from 1964 up to the latest one, 1991/1992. The Supplemental Royal Charter 1988 also gives the wrong date for the original Royal Charter.

I draw attention to the following references in support of my contention that the Association was incorporated by Royal Charter in 1963:

a) *LAA Handbook 1964*. Royal Charter—'Witness ourself at Westminster the twenty-ninth

day of January in the eleventh year of our Reign'. (ie. 1952+11=1963).

- b) *ALJ*, March 1963, p.14—'Members may confidently expect the year 1963 to be another landmark in the Association's history, along with 1937 and 1949.'
- c) *ALJ*, September 1963, p.117—General Council Resolution 10/63—'That this first General Council of and on behalf of the Library Association of Australia incorporated by Royal Charter dated 29th January 1963...'
- d) *ALJ*, June 1964, p.100—Annual Report for 1963, para.2, Royal Charter.
- e) *LAA Handbook 1964*—'A Royal Charter of Incorporation was granted to the Association by Her Majesty the Queen on 29th January 1963...'
- f) *ALJ*, December 1963, p.184—'...the Charter was published as a private advertisement but as a means of public notice the *Commonwealth Gazette* No.67 of 16th August 1963...'

There is inconsistency about the date of the original Charter in the Association's publications, e.g.,

- given as 1964 in Supplemental Royal Charter and in Annual Reports 1987 to date;
- given as 1963 in *Office Bearers Guides*, and in *Handbooks* 1964 to date.

Jean M Murray

former Executive Secretary, LAA,  
December 1962–June 1970 ■

## Apology

The gremlins struck twice at Harrison Bryan's letter concerning Fellowships for library technicians (*inCite* 6, p22):

- Harry's computer had inadvertently omitted a line from the quotation in his first paragraph, which we printed verbatim as received. The quotation should have read, 'advise General Council, by the Council's last meeting in 1993, on the criteria and procedure for extending to the Technician members eligibility for the distinction of Fellow' (*inCite* 4, p17).
- we then allowed the small but vital word 'not' to disappear from his penultimate paragraph, thus vitiating his earlier argument. The correct wording is, 'It seems to me to be quite contrary to the best interests of the Association not to preserve, quite jealously, for librarians and librarians alone, marks of distinction which have helped over the years to identify librarians and so to clarify, in the minds of the public, librarianship's claim to be regarded as a profession.'

We regret our contribution to the confusion, and hope that the record is now straight. ■