

# LOCAL BODY ARCHIVES IN NEW ZEALAND

## A Personal View

By S. R. STRACHAN  
*Archivist, Hocken Library, University of Otago.*

*Revised text of a paper given at the session on local body archives, NZLA Conference, Wellington, Thursday, February 21, 1974.*

The abolition of the provinces in 1876 led more or less directly to the establishment of the system of local government in New Zealand that we have today; territorial bodies in the form of county, city and borough councils, each performing a wide variety of functions; and *ad hoc* or special purpose bodies of all kinds, each charged with one major function. The most impressive single feature of New Zealand local government is the great variety and number of its constituent authorities; and as a natural corollary, with some very notable exceptions, the typical New Zealand local body tends to be restricted in scope, area, population and resources generally, compared with its counterpart overseas. The latest edition of *Local Authority Statistics* lists a grand total of 691 local authorities, of which 245 are the very important territorial bodies, a further 199 are pest destruction boards, and the remainder special purpose authorities of all types including fire, hospital, harbour, catchment, power and drainage boards and a host of miscellanea.<sup>1</sup> But this is not all. There are also 10 education boards; 1,122 state primary and intermediate schools, most of them with school committees; and a further 268 secondary and district high schools, most of which have separate boards.<sup>2</sup> And what about domain boards, licensing trusts, regional development councils, universities, teachers colleges, museum trust boards, regional planning authorities, airport authorities, etc? The list can be extended almost indefinitely.

All these bodies produce records of greater or lesser importance in enormous quantities. A small part of them, but one large enough in absolute terms, is worth preserving indefinitely as archives.

By archives is meant those records of permanent administrative and historical value which have passed out of current use. One eminent English county archivist estimates their proportion to be 1-10% of the total created, depending on the nature of the records concerned.<sup>3</sup> While the keeping of archives cannot compare with the treatment of sewage, the reticulation of water or the disposal of rubbish as a service essential to the physical well-being of society, in the words of the Grigg Report, "the making of adequate arrangements for the preservation of its records is an inescapable duty of the Government of a civilised state".<sup>4</sup> This statement applies with no less force to the records of local government. Because of the great range of functions performed by local bodies in this country, touching as they do almost every aspect of local life, their records contain a great mass of historical and socio-economic information, not duplicated elsewhere, and represent a cultural asset of inestimable value not just to individual localities but to the nation as a whole. Further, a properly organised archive can be a valuable aid to administrative efficiency, and a source of pride and prestige to the local body concerned. The problem is to determine the quintessential 1-10%, to ensure that it survives in good order and is adequately exploited; to ensure above all, that the baby is not thrown out with the bathwater. For this to be done, a suitable framework for the administration of local body archives has to be worked out and proper standards set.

Before going further, it is as well to look at the relevant legislation. It is scanty and dispersed. New Zealand's only piece of purely archival legislation, the *Archives Act 1957*, is completely silent on the subject of local authority records. It did pave the way for the establishment of a system of regional repositories, but only with reference to the records of district offices of government departments.<sup>5</sup> There is no equivalent to the British *Local Government (Records) Act 1962*, which actively empowers and encourages local authorities to promote the public use of their records.<sup>6</sup> Still less is there anything to match the mandatory clauses of the new British *Local Government Act 1972*, requiring the principal councils of counties, including the metropolitan ones, to "make proper arrangements with respect to any documents" in their custody.<sup>7</sup> For New Zealand the two most important statutes are the *Municipal Corporations Act 1954*<sup>8</sup> and the *Counties Act 1956*<sup>9</sup> under which territorial bodies are constituted. Both acts, which bear a strong resemblance to each other, require that minutes of council proceedings, copies of electoral rolls, by-laws, and special orders should be kept at the office of the council and be available for public inspection. But for how long is not touched upon, and some very important categories of records, such as departmental reports, legal documents and correspondence, are ignored altogether. Two additional provisions of the Acts are of importance for archives. One provides for penalties against those who remove and detain council records without authority.<sup>10</sup> More important, the second permits local bodies to make by-laws "providing for the custody of documents",<sup>11</sup> and presumably allows money to be spent for the purpose. This provision in the case of municipalities has existed since at least the 1900 Act,<sup>12</sup> but for counties only since that of 1956. Whatever may have inspired its inclusion originally, no local authority, so far as I can determine, has thought it necessary to take advantage of this permissive section. The *Municipal Accounting Regulations 1965* and the *Counties Accounting Regulations 1958* require local bodies to keep adequate books of account, and to prepare and publish certified accounts and statements of statistics.<sup>13,14</sup> Individual acts, such as the *Rating Act 1967*, demand the keeping of particular records.<sup>15</sup>

But perhaps the most important document for local body archives is one with the least statutory force. Section 379 of the "Manual of Audit Instructions" issued to local authorities by the Audit Office, recommends the preservation and destruction of various forms of financial records and correspondence.<sup>16</sup>

Special purpose bodies have their own governing statutes and regulations.<sup>17</sup> Commonly these are even less specific on the subject of records than in the case of those for territorial bodies. There is no statutory requirement, for instance, that education, harbour or hospital boards keep minutes of their own proceedings, though invariably the boards' own by-laws order this to be done.

This diffuseness of legislation and regulation on the subject of local body archives is, in general, matched by the relative indifference of local body administrators to the value of their records as potential archives. Total indifference is very unusual and most town clerks have some conception of the permanent value of obviously significant records such as council minutes; and of course, this awareness is much greater than it used to be, partly as a result of the work of the Archives Committee of the New Zealand Library Association,<sup>18</sup> but also with the growing historical consciousness generally brought about by the number of immediately past and approaching centenaries. Even so, local body archives are not usually treated as a matter for serious concern by those who create them, and my own experience has been that few town or county clerks or secretaries of boards really know what records they have or are aware of their full value.<sup>19</sup> And by some perverse law of human nature, the greater the ignorance the greater the suspicion of any request to look through the records or of any attempt to organise them. A firm indication of this lack of serious interest is the almost complete absence of writings on the subject in the texts and journals of the local body administrator.<sup>20</sup> The one article of significance to have appeared in recent years was written not by an administrator, but by an

outside historian, with experience of local record offices in England, appalled by the situation he found here.<sup>21</sup>

Where there is no indifference, sometimes compounded with suspicion, but considerable interest instead, there is often inexperience. In the press of daily business, records which have ceased to be current are usually relegated to out-of-the-way strongrooms, basements and out-houses, ill-arranged, unlisted and poorly housed, worthless records confused with the permanently significant; and in a large local body they will be scattered around a number of departments, each with its own record keeping system separately staffed.

As matters now stand, local body records are kept for the following reasons: legal requirements, administrative convenience, sufficiency of space, historical considerations, in something like that order of importance. The degree of importance attached to each of these factors varies from council to council, depending on the interests of individual councillors, the town or county clerk and the records clerk. A typical position is that if the space is available, then everything is kept. If not, then the records are more or less expertly "purged", a favourite term with local body officials and one which fairly conveys the traumatic nature of the operation. Occasionally this work is left to the discretion of junior filing clerks with disastrous results. Only rarely are proper records management procedures worked out to reduce systematically the great accumulations of modern records and ensure that they do not occur again, and which take into account all factors, legal, administrative, financial and historical in their destruction or preservation. Two situations in which records are especially likely to suffer are the amalgamation of two local authorities, in which case the records of the smaller body are particularly at risk, and the construction of new town halls and civic centres which are usually taken as a "first-class opportunity for a clean-out", a clean-out which should never have been necessary in the first place. Whatever the circumstances, active participation in a vigorous and intelligent records management programme is an essential pre-requisite to the establishment and development of a sound archives service.

This brings me to my next point, the general failure of mature local archive services to develop in this country. For a country of its level of culture, or rather, in this context, standard of living, New Zealand at the local level is archivally one of the most backward countries in the world. In library parlance, the situation can be termed pre-Carnegie. The extent of this failure only becomes fully apparent when the situation here is compared with that overseas, particularly in Europe. A survey conducted by the Society of Archivists, London, in 1968/69, of 91 local records or archive offices of all kinds revealed that the average county record office had a staff of "three to four professional people, one to three records clerks, one repairer (and) one typist", with an average annual budget of £15,000. Cities did themselves less well with an average budget of only £5,300.<sup>22</sup> And that was five years ago. Metropolitan France, which is highly developed in this respect, has an archives service for each of her 90 metropolitan departments with a total of 132 professional staff. In addition, at a lower level still, there is rudimentary network of communal and hospital archives.<sup>23</sup> Norway, a country much the same size as New Zealand in area and population, has seven fully fledged regional archives repositories, the first of which, Trondheim, was established in 1851.<sup>24</sup> Europe generally in the field of archives administration is decades and more in advance of New Zealand. Their archive institutions commonly date back to the early nineteenth, and in some cases to the eighteenth century.

New Zealand's archive tradition, so far as one exists, follows those of the United States and Australia, which until recently were themselves archivally backward nations, particularly at the local level.<sup>25</sup> In these countries pure archive institutions were slow to develop, and the archive function has tended to be assumed by related but not primarily archival bodies, such as libraries of all kinds, museums and historical societies; a pattern already very evident in this country. Though it is always dangerous to generalise about the United States, the three countries, initially at least, had a great deal in common: small

populations in relation to area; the absence of firm historical traditions in comparison with those of Europe; the recent emergence of their societies from the pioneering stage with the primary emphasis on physical and material values; the lack of glamorous ancient documents; and the absence of an interested gentry, particularly important in the case of England. All this may go some way towards explaining the failure. But a crucial factor operating in the case of New Zealand has been the structure of its local government. One respect in which New Zealand local government resembles that in the United States and Australia is in the great number of territorial and special purpose local authorities, most of them too small and too poor to maintain properly established archives on their own account. In England, however, the counties and many cities and boroughs are large and wealthy enough to have established their own very good record offices.<sup>26</sup>

In addition, the United States and Australia, and also Canada and South Africa, all have intermediate levels of government between the national and the purely local levels in the form of states and provinces which are now beginning to support strong archive repositories for the areas under their control. New Zealand lacks any such level of government, and one effect of the abolition of the provinces was to eliminate the only units of government to which regional archives could be naturally attached. Politically and economically the abolition of the provinces may have been a good thing, archivally it was a misfortune. Certainly, the result has been less than perfect. Local body archives tend to lead a precarious existence in the strongrooms of originating authorities. A small quantity further crams the quarters of libraries and museums, often themselves short of space and financially straitened, and whose primary interests are books and artefacts; a situation exacerbated by lack of trained staff and suitable accommodation. This is not the picture of a mature archives system.

What then are the options for the development of local body archives in New Zealand today?

1. Matters can remain much as they are. That is, local bodies can look after their archives in much the same way as they always have done and be the particular concern of no one. This leaves too much to chance, everything depending on the enthusiasm of individual town or county clerks, for whom in any case the preservation and use of archives is not a primary concern. Nor is there any guarantee that an interested clerk will be replaced by one equally interested when he eventually retires. Under this system, if it can be called a system, considerable losses have occurred and are bound to occur again. Moreover, ill-arranged and unlisted archives are exceedingly difficult to use, which greatly limits their value both to the local authority and to the community at large. Archives are valuable only in so far as they are accessible, otherwise they can only be a liability. If archives are to survive in good order and be adequately exploited, then they must become the primary concern of an office or official whose business is archives, that is become an accepted part of local government administration.
2. The establishment of archive sections in the town clerk's department. In New Zealand it would be unrealistic to propose separate archive departments as has been done by some local authorities in England, notably Hertfordshire, but the establishment of archive sections in town clerks' departments or their equivalents is perfectly feasible, particularly for the larger cities. In England, it is regarded as a logical and usual situation for a local record office;<sup>27</sup> whilst in France the *conservateur* of the departmental archives is responsible to the prefect of the department, as well as to the Direction des Archives de France, and at the communal level the archivist, if there is one, is usually located within the office of the *secrétaire de mairie* or town clerk.<sup>28</sup> In general it can be said that the greater number of the best, largest and most effective archive offices are so located.

There are enormous advantages, providing as it does by far the clearest lines of administration. The town or county clerk's department is the senior and central administrative department of a local body. It is the department in

which the most important records, such as council and committee minutes and meeting papers, are generated, and through it much of the business between the council proper and the other departments is routed. It occupies such a pivotal position within the administrative structure, that an archives section located within this department is most advantageously placed. The archivist here is closest to the most important records for which he will ultimately have responsibility, and it is a much easier matter for him to win the respect and confidence of the town clerk if he is directly responsible to him. Without that respect and confidence, the proper development of the archives will be frustrated. A considerable difficulty when it is proposed to deposit local body archives in another institution is to persuade the town clerk or secretary that the older minutes can safely be parted with.

It should be remembered, also, that many important forms of records are required by law to be available for public inspection at the office of the council. If the archives section is located within the town clerk's department, that difficulty is greatly minimised. Indeed the opposite can happen. The Worcestershire County Record Office holds the current committee minutes of the Council which are issued to the committee clerks only on a signed requisition to be returned when finished with.<sup>29</sup>

A further advantage of locating the archives section within the town clerk's department is that it is in a good position to exert some sort of authority over the archives and record keeping practices of other departments, facilitating a comprehensive approach to all Council archives. The records clerk in the gas department is more likely to take seriously an archives programme being formulated from within the town clerk's department than he is from the New Zealand Room of the public library, or from an outside institution altogether. Another very real advantage of locating the archives section within the central administrative department is that its closeness to the records creating process will enable it to participate more effectively in records management programmes and to ensure that in their formulation sound historical criteria are met. It will also enable the regular and continuous transfer of permanently valuable records from the records room into the archives once they have ceased to be current, thus avoiding large and dangerous accumulations of documents. Lastly, it must be remembered that an archives section has administrative functions which must always take priority over the cultural, as records are created first for the use of the local body, and only incidentally for the historian, and these administrative functions are most easily discharged from within the central administrative department.

There are some disadvantages, but not many. Only large cities are likely to be able to afford such an arrangement, as it will inevitably involve some expenditure on salaries and accommodation, though this expenditure will be incurred wherever the archives section is located. Finally, the very unfamiliarity of the arrangement has told against its adoption in this country, having never been seriously considered at all, and it is ironical that those cities which could best afford it are in fact moving towards another solution. Nevertheless, it is still well worth considering, even only in theory, because it sets a standard for a sound archives service, against which other arrangements can be measured.

3. The other arrangement referred to before is the location of the archives section within the public library. There is a certain obviousness to this arrangement in New Zealand, particularly for the larger cities which have a strong tradition of a New Zealand room in their public libraries. Already a number of public libraries, notably Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, Dunedin, Palmerston North and Whangarei have begun receiving the archives of their local bodies. In one or two cases, such as Dunedin, the by-laws of the local authority specifically permit its Public Library to collect papers and records.<sup>30</sup> The trend, however, though marked, is not absolute. What are the advantages of a local authority depositing its archives with the public library? First, the longer hours observed by public libraries would make the archives

more accessible to the general public, particularly in the evenings. Secondly, the wide range of allied material in the form of books, pamphlets and newspapers to be found in a New Zealand room can complement most fruitfully the archives of a local body. Thirdly, members of the New Zealand room staff are very often at present those most interested in the records of their local body for their historical value. In short, the arguments for locating local body archives in public libraries are cultural rather than administrative. The disadvantages for such a location have been put most succinctly in a recent report (1967) on local authority records in Scotland, a country which shares with New Zealand a poorly financed local body structure:

46. There are, however, distinct objections to the simple adoption of this course. There are certain differences of technique and outlook between the professions of librarian and archivist which cannot be ignored. A kindred objection is that under such a system archives will never be the primary interest of the library staff who must seek their advancement in the sphere of printed books. There is, consequently, a clear danger that the records would be inadequately catered for. It must moreover be accepted that the library service in Scotland as at present constituted is of variable quality. While many libraries might be able to undertake archive work without undue difficulty others are at present strained even to perform their primary task. To place an extra load on these libraries would be to the detriment of books and archives alike. This last objection is one which we would hope that time will cure.
47. But two fundamental obstacles to the use of the library service per se appear insuperable. Firstly it would lead to an even greater degree to that proliferation of small record offices without adequate facilities which has already been criticised in paragraph 26 as an undesirable feature of the English system. And secondly we do not consider that the librarian is either well placed in the hierarchy of local government or properly qualified to advise the clerks and other officials of his authority on the problems of modern records. For this will in practice involve giving advice not merely on the future historical value of records but also on the methods whereby records should be organised and framed.<sup>31</sup>

These objections added to the general difficulties arising from the library's remoteness from the centre of administration constitute a formidable handicap to the satisfactory establishment of a local body archive in the public library. Above all, it must be remembered that archives make their own considerable demands in terms of techniques, time and space, and the tendency in this country to regard them negatively as "non-book" or "special materials" must be vigorously checked. It is important that they should not merely be regarded as an interesting adjunct to the New Zealand book collection. If a public library, or any other institution for that matter, goes into the business of archives then it must do so with a sense of commitment, financial commitment, in terms of staff, space and equipment. In short, archives are something to be taken seriously, to be accepted on their own terms, not to be dabbled in. If a library cannot afford this commitment, then it is better out of it altogether.

In staffing, the crucial requirement is the employment of an archivist. In fact, the English Library Association in its policy statement on archives (November 1968) in libraries goes so far as to state that "no existing repository for archives can be considered satisfactory unless the quantity of material is sufficient to justify the employment of an archivist".<sup>32</sup> It must here be said that library training in New Zealand does not equip librarians to handle archives, particularly in large quantities. I am not going to rehearse again the

differences between the two kinds of work, except to say that there is no particular mystique about working with archives any more than there is about librarianship. A qualified archivist should preferably be a graduate in history or an allied subject, and have a sound appreciation of historical method. He should also have a thorough knowledge of records management techniques, archives administration and a practical training in the compilation of various forms of finding aids. He should also have a knowledge of basic accounting, administrative law and history, forms of legal documents, New Zealand bibliography, indexing and document repair. Book cataloguing is not relevant, as in archives work the catalogue card is replaced by the list in all its forms. The snag is that it is not at present possible to acquire this sort of training in New Zealand, except perhaps as in-service training at the National Archives. There is a good case here for supporting the newly established Diploma in Archives Administration course at the University of New South Wales. Moreover, the level of appointment of an archivist within a public library is critical. This should be a senior appointment, preferably at head of department level, and should carry with it the title city archivist or its equivalent. This is important if he is to carry the necessary weight with officials of other departments with whom he will be required to negotiate concerning reviewing, scheduling, weeding and other records management procedures, and display a large sense of administrative and historical judgement. If he cannot command their respect, the quality of the archives will be in jeopardy.

If it is at all possible, the archivist should have supporting staff; three, an archivist, an assistant and a document repairer is considered to provide a good minimum working unit. There is also the question of accommodation. The archives of a large city corporation will probably require something of the order of 1-2,000 feet or more of 15 inch steel shelving; long workbenches are necessary for the ordering of long series of records; basic repair facilities should be provided. In addition, money must be made available for the purchase of boxes, small items of equipment and professional texts and journals. It is a mistake to think that because archives are not purchased that they can be adequately provided for on the cheap. A library proposing to enter the field of archives administration must have a full appreciation of the difficulties and the will to surmount them. In any case this arrangement is only feasible for large cities with strong public libraries. Local bodies such as counties, special purpose authorities and small boroughs with no or only small public libraries, and without the resources to establish an archives section in the central administrative department must make other arrangements. The most likely alternative is for them to deposit their archives in a regional repository.

4. The *Archives Act 1957* permits the depositing of central government records of local interest in approved libraries and museums. So far seven institutions outside Wellington have been so favoured, in Auckland, Te Awamutu, New Plymouth, Napier, Blenheim, Christchurch and Dunedin. They are a mixed bag, consisting of one university library, one public library, two historical societies, one museum library and two museums. Except perhaps for the historical societies, all have a long-standing interest in New Zealand history and possess considerable manuscript and book collections of research quality. Over a period of time, they have accumulated a considerable body of archives, and, to a greater or lesser degree, have come to be regarded as unofficial "regional repositories" for the archives of all kind of institutions, local bodies, businesses, clubs and societies, and schools, as well as for the district offices of government departments. My own institution, the Hocken Library, Dunedin, accommodates approximately 3,000 linear feet of records, 750 feet of business records and the remainder miscellaneous archival and manuscript material. It is very noticeable that the local body records held by the Hocken Library are those of counties, special purpose boards and small boroughs, and this is also true of other "regional repositories", such as the Canterbury

Museum in Christchurch and the Auckland Institute and Museum. Though in each case, they are the oldest and largest archival institutions in their respective cities, none of them administers the archives of its largest local body, the city corporation. These are tending to become the preserve of the public library instead. So that an interesting pattern is beginning to emerge of two actual or potential archive repositories for local body records in each of the main centres. Is it one that we can afford?

It must be said that the standard of archives administration in "regional repositories" is not high, and by overseas standards lamentably low. Only two repositories can be said to employ archivists, and all are inadequately staffed, both in training and numbers, poorly financed, lack space, are deficient in technique and procedures, and only one has produced a comprehensive guide to its holdings.<sup>34</sup> For none of them is administered by a primarily archival institution but in every case by a library or museum, whose priorities must of necessity lie elsewhere. To take a hypothetical case, it would be foolish to expect the director of a museum who is a botanist to advance body and soul the cause of archives, yet it is precisely this missionary spirit, fanaticism if you like, which is so necessary if archives are to be rescued from their current "slough of despond". As it is, archives in a regional repository pursue a parasitical existence, subsisting in a love-hate relationship with the parent institution, wanted and unwanted, wanting and unwanting. Without the parent institution they would have no existence, but their existence gives them little satisfaction. Further, regional repositories suffer also from the problems of remoteness from the central administrative departments of local bodies, both organisationally and in distance, that I have already outlined. Councils are often hesitant about entrusting their records to bodies over which they may have little or no control. This is hardly surprising. For, after all, "who are archivists anyway?" To some extent these difficulties can be removed by a number of devices: by insisting that the ownership of records remains with the Council, that is they be deposited and not gifted; by restricting access without the prior permission of the Council; by allowing them to recall immediately any records that they may require for their own purposes; by supplying them with detailed finding aids to their records; by providing photo copies of particularly valuable or useful records; and, most important, by ensuring that the local body retains a strong sense of identity with its archives. Without that sense of identity, you have a dead record group on your hands. Too often, this is precisely what happens. But, above all, there is no substitute for sheer professionalism of approach, which can only be the product of a thorough theoretical and practical training and experience.

Even so, regional repositories, stunted though they are, cannot be lightly written off. They are of crucial importance for two reasons. First, they possess by far the greater part of what archival experience exists in New Zealand outside Wellington, and such experience is such a scarce commodity that we must husband carefully all we have. Secondly, they are important as an idea, as a concept for something much greater. It is my estimate that within each of the major regions there exists 10-15,000 linear feet and more of preservable archival material of all kinds: the records of district offices of government departments; of local bodies; of businesses; churches; trade unions; and societies and clubs. These by New Zealand standards are very large footages indeed, footages that would justify the establishment and maintenance of substantial archive repositories if *all* the records created in a region were funnelled into the one institution. For once, some of the much vaunted economies of scale might have some application. Such footages would allow the employment of archival staff on an English scale, say three to four archivists, two or three assistants and a document repairer or two. Indeed the almost total lack of document repair facilities is one of the most disgraceful features of the New Zealand archive scene. It would also allow the purchase of expensive specialised equipment, such as laminating machines and fumigation chambers. At a different level, it would end the professional isolation of archivists working alone and enable them to



develop their skills more quickly, each learning from the other, and permit the growth of a hard core of practical institutional experience that would survive the departure of any one individual. Finally, it would allow the establishment of some sort of career structure for archivists, which otherwise is so lacking at a local level in this country, and hopefully attract graduates of ability into the work.

All this would involve a certain degree of restructuring regional repositories as they are at present constituted. Some may have to resign their status, and others be erected in their place and still others created where at present none exists. Above all, their financial base will have to be augmented considerably. In the case of the Hocken Library, for instance, it would be over-optimistic to expect the University of Otago to bear such a burden without assistance. Perhaps local bodies, depositing their records, could make an annual grant to help cover the costs of storing and servicing them. Perhaps the same could be done by the government for the records of district offices. Perhaps a case can be made for government assistance along the lines of that now being given to art galleries and museums, but without the intermediary of the Arts Council. Whatever the precise nature of the solution, the fate of local authority records may well be bound up with the question of all archives created at a local level. What is to be avoided at all costs is the proliferation of small sub-standard, inadequate repositories. Can we afford the sort of situation which at present exists in Auckland, where there are four institutions, the Public Library, the University Library, the Institute Library, and the Records Centre of the National Archives, all with archival material but not one of which employs an archivist. Combined, something might be done.

So far three different ways of organising the administration of local body archives have been looked at: an archives section in the central administrative department; an archives section in the Public Library; and strengthened "regional repositories". There are others, such as a records office for a number of local authorities operating under a joint committee, of which there are a couple of examples in England. No one solution is likely or even ought to be adopted. Much depends on existing arrangements and, much, too, will depend on the forms of regional government at present being evolved. Thus far, New Zealand's present ramshackle local archive structure has grown like Topsy without particular form or reason, very much the result of the enthusiasm of a few individuals, such as Frank Rogers, one-time Librarian of the University of Otago. But times are changing, local government is being restructured, new forms of records are being created in ever-increasing quantities, pressures towards the cultural exploitation of archives are yearly becoming greater. If these changed conditions are to be coped with, then there must be a considerable updating and rationalisation of the existing structure. It will call for a radical revision of attitude towards archives by all bodies concerned: local authorities, libraries, museums, universities and the Government. And it is here that the New Zealand Library Association, so long benevolent stepmother to the orphan Archive in this country, could have a critical role to play. A revived Archives Committee could consider and promote empowering and mandatory legislation for local body records; it could draft model by-laws for adoption by local authorities; it could draw up and publish standards for archive repositories; it could examine the question of the training and certification of archivists; it could help determine archive catchment areas; and settle disputes; but above all, it could help evolve a general policy for local archives development. Nobody else looks like doing it.

## References

1. N.Z. Department of Statistics. *Local Authority Statistics 1970/71*. Wellington, Government Printer, 1972. Most complete listing available.
2. N.Z. Department of Education. *Education Statistics of New Zealand. Part II 1971*. Wellington, Department of Education, 1972.
3. Dr. F. Hull, Kent County Archivist.
4. Great Britain. Committee on Departmental Records. *Report . . . 1954*. London, H.M.S.O., 1954. p.6. The Grigg Report.
5. N.Z. Parliament. *Archives Act 1957* No. 13. Section 19. The Chief Archivist has the power, however, to advise on the preservation of non-public archives, including presumably local body records (Section 23).
6. Great Britain. Parliament. *Local Government (Records) Act 1962*. Ch. 56.
7. Great Britain. Parliament. *Local Government Act 1972*. Ch. 70. Section 224.
8. N.Z. Parliament. *Municipal Corporations Act 1954*, No. 76.
9. N.Z. Parliament. *Counties Act 1956*, No. 64.
10. *Municipal Corporations Act 1954*. Section 405; *Counties Act 1956*. Section 442.
11. *Ibid.* Section 80(g); *Ibid.* Section 92(g).
12. N.Z. Parliament. *Municipal Corporations Act 1900*, No. 50. Section 76(7).
13. N.Z. Executive Council. *Municipal Accounting Regulations 1965/51*. Sections 10 and 13-14.
14. N.Z. Executive Council. *Counties Accounting Regulations 1958/1*. Sections 10 and 13-14.
15. N.Z. Parliament. *Rating Act 1967*, No. 123. Section 28 requires the compilation of valuation rolls and section 54 the maintenance of rate records. Examples of other acts requiring the keeping of particular records are: *Land and Income Tax Act 1954*, No. 67. Section 239 (financial records to be kept for seven years); *Burial and Cremations Act 1964*, No. 75. Section 50 (burial registers); *Dogs Registration Act 1955*, No. 42. Section 4 (dog registers); and the *Town and Country Planning Amendment Act 1966*, No. 104. Section 48 (district schemes).
16. N.Z. Audit Office, "Audit Instructions and Statutory Requirements for Counties, Electric Power Boards, Municipalities and General", *Local Authority Finance, Accounts and Administration: Supplement 1966*. by C. L. Bishop. Second Edition. Wellington, Butterworths, 1966. Appendix B. p.114. These instructions are based to some extent on Treasury Instructions (Ty Instructions M3).
17. E.g. *Education Act 1964*, No. 135. Sections 36 (Annual Reports of Education Boards), 49 (Annual Reports of School Committees) and 64 (Annual Reports of Secondary Schools); *Fire Services Act 1972*, No. 119; *Harbours Act 1950*, No. 34; *Hospitals Act 1957*, No. 40; and *Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act 1941*, No. 12 (Catchment Boards). Local bodies are invariably required to keep accounts.
18. This Committee was formed in 1951 and largely concerned itself with local body archives. In 1960 it produced and distributed a small booklet, *What to do with your Records: A Guide for Local Body Officers . . .* Wellington, New Zealand Library Association, 1960. Shortly afterwards, the Committee became defunct. See Judith S. Hornabrook, "Local body archives", *New Zealand Libraries* vol. 36 no. 7 (Dec. 1973) p.394-396.
19. This situation also exists in the United States, where on one survey "staff quickly discovered that the surest way to find materials was to start at the bottom, rather than at the top, of the municipal bureaucracy", Dale A. Somers, Timothy J. Crimmins and Merl E. Reed, "Surveying the Records of a City: The History of Atlanta Project", *American Archivist* vol. 36 no. 3 (July 1973) p.357.
20. *Jolliffe's Local Government in Counties and Boroughs* (8th ed. Edited by J. P. McVeagh. Wellington, Ferguson and Osborn, 1963) is with *Supplements* merely a massive compilation of relevant statutes and statutory regulations.

The standard text, C. L. Bishop, *Local Authority Finance, Accounts and Administration* (2nd ed. Wellington, Butterworth, 1959) has practically nothing to say on the subject, and likewise G. A. Ammundsen comp., *Local Body Administration in New Zealand* (Wanganui, New Zealand Institute of Local Body Administrative Officers, 1960). R. A. Johnston, "The conduct of meetings of local authorities", *Local Government in New Zealand* (Edited by F. B. Stephens. Wellington, Department of Internal Affairs, 1949) p.293-4 comments upon the historical value of minute books. By far the best account of local authority registry or record room practice is T. A. D. McFadden, *Records Systems and Procedures* (Paper given to the Fifth Staff Training Course conducted by the New Zealand Institute of Town Clerks and Municipal Treasurers, Wellington, 1964. Duplicated) and *Records Management* (Paper given to Staff Training Course No. 8, New Zealand Institute of Town Clerks and Municipal Treasurers, Wellington, August 12, 1969. Duplicated).

21. G. W. A. Bush, "A Plea for Municipal Archives Departments", *New Zealand Local Government* vol. 4 no. 5 (May 1968) p.190-191.
22. Michael Cook, "The Society of Archivists' Survey of Records Offices", *American Archivist* vol. 33 no. 3 (July 1970) p.370.
23. For a fuller description of French departmental and communal archives, see Association des Archivistes Francais, *Manuel d'Archivistique*. Paris, Sevpen, 1970. p.54-59 and 346-368.
24. Thorsten Eken, "Norvege", *Archivum* vol. XIX (1969) p.39-40.
25. For an account of American state and, to a degree, county archives, see Ernest Posner, *American State Archives*. University of Chicago Press, 1964.
26. For developments in England, see Elizabeth Ralph and Felix Hull, "The Development of Local Archive Service in England", *Essays in Memory of Sir Hilary Jenkinson*. Edited by Albert E. J. Hollaender. Chichester, Society of Archivists, 1962. p.57-70.
27. Lilian J. Redstone and Francis W. Steer, *Local Records: Their Nature and Care*. London, G. Bell and Sons for The Society of Local Archivists, 1953. Ch. III-IV; Society of Archivists, *Recommendations for Local Government Archive Services*. Cambridge, 1971; and Society of Archivists, *Local Authority Archive and Records Management Services in Metropolitan Areas*. 1972. The last two documents are essential reading.
28. See note 23.
29. E. H. Sargeant, "Local Archives of Great Britain XXII. The Worcestershire Record Office", *Archives* vol. V no. 27 (Lady Day 1962) p.155.
30. Dunedin City Council. *Standing Orders for the Regulation of the Proceedings of the Council*. . . Standing Order 118 "The Library Committee . . . shall arrange for the purchase and selection of all books, papers, music, records, art prints and generally all material required for library purposes".
31. Scotland. Home and Health Department. *Local Authority Records. Report by a Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland*. Edinburgh, H.M.S.O., 1967 p.17-18. A most pertinent document.
32. "The place of archives and manuscripts in the field of librarianship: a statement of policy approved by the LA Council, November 1968", *Library Association Record* vol. 71 no. 1 (January 1969) p.15. Reprinted in J. L. Hobbs' *Local History and the Library*. Completely revised and partly rewritten by George A. Carter. London, Andre Deutsch, 1973. Appendix 1 p.304-306. Also essential reading.
33. John L. Hobbs, *Local History and the Library*. London, Andre Deutsch, 1962. p.250.
34. Auckland Institute and Museum Library.