

NOTES ON EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING  
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION  
MARCH 19, 1938.

Mr. Wilson thought the Board should add one paragraph at the end of the committee report before it considered whether or not to adopt it. The addition should be as follows: "In concluding its work, the Special Committee wishes to express its very great appreciation of the fine cooperation given it by the Advisory Committee in the preparation of the memorandum, and for its general understanding of the importance of including library service in its report to the President."

Mr. Dudgeon suggested appreciation be expressed in the motion of adoption.

Mr. Craver said there should be a clear statement of what the committee did. He remarked that the Committee asked for twice as much money as was agreed upon. Mr. Joeckel answered that the committee asked only for a thousand dollars, and the Executive Board made the amount \$2,000.00.

Mr. Dudgeon moved it be adopted with appropriate commendations.

The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Mr. Craver proposed to appoint a committee to draft what was agreed upon. Since it was agreeable to everyone, he gave that duty to Mr. Munn and Mr. Ferguson.

Miss Merrill read letters from Mr. Malcolm G. Wyer, librarian, and from Miss Harriet C. Long, librarian, Oregon State Library, Salem, Oregon, both of whom were unable to come to the meeting.

Mr. Milam read letters from the following members of boards to whom he wrote about particular provisions: Nora Bateson, Canadian; Mr. Compton, Chairman of the Board of Education; Helen Harris, member of the Board of Education; Miss Rothrock, librarian, Extension Board; ~~Mr. Buss~~, Chairman of the Board of Library

Miss Beust

Service to Children and Young People; Mr. Metcalfe; and Miss Eastman.

Mr. Wilson stated that in this report the library has been put into the general framework of educational agencies in America in a way that it has not been formerly. He continued: "I can't see how school people from this time on are going to fail to see libraries in the total American educational scheme of things. If you will look in the index of the report under libraries you will see that it comes in fifteen or twenty times. You have seven brackets here and even through explicit statements or implied meanings the library appears in six and perhaps seven of the provisions."

Mr. Milam suggested that the Board might wish, now or later, to go through the draft of the bill itself item by item insofar as those items affect libraries closely, directly, or indirectly. He thought all comments on the bill should be made to the Committee and not to the general public. He recommended that the Board consider the resolution and get down to the detail of the bill.

Mr. Joeckel added that the NEA is now taking over legislation arising out of the Reeves' report. Mr. Craver said the draft endorses the bill in general and endorses funds to be made available for certain purposes. Mr. Spaulding said the bill is theoretically non-existent at the present time.

Mr. Milam thought it advisable to consider the resolution first and the bill afterwards. He said that so far as the Hall committee is concerned, it would recommend any resolution from the A.L.A. endorsing the report. For the reason which Mr. Spaulding stated, however, he felt that it would not welcome recommendations of a bill. He thought, therefore, that the Board ought to act on the Reeves' report and then either authorize some individual or group to represent it before the legislative committee or the Congress, or decide on some other method of expressing its opinions hereafter. Mr. Craver added that the resolution states that the Committee endorses the bill and hopes it will be made passable.

The following amendments to the Resolution were proposed:

In the first sentence; "----To join in supporting legislation to put those recommendations into effect," instead of "-----To join in translating into action."

In paragraph two: that "books" be inserted after "----have had access to", and that "do not have" be substituted for "never have had" in the second line.

In the third paragraph, "the association believes" be substituted for "it believes" and also "----that it should be allocated through an agency of the State which is concerned with library advancement," be substituted for "---made available through----agencies-----."

In the fourth paragraph the following addition was suggested: "----and for extending and equalizing library service generally throughout the states." It was also suggested that "rural public library service" be substituted for "rural public libraries." Mr. Craver suggested taking out "elementary", "secondary", and "school" in the fifth line, and "----of educational personnel including " in the sixth, and "schools and other" in the seventh line.

Mr. Munn suggested that the third line of the last paragraph should read "that Federal funds be made available for library services through rural public and school libraries," instead of "that Federal funds be made available for rural public libraries." There was a discussion about whether rural public library" would be good in the bill and resolution. It was agreed that if it could be defined to mean "publicly supported" it would be satisfactory.

Mr. Joeckel said that the fact that there were no library facilities for forty million people was questioned in their statistics; that is, many people live in place where, because of political location, they have no public library facilities.

Mr. Spaulding moved the resolution be left as is, with the insertion of "books".

Mr. Wilson said: Mr. Bruner will certainly take exception to your statement. Bruner thinks he knows about rural area public library service to which

the individual was entitled because he lives within a given unit;-that kind of service has not been available. Mr. Milam: "Because some of the schools furnish services public libraries furnish."

Mr. Joeckel suggested taking out the "forty" in front of "millions." It was also suggested that "recommendation" in the fourth paragraph be made plural. It was also suggested that the facts in the last part of the first paragraph be repeated in the last paragraph. There was a criticism of the effect one gets from reading the last paragraph. Mr. Milam said he wanted to get everything about library features in all of the report in the first paragraph. He said that there is not anything mentioned that is not library. Mr. Ferguson said "school" is emphasized.. Mr. Dudgeon said everything should be interpreted as including "public", that if the board didn't interpret it that way, others couldn't be expected to do so. Mr. Craver said he liked the opening paragraph and would not mind repeating the same idea at the end. He suggested that Mr. Spaulding and Mr. Ferguson go over the resolution and reword it according to suggestions.

The afternoon session convened at 2:30 PM

Mr. Spaulding read the revised resolution.

Mr. Dudgeon moved the resolution be approved.

The clarity of meaning of "a trained personnel" was questioned. It was suggested that the word "especially" be inserted in front of that phrase in paragraph 3.

Mr. Craver seconded the motion of approval. Since there was no more discussion, the motion was passed unanimously.

Then followed a discussion of the bill. The following sections were discussed or referred to specifically:

Section one, page one, third line: It was pointed out that the bill is not an appropriation measure. There was a question about the word "appropriation".

Page six, section 5-A: "The operation of school libraries as one of the activities"-----There was a question as to whether that could be so worded as to mean not merely for direct operation of school libraries, but also to make funds available to secure such service through contract with other libraries.

Page seven, Sections 6 and 6a--"The amounts---are to be available under the provisions as the representative states may determine".

Section 7A, page unmentioned: -- "Improved coordination between the schools and other public agencies."--- It was explained here that libraries are required to cooperate with schools and schools with other agencies.

Page 17, Section 31, A, B, and C--it was suggested that an interesting question existed as to whether the last part of C applied also to A and B. It was asked whether this section referred to privately supported as well as to tax supported schools. Explanation was offered that the phrase, "shall be restricted to those agencies permitted by law to offer such instruction (teacher training)", runs through the entire bill; that it possibly would be interpreted as meaning where state funds are available."

Page 32, Section 4<sup>1</sup> seemed to combine both the subjects of adult education and audits. A suggestion was made that the word "library" be inserted at a particular place in the section. Mr. David had reported on the difficulty of audits, but it was asked why the difficulty would be any greater at libraries than it would at non-profit educational institutions. It was added that budgeting troubles exist regardless of the type of place. It was further pointed out that the insertion of "libraries" would be a good thing because it would cover any part of library support. Someone added that even if asked for, the appropriation would probably not be gotten. Then Dr. Wilson said the whole thing might

be changed before it was fought for; that it should not be given up too easily. There was more discussion on the insertion of the word "libraries". Since there was no further objection it was agreed to put it in.

Mr. Wilson stressed the fact that it was important to be clear so that the people who are going to "bat" will know exactly what part "the library" plays in adult education; for example, how the payment of bills for books and similar items are justifiable. Mr. Munn suggested the use of the words "educational library" instead of "library" and that on the preceding page it might help to include salaries and books. Then it would apply not only to libraries but to other public agencies. The clause "salaries and books necessary to provide for-----", should be elaborated on. It was further stated that it would be up to the local libraries to make clear the point included in the first three lines of Page 33.

Section 401, page 39 is so worded as to appear that the work will be going on one year ahead of the grants. It was said that the Office of Education has been considering what they will do that first year in getting ready with schools, plans, etc., and that they are planning to use that first year to gather data from which to work. It was asked if the section meant that some of the grant could be used for library investigation. Someone replied that apparently it was not limited to public institutions inasmuch as the section stated further on that the funds may be used in public or private agencies. An earlier part of Section 401 was mentioned as being very important since it said that the funds "shall be available---(for)--- research institutions, colleges, universities, state departments of education ---and other non-profit institutions and agencies approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education."

It was questioned whether the bill include "state library associations." Someone commented that educators would not consider libraries as a part of the

bill unless a fight is to be put up and suggested that "state library agencies" be inserted after "state departments of education".

The fourth line of Section 401, including the following statement, "for research planning and demonstration" was discussed. Mr. Wilson said that "demonstrations" had been considered in writing the report. Mr. Joeckel stated that there was no reason why demonstrations could not be carried on by the state offices of education. Mr. Milam suggested leaving out "state" or "extension" and putting in "library agency". He said it was entirely possible that the Graduate Library School would have a better chance as a library agency rather than if the term "Social agency" were used. Mr. Joeckel added that the whole purpose of the bill was stated in Section 400, and that this statement applies to the entire act, and not only to any one part. Someone asked if it would cover an institution for state workers and library workers.

While page 35 was being discussed Mr. Dunbar was asked if he thought that the administration of this particular fund in Washington and in the states should be given some special consideration. Mr. Milam felt there was no special provision for that. He did not know whether the fund could be used for increasing Mr. Dunbar's services in Washington or not. He said Dr. David also wondered if it could be used to provide an extra assistant in Indiana. Mr. Dunbar asked what provision was made for overhead administrative expenses. Mr. Milam asked who would pay the expenses if all state people had to be brought together. He also said he was thinking about the provision that the Commission of Education should organize a council made up of several library officers of different states. At this point someone stated that Section 403 on Page 40 included a statement in regard to covering the expenses of people called to Washington. Mr. Milam then said it was up to Mr. Dunbar to convince Mr. Studebaker of the importance of bringing people here. He pointed out that Section 3 was under the "research plan" and that section that was being discussed is "under library

service". He further stated that these come under two different titles and yet that they should apply to all titles in a sense. Mr. Joeckel replied that Mr. Milam was dealing with an entirely different title,- that he was dealing with title 4 and that at the moment the discussion was about title 3. Both titles 3 and 4 were considered, and it was noted that some of the provisions in one did not cover those in the other. It was further pointed out that page 10 contained no appropriation and that possibly there was no administration fund except the one for research. If so, a heavy burden would be placed on the Office of Education. Mr. Joeckel stated that he thought that the provisions were intended to cover title 4, adding that this bill was not an appropriation measure, and that the funds probably would be provided for in a regular Interior Department bill. He declared that the bill starts off by mentioning 40%, and that 40% makes a pretty good budget, at least for preliminary services. He continued by saying that a "jam" was possible if Congress did not increase appropriations, as they had refused to do this session. There was further discussion of what the Board is going to do and what steps it wants to take to follow up the progress of the legislation.

Miss Merrill began a discussion of the docket, stating that nothing was said about how this measure would be supported. She thought some instructions to the Federal Relations Committee should be considered. Mr. Joeckel stated the Association should keep some hand on this matter. He suggested that the activity should be cooperative between the Secretary of the A.L.A. and the Federal Relations Committee and that the Secretary be here in order to make sure that nothing happens to the legislation. He said he feared that title 3 or 4 would be dropped out, and he felt that to make the full responsibility fall on the Committee might be bad. Mr. Milam said that there might be a distinction between work and responsibility. He felt, however, that more than one person should be available to make decisions and thought it might be

well for the Board to authorize a Committee to assume responsibility in regard to legislation.

Mr. Dudgeon moved that the Executive Board authorize the Federal Relations Committee, with the advice of the President and the Secretary, to represent it in necessary decisions with respect to federal aid legislation and in advancing the legislation in Congress.

The motion was unanimously approved.

There was also unanimously agreed upon that copies of the resolution should be sent to the President and to members of Congress.

Mr. Milam suggested that in regard to meeting with the Advisory and Legislative Committees of the N.E.A. the Board might wish to designate one or more individuals to represent it. He suggested that the Committee make the final decision. Mr. Craver moved that Mr. Joeckel, together with the Secretary and Mr. Spaulding, represent the Board.

The motion was accepted. Mr. Craver added that it might be well to pay attention to Mr. Wilson's remark, viz., that there are Monday and Tuesday in which to work on individual members of the Committees and that such work might prove of very great importance. Mr. Spaulding asked if it was possible that some of the people at the meeting might have special access to some of the members of the Committees who will work on the bill. Mr. Munn said he felt that the N.E.A. was even more important to work on. Mr. Craver asked if there was any possible addition to the program of activities. Mr. Milam thought that the Board should advise the staff and the Committee on how to arouse a genuine wide-awake interest on the part of library people in this bill. He said he had attended Reeves' broadcast at "The Town Meeting of the Air" and that place had not been one-third full; -people had just ignored it. He added that they did not boycott it, but they were just not enough interested. He

said Mr. Melcher was very much interested in this work and stated that he had an article about it in "Publishers Weekly". Mr. Milam added that the Board would have to do a great amount of that kind of business if the libraries were to do their share in supporting this legislation. He added that the library feature would just be dropped out unless library people expressed interest.

Mr. Wilson asked how a person 300 miles away could be pressed to action. He thought a report might be of use showing what steps have been taken and that some kind of material should be presented to get response and respect. Miss Merrill said that presumably some of this would be sent out the first of the week. Mr. Milam suggested a supplement to the April Bulletin of the A.L.A. He said the very fact that it is separate might give it emphasis and suggested that it be the summary of the legislation itself or of the Committee report. He thought it should rest presumably on the action that was taken in the Executive Board Meeting or that the subject be treated in a separate article in the beginning of the Bulletin. He felt that the report by Mr. Wilson should be included in full, if possible, and then there should be at, or near the beginning, a dynamic statement from the Federal Relations Committee or the President of the Association, or the Board, which would be intended to stir imaginations and challenge some kind of activity on the part of every member who is concerned with the national library movement.

Miss Quigley said that in New Jersey a library committee served to circulate news and publicity. She had received a letter asking her to write to her Congressmen. She felt action could be taken through legislative committees.

Miss Merrill suggested the ten spring meetings.

Mr. Cannon asked if states did not have such committees. Miss Merrill said certain places can't act unless the entire set-up meets.

Mr. Munn recommended the type of story that the New York Times would print because the bill is urgent and a supplement might be thrown into the waste basket. He said a brief but exact article would help and that a bulletin would be all right if it didn't look like another report. It was asked if there was any disadvantage in sending letters to representatives before the bill had been introduced and had a name and number. Mr. Spaulding said it was advantageous. He felt that if the material contained something which could be used as a letter, or in a letter, it would help. He said that the only disadvantage in writing before a bill is actually formulated is the difficulty of identifying it, but pointed out that it could be referred to as "The Federal Aid to Education Bill" as based on the Reeves' report. Mr. Milam agreed about the name but opposed a form letter. Miss Prouty asked what points should be covered in a form letter. Mr. Spaulding said that human interest in a letter gets more attention than petitions. For example, to get a foreign woman to write a letter and then send it to a Congressman accompanied by another letter saying such things come to your desk would be good strategy.

Mr. Milam asked how many persons present would agree to write a letter to the President, to each Senator, and to all of the Congressmen in his state endorsing the report. He felt that alone would make an impression. Mr. Craver said he thought everyone could do at least that much. It was further suggested that the supplement be put in any typographical copy just so it was the same size as the bulletin. Someone else said size did not matter. Mr. Milam asked, assuming that the Board could do whatever it wished, what it felt was the best thing to do. He said the Bulletin could be held for a week or two. Mr. Wilson added that the Board should decide definitely. He said they ought to issue a possible brief summary of the methods by which library agencies could proceed effectively to further the bill and get it out as quickly as possible to the membership and to library organizations in the country. Mr. Vitz asked if it were possible to make the material available in bulk. Mr. Milam replied that the only limitation was a monetary

one. Mr. Munn suggested sending out a broadside mimeographed letter or "what-not" to agencies and individuals from whom some action might be expected, and informing the membership at large through the bulletin. Mr. Spaulding said the bill would have to be introduced before any writing could be done. It was asked if the effect of a letter would be worn off before the bill had a number and title. Mr. Milam said that Dr. David indicated the bill might be considered informally and never given a number or title or be printed until the day it is presented or the day following presentation. If that happened there would be no time for pressure on the senators. Mr. Milam thought the House or Senate would not move so rapidly. He felt that an immediate campaign ought to be built up on the assumption that librarians in large numbers will be willing to cooperate if they see recommendations and if they know the Executive Board is behind them. Librarians must write more than one letter. They must be repeated. If there is time after the bill is introduced, the letters should be written over again. Mr. Joeckel expressed the opinion that the bill would move fast and that is all the more reason to get in touch with senators now so that if anything breaks on the floor, - if the amendment is carried, - they will know that the Federal Aid for Education bill is the one their librarians have been writing them about. He added that we would have to get a few people in the Senate who would watch out for the library end of it too. Mr. Milam suggested seeing Keller, stating that the approach might be that he had always said he was for libraries, and might now be asked what he was going to do about it. Mr. Wilson said that if we want to carry the librarians in backing this, we should take a little from past experience and see that there is a reasonable amount of information submitted to the Association as a whole with regard to the steps that have been taken up to date in bringing the bill to this point. Mr. Munn suggested them as parting documents and not to be read before the letter. Mr. Spaulding

suggested having something to hand a senator or Congressman at the end of an interview. He suggested the "equal chance" idea; a booklet which shows something about his state. Mr. Dudgeon asked when those letters should come in and if people should be informed as to what has happened. Mr. Joel suggested writing at once. Mr. Dudgeon asked if that were possible. Miss Merrill asked if such letters would be sufficient. She thought just as much time should be given to talking to people. Mr. Craver asked what money was available for doing anything. He said the Federal Relations fund had a balance of about \$2,000.00 and everything would have to be paid out of that.

Mr. Milam said he had taken the liberty of telling members of the Federal Relations Committee that he would pay for this meeting out of the balance of the contingent and travel funds, leaving this \$2,000.00 free for whatever might come up, -just such as this. Mr. Craver said that all printing and telegraph expense would have to be taken out of it. Mr. Milam suggested authorizing the treasurer and secretary or any agreeable combination to examine budgets and withdraw from appropriate funds such balances as can be withdrawn without seriously hampering the existing programs of those activities. For example, if the Public Library Division has \$216.00 left for printing, we can ask if there is any commitment. Authority to do that should be delegated to someone.

Mr. Munn moved that the Secretary and Treasurer in consultation with the President, be so authorized and instructed. The motion was passed.

In answer to the question whether library associations would be able to contribute, Mr. Craver said they would probably need their own funds and probably could not do their jobs and have anything left over.

Mr. Milam suggested a letter commending the report of the Reeves Advisory Committee on Education and particularly commending its inclusion of several library features.

Mr. Munn read the following resolutions:

"The Executive Board commends to the membership of the A.L.A. the report of its special Committee on Federal Relations to libraries consisting of (names). Charged with an enormous and difficult task which had to be completed in limited time, this committee's work calls for special recognition. The Executive Board wishes also to direct attention to the Association's indebtedness to the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago for its repeated willingness to undertake extensive studies and surveys for the benefit of the Association. In this case the committee's work was made possible by the release of Dr. Carleton B. Joeckel from his regular duties at the Graduate Library School."

Adoption of the resolution was unanimously approved.

Mr. Craver said the Joeckel report would be published by the government but is not available at present.

Mr. Vitz said many people think that this bill is a better aid to education in school libraries than public libraries and it should be corrected on that point. He said education is needed in the public libraries for the librarians themselves. Mr. Milam said care would have to be exercised in stating certain things.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved for adjournment.

**Executive Board**

**AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION**

---

**March 19, 1938  
Washington Hotel  
Washington, D. C.**

**The MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, Inc.**  
Law Stenography • Conventions • General Reporting

NEW YORK  
51 MADISON AVENUE  
AShland 4-1827

WASHINGTON  
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING  
National 8558

CLEVELAND  
STANDARD BUILDING  
Main 0894

CHICAGO  
540 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE  
Superior 3255

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Saturday Morning Session  
March 19, 1938

Report of Special Committee on Federal Relations to Libraries, by Dr. Louis R. Wilson ..... 1  
 Discussion ..... 4

Remarks by Dr. Paul David, Secretary of President's Advisory Committee on Education ..... 8

Discussion of the Committee's report ... 20

Presentation of Title III of the proposed Act, Grants to States for Rural Library Service ..... 24

General discussion of the provisions of Title III ..... 25, 55

Remarks by Dr. David on the legislative situation regarding the Committee's report ..... 42

Discussion of Title III with respect to adequacy of state agencies ..... 47

Discussion of library service in relation to adult education ..... 64



1370 ONTARIO STREET  
CLEVELAND

51 MADISON AVE.  
NEW YORK

THE MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.  
LAW STENOGRAPHY - CONVENTIONS - GENERAL REPORTING

540 NO. MICHIGAN AVE.  
CHICAGO

NATIONAL PRESS BLDG.  
WASHINGTON

A meeting of the Executive Board of the American Library Association was held at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., at 9:30 o'clock Saturday morning, March 19, 1938, Mr. H. W. Craver presiding.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Dr. Wilson, I believe the first item on the agenda is your report of the Special Committee on Federal Relations to Libraries.

... Dr. Louis R. Wilson read his prepared report (marked Paper No. 1), with the following interpolations:

No. 1, p. 2: I might say there with respect to the phrase "to bring it into conformity with," that wasn't to bring it into conformity with any ideas, but general organization and appearance.

No. 2, p. 3: I might say at that point that there are supposed to be nineteen of these memoranda prepared by various members of the staff of the Advisory Committee.

MR. MILAM: Dr. Wilson, aren't there a lot more than that?

DR. WILSON: Nineteen are to be published. There were a good many others submitted.

No. 3, p. 3: This was done, I should say, with the approval of the Special Committee; that is the decision to have

1370 ONTARIO STREET  
CLEVELAND

51 MADISON AVE.  
NEW YORK

THE MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.  
LAW STENOGRAPHY · CONVENTIONS · GENERAL REPORTING

540 No. MICHIGAN AVE.  
CHICAGO

NATIONAL PRESS BLDG.  
WASHINGTON

it appear in that form was unanimously approved by the committee.

No. 4, p. 4: That is, this formula looked three ways--a sixty cents per capita item, an item to take care of rural population, and an item to take care of effort now being made by the various states as represented by their actual expenditures for library service.

No. 5, p. 5:

MR. MILAM: Did you say "service to rural population through city libraries"?

DR. WILSON: Yes.

MR. MILAM: I think you are right but I don't know that you are.

DR. WILSON: We thought we were right, didn't we?

MR. JOECKEL: I think it was certainly the intent that it could be done in any way that the state decided.

MISS MERRILL: Mr. Vitz is serving his rural neighbors by contract at present. Certainly federal grants under this new plan could be used for enlarging that area of service.

MR. MILAM: That is an interpretation of the report and the Act which has a little more assurance than I had.

DR. WILSON: Of course, I didn't have the report in hand when I wrote this.

MR. DUDGEON: If it is to serve rural regions generally, it is reasonable to suppose it would have to be hitched up with the city library.

No. 6, p. 5:

MR. MILAM: May I ask whether you would like to insert there the fact that that fund is recommended to be made available in the next fiscal year, instead of postponing it a year, thus the research can begin a year in advance of the program of federal aid.

DR. WILSON: I will make a note of that.

No. 7, p. 6: I might say that if we think in terms of the per cent of the tax dollar that has gone for library purposes from 1904 to date, it has been given anywhere from about 1.1 up to 1.8, that is for maintenance, with an average of 1.3, whereas the amount of the tax dollar spent for education has been about 31. There you have your 4 per cent--that is your 1.3 divided by 31 gives you 4, so if you think of it in the terms of what has actually been happening in the American cities of twenty or thirty thousand population or more, you will have about the ratio indicated. ...

DR. WILSON (Continuing): This report is signed by Mr. Joeckel and myself. I have a supporting telegram from Mr. Wilcox and a letter from Mr. Lydenberg, but he is present

here and can either modify or suggest or take such action as he likes with respect to the report as submitted.

It hasn't been possible for us to have a meeting and this was the way in which the report it seemed to us ought to come before you, with the limitations that it has had in that all of the Advisory Committee's report was not before it, through Mr. Joeckel and I have seen a good bit of it in various forms.

Mr. Chairman, I submit it in that way.

Accompanying it is the list of expenditures for which an appropriation of \$2,000 was made at the June meeting, and the expenses are itemized. Seemingly we turned back to the A.L.A. \$883.70.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: If you don't spend any more before the end of the fiscal year.

DR. WILSON: If you terminate us as a special committee at the close of this meeting, we won't be in position to spend any more and then you can spend it through some other committee.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Mr. Lydenberg, do you want to change your vote, now that you have seen the report?

MR. LYDENBERG: I should like to take this opportunity to make an entry of hearty approval. May I have a minute,

1370 ONTARIO STREET  
CLEVELAND

51 MADISON AVE.  
NEW YORK

THE MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.  
LAW STENOGRAPHY · CONVENTIONS · GENERAL REPORTING

540 No. MICHIGAN AVE.  
CHICAGO

NATIONAL PRESS BLDG.  
WASHINGTON

though, Mr. Chairman, to say that I am not certain where it ought to be done but I do hope that some place we can make it plain that we are heartily in favor of federal aid to education and to libraries. We feel, however, that that aid should be supplementary to and complementary to local support and local interest. The thing I am afraid of is that some narrow-minded legislator or some member of the committee or someone who may have control, when the time comes to vote on the question of local support, will airily say, "Let Washington do it."

I am sure we all agree that that is one of the strong elements in favor of the Carnegie Corporation's demonstrations in library efforts. They have been willing to go in and spend the money for a demonstration, with the expectation, either implied or explicit, that the locality is to continue its support. I don't think that this is the place or we are the people to indicate, or naturally to insist on, the precise form of that relation, but I do hope that in some way we may be able to see in unmistakable form words to that effect included in the report of the committee. I know that with all the people I have talked to about that, the assumption has been very plain that such is their point of view. I am not prepared to say just how that expression of opinion should take

place, granting that the rest of you agree with it and it is not a case of "everybody out of step but George," but I do hope that the principle may be recognized and that the report may contain some unmistakable expression of feeling to that effect.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: I think all of us will agree with that idea, that nothing is to be gained by moving the source of the money, and so some degree of control, from the locality to Washington. If it is simply trading a dollar in Omaha for a dollar in Washington, it is a loss, not a gain.

MR. JOECKEL: Might I say, Mr. President, that I think the whole report of the Reeves Committee is very positive on that point, that there is to be state and local control of education. In fact, they go so far that the principal argument that was held between Mr. Reeves and Mr. McLean the other night on the Town Meeting of the Air seemed to be that Mr. Reeves was going farther than Mr. McLean, who was opposing him, wanted him to go in saying that the states and local communities should have complete autonomy in the expenditure of federal aid to education. In other words, the opponent of Mr. Reeves was rather arguing for more federal control, whereas Mr. Reeves was arguing substantially for no federal control as to policy or form, or anything of that sort.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: I didn't understand that

Mr. Lydenberg was talking at all about control. He was talking about the question of a community letting down on its support if it is getting support elsewhere.

MR. LYDENBERG: I am not worrying about the control. The thing I hope is that somewhere a quotable paragraph will be inserted to hold up to the localities that they must not let down in local support on the ground that Washington will take care of it when they let it down.

MR. JOECKEL: Probably Mr. David can speak to that point.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: We have Mr. David here for the Advisory Committee. Will you introduce him to this audience, Mr. Joeckel:

MR. JOECKEL: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: It is a very great pleasure indeed to introduce Dr. Paul David to this group. He is the Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Education and the Assistant Director of Studies and has been in direct charge of the Washington office and the staff of the Advisory Committee in all of its work.

I think it may be somewhat comforting to librarians to know that Dr. David is, I think, an economist by profession. He is not in the educational group directly. I think he has a

1370 ONTARIO STREET  
CLEVELAND

51 MADISON AVE.  
NEW YORK

THE MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, INC.  
LAW STENOGRAPHY - CONVENTIONS - GENERAL REPORTING

540 No. MICHIGAN AVE.  
CHICAGO

NATIONAL PRESS BLDG.  
WASHINGTON

very broad view of this whole situation of federal aid to education. He has been connected with a number of studies here in Washington, and I would like to say personally that I have appreciated very much his attitude and that of his staff toward the library study which was submitted.

I think that we would like to hear from Dr. David with respect to the general purpose of this whole report, and then perhaps some special application of it to the library situation, and I think that we want to know from him what it is really that Mr. Reeves and his Committee want with respect to education and we want him to show how libraries are integrated with other educational activity. And perhaps he might also speak to the point which Mr. Lydenberg has made relative to the possible danger of local units letting down, as he says, on their own contribution to library support.

DR. PAUL DAVID: Thank you, Mr. Joeckel. It is a privilege indeed to meet with this group. I am not sure how adequately I can summarize this report in the rather brief time which I imagine you want me to give to it, but I think to clear the groundwork a little it would be well to consider the situation under which the Committee began its work, particularly a year ago.

The Committee, as you know, was appointed about

eighteen months ago originally to make a study of federal aid to vocational education. The original study grew out of the fact that there has been federal aid for vocational education in public schools ever since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and that Act in a good many respects has worked less well than most of the other fields of federal aid. There has I think almost continuously been more criticism of some of its features than there has been of the federal-state relationships under the land-grant college set-ups. At any rate, the issue was forced by legislation in 1936 which increased the amount of federal aid to vocational education and the President appointed this committee to make a study.

That explains how the Committee came into existence. The fact that there was an area of federal aid to vocational education where conditions had become acute and needed attention is significant in the whole general field of federal-state relationships, but at any rate the Committee's original assignment was rather limited.

I have to go into another field of background to explain the expansion of the Committee's functions in April of last year. The educational group, particularly the N.E.A., have been pushing for federal aid for education for many years. The movement has gained strength. I think it gained the great-

est strength in recent years, during the depression days of 1933 and '34, when so many schools all over the country were having their budgets cut, and so on. In the pressure of other activities, the N.E.A. was not able to make headway at that time with its request for federal aid, but there has been continuous pressure in Washington. It hasn't gotten into the press much, but I am sure that all the members of the House and Senate have been quite conscious of this pressure during the past four years, and certainly the President has been very conscious of it.

A year ago the Harrison-Fletcher Bill, a bill drafted I believe by the N.E.A., and which certainly they sponsored, was introduced or reintroduced, and extensive hearings were held, both before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and the House Committee on Education. The bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee with the unanimous recommendation that it be adopted. It got bottled up in the House committee and was not reported out. On the Senate floor the bill lay on the calendar and no action was taken.

The provisions of the bill were essentially federal aid starting at \$100,000,000 a year and going up quite rapidly to \$300,000,000, going up \$50,000,000 a year, to be distributed among the states on the basis of their populations of school

age, or five to twenty, to be exact, and very few provisions in the bill relating to what the states should do. There was one major provision to the effect that the states should continue to spend for education not less than they had been spending. There was another provision to the effect that they must maintain schools for 160 days a year, and as the result of rather intense legislative activity on the part of the Negro groups, there were eventually provisions written in which protected the distribution of the funds in southern states maintaining separate school systems for Negroes.

The bill got out on the Senate floor about the first of April, as I recall it, and for about two weeks it looked like it was going to pass, and pass very quickly in fact. Then the economy movement came up, the economy wave that sort of swept the country along about the end of April last year, and that I think was the real reason why the bill was stalemated at that time. But it was also true, at least the President was quoted in the press by various people who indicated that his views were opposed to certain features of the bill. At least it was not an administration measure.

In the light of all these circumstances, plus the fact that the Committee on Vocational Education had not been able to see any way to write a decent report which would not

include rather definite pronouncements about education in general, the President decided to extend the terms of reference to the Committee and appointed four additional members. He asked the committee to study the whole subject of federal relation to state and local conduct of education. The topic was about as broadly stated as possible and there was no interpretation in the letter.

The Committee then went ahead with the study. We have made a rather elaborate reëxamination of the evidence as to need for federal aid. The results of that examination, of course, show that there are many whole states, and in some states whole areas, in which it was simply impossible to maintain a decent level of educational service with the financial resources which are locally available, and of course public education is supported almost entirely from the real estate or property taxes. The facts as to needs that the Committee developed were not particularly new. They had been exhaustively presented in these hearings by the N.E.A. and other groups a year ago.

I think the Committee members, with not over two or three exceptions, were convinced even at the beginning of the year that they would eventually come out with a recommendation for federal aid of some kind. The principal questions that were

in the minds of the Committee, as far as I could tell--I don't know that I would want to be quoted as saying the issue was closed on federal aid before the Committee began its work--were now it was possible to develop a feasible plan that would put the money where it was needed without putting it where there was considerably less need, and how the federal taxpayers might be protected on the one hand against maladministration and waste and actual theft of money, and how on the other hand the local autonomy of the schools could be preserved.

It was on the basis of those considerations that the Committee has reached the kind of recommendations it has. The emphasis on distribution of funds on a need basis is a major feature of the Committee's report. We hope we have a procedure to do that which will work and which will not give rise to the sort of criticism which inevitably occurs when some federal agency has discretion to determine how much a state or community shall get. The decision is in terms of a formula which can be applied and anybody can look at, and which will not give the Commissioner of Education or any other federal official the direct authority to vary the amounts going to each locality on a discretionary basis.

Another major feature was the joint planning, and there I would like to emphasize as much as I can that the kind

of joint planning the Committee has had in mind, with exceptions for rather incidental matters, in connection with the aid for education is almost entirely joint planning on what might be called financial administration; in other words, joint planning as to where the funds shall go within a state, joint planning as to audits and joint planning as to reports. On the other hand, it is specifically stated that there shall be no joint planning with respect to curriculum nor with respect to the actual processes of education and what the schools shall teach. In other words, the committee has attempted to safeguard these financial matters and still retain local autonomy on the more purely educational matters.

There is one provision in this draft bill which I suppose some of you have seen, or perhaps all of you, which I think is unique in that sort of thing, namely a provision that the joint plans shall not include any provision whatever not authorized by law. A good deal of the expansion of federal control in some areas has been due to the fact that since joint plans were required, they kept putting more things in them.

Then turning to the library matter specifically, the Committee I think was quite prepared to consider libraries on the same basis as all other educational agencies in considering federal aid and questions of federal relations. We had, of

course, the statement submitted by the American Library Association, and as the Committee pondered over that, it became convinced first of two major conclusions, I would say. The first conclusion was that wherever feasible, the schools and libraries should be brought into as cooperative a relationship as possible, and that therefore in recommending federal aid for the schools, it should be made quite clear that that aid should be available for library purposes where it was appropriate to do so. In other words, this general aid fund for the operating expenses of elementary and secondary schools would be available, among other purposes, for the operation of school libraries, and it was suggested that those school libraries should where feasible be open to public use. That provision, I take it, would be particularly important in rural areas where generally speaking there is not much other library service.

Another provision in recommending some federal aid for the construction of school buildings--it was pointed out that the buildings should be made as generally useful as possible, and where it was desirable to include facilities for community center activities and library service, that certainly should be authorized, and in so far as an appropriation to do so was concerned, perhaps encouraged.

On the matter of the special aid for the training of

teachers and other educational personnel, that was opened up for the training of school librarians. I think that was originally phrased just "librarians" without the qualifying word "school," and it was qualified primarily as I understand it because the Committee didn't want to stimulate the establishment of a lot more library schools but it did want to make sure the funds would be available for training school librarians in facilities now existing.

Then of course the adult education fund recommended by the Committee was made available not merely for adult educational activities in public schools, but also in other appropriate non-profit educational agencies. I think the Committee was thinking there primarily of the Extension Services of colleges and universities, but I would assume that that language would include the adult educational activities of libraries.

Coming to the libraries in particular, the Committee recommended this special aid fund, and there it put the emphasis on the great need in rural areas. Notwithstanding the admittedly deplorable conditions with respect to library service in some cities, the facts are there are very few cities which are wholly lacking in library service, as are the rural areas, although there are some states which are now

attempting to provide library service on a state-wide basis. And so the Committee recommended that federal aid for library services specifically, at least so far as this report is concerned--and of course these recommendations are for an experimental period of six years--should be based on rural population and should be primarily devoted toward the bringing about of library service universally available throughout rural areas.

In spite of the fact that that was to be apportioned on a rural population basis, and as I say was primarily intended to bring about universal availability of at least some minimum degree of library service, it is not restricted to use in rural areas. The reason for doing that was simply the fact that if it hadn't been done, presumably you would get a split set-up in virtually every state with a very great probability of lack of coordination between service in rural and urban areas, and I presume when the funds have been so opened up, they will be used in a great many states to at least some extent in urban areas.

Is there any other point in the report that I should summarize.

MR. JOECKEL: Have you anything to say to the question Mr. Lydenberg raised.

DR. DAVID: This matter in the reduction of state

and local support is not specifically discussed in connection with library service, but it was very important in connection with federal aid for elementary and secondary education. The Harrison-Fletcher bill did contain this provision to the effect that the federal aid was conditions on the state's continuing to provide as much support as it had provided I think during the calendar year 1937, or the fiscal year ending in '37. The committee was opposed to that kind of a provision, primarily for this reason, that as the years develop, sooner or later probably we will come to federal aid partly at least for tax reform in order to reduce the burden on local real estate and shift that to the ability type of taxes, particularly the income tax which the Federal Government is so much more able to assess and collect than the states. That means, of course, that you can't have a reduction in local taxation and a shifting of the burden onto federal income tax if you freeze state and local expenditures as a condition of federal aid, and therefore the committee felt that it would be very unwise to start federal aid off on a basis which would freeze state and local expenditures.

I think it can be said, however, that with aid allocated on a need basis, the objections to that kind of a requirement are much less compelling. In other words, if you

did have it allocated on the per capita basis of the Harrison-Fletcher Bill, I have forgotten the amount that would have gone to New York State but it would have been a rather large number of millions of dollars, and the Committee had a good deal of question as to whether that money going into New York State would have been required to be used in addition to the amount New York was already providing. In other words, the only basis the Committee could see for allocating a large amount of federal aid to wealthy states was for the matter of tax reform, in order to permit a reduction in local taxes, and the Committee wasn't ready to recommend federal aid on that basis.

What will be done in legislation on this point I do not know. Of course, I recognize the fact, as I am sure the Committee did, that there is real danger during the first year or two that federal aid is available. I think if the hurdle can be bridged of the time when the new federal money first becomes available, without sharp reductions at least of state and local support at that time, that the thing will take care of itself, but personally I could see some point in some sort of restriction that affected the transition period. Is that sufficient answer?

MR. JOECKEL: Of course I would say myself that it would be expressed as a sort of syllogism. Since there is no

considerable amount of library service in rural areas, it is pretty hard to reduce that amount.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That is just what I was thinking. You have a rural area where the present expenditure is zero. Under this bill I suppose the local expenditure will remain zero until the end of time. They will take what they get from the Federal Government and ride on that eternally.

MR. MILAM: I think Mr. Lydenberg's comment puts a very considerable burden on library leadership nationally, and especially within the states. If the state library extension agencies and the state library associations let down as the result of federal aid, then undoubtedly the local communities will let down, but it doesn't seem to me there will be any likelihood of that if the agencies become, as they should become under the provision of these recommendations, more alive and more alert than they have been in the past.

MISS MERRILL: Mr. Craver, fortunately we have just had a little experience in this in administering state aid in Arkansas, where rural expenditures were certainly nil and where \$100,000 of state aid sounded like really vast sums of money, and without its being positively written into the law, that has been so administered that when a county gets aid, it commits itself at once to certain very specific expenditures, for

instance, quarters, the salary of a librarian, etc, and that has been done with good feeling and all of that. The Commission has set its own requirements although there was no such matching formula whatever.

DR. DAVID: The problem is very difficult from the standpoint of federal legislation; that is, even if you want to write that kind of requirement, as soon as you get away from the simple matching type of thing which is so obviously inequitable-- I don't see how anybody can defend it much longer in connection with federal aid--the Harrison-Fletcher type of thing simply requires the states and localities to keep on doing what they do now and is probably just administratively unworkable, and how can State X compel all of the local school jurisdictions within that state to keep on spending exactly to a dime the amount of money they have been spending some given year? If one community wants to spend more, does that mean that some other community can then be allowed to spend less, and so on?

A provision that would probably be administratively feasible would be to require the same amount of expenditures by the state government, leveling out the local part of the picture, but I take it that is not a material factor in this library matter.

MR. MILAM: No, it is a very small feature, only

four or five states.

DR. WILSON: Just on that point, I was interested when we were working over the whole problem of the report two years ago on federal aid, to discover that in the instances of assistance as in the land-grant colleges, highway construction and various other permanent forms, the contributions of the localities were about four times those of the Federal Government; that is, instead of being one to one it was four to one out of the local and state pocketbook.

DR. DAVID: This whole program, of course, is recommended as a six-year program with the recommendation made very specifically that the grants not be authorized initially for longer than the six years, and that the whole program be reviewed again starting in perhaps 1943, with a view to determining future policy. I think it is possible that when that time comes, our techniques, and so on, may have reached the point where it is possible to write legislation under which you will require the states to make effort in accordance with their ability rather than to match on some 50-50 or 25-75 or any other arbitrary basis applied uniformly to all states, but I must confess that while we hope our techniques are good enough now to allocate federal aid on a need basis, there is some question as to whether they should be asked to

bear the additional burden of determining how much a given state ought to do. If the states in any appreciable number fail to meet reasonable expectations during this intervening period, if the legislation is adopted, I think that that is certainly a point which will be of the greatest importance six years from now.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: I think while Dr. David is still with us, I will ask Mr. Milam if he will read this Title III of the bill, which deals with the grants for rural library service. Possibly you may want to ask some questions of Dr. David with respect to that.

MR. JOECKEL: Don't you explain, Mr. Milman, just exactly what this is you are going to read?

MR. MILAM: You will find on page 35 of the blue covered document this Title III, and you will also find in front of you separate mimeographed copies. The mimeographed copy should be available at all the places. The others are not so numerous.

This is Title III. Title I covers: General federal aid; aid for vocational education; improved teacher preparation; construction of school buildings; administration of state departments of education. Title II covers adult education; Title III, rural library service.

... Mr. Milam read "Title III - Grants to States for Rural Library Service" (marked Paper No. 2), with the following interpolations:

No. 1. p. 1: Mr. Dunbar and I raised the question yesterday whether the fact that a few things are mentioned might be interpreted to limit the purposes, and whether a re-phrasing which would get the general clause at the end might be more satisfactory, something like this: "shall be available for salaries, the purchase of books, periodicals and library supplies, and other current operating and maintenance expenditures for public library service."

MR. DAVID: This thing has not been gone over by any legislative counsel yet.

MR. DUDGEON: We used a phrase even broader than that: "Whether similar to those items mentioned or otherwise." Even that phrase which you mentioned has often been construed to mean only those things that are closely parallel to those mentioned.

No. 2, p. 1: (Miss Merrill wants to insert "library" before "administrative").

No. 3, p. 2: I might call attention here to the fact that there are no specifications as to the character or quality of the administrative agency which may be chosen in this

title of the Act, whereas there are some specifications in other titles of the Act.

DR. DAVID: All the others designate the Office of Education.

MR. MILAM: But there are specifications concerning the employment of personnel on a merit basis in those departments, for example. I only thought that at least theoretically this leaves the Legislature free to designate a perfectly hopeless agency within the state to administer libraries.

DR. DAVID: Line 4 of Section 306 requiring the state to have an adequate cooperating administrative agency---

MR. MILAM (Interposing): Maybe that would have a bearing.

No. 4, p. 2: The interpretation of those last four words will be interesting. ...

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Has the Board any questions that it wants to raise that Dr. David may be able to answer?

MR. DUDGEON: Has there been any definition of rural regions or rural inhabitants?

DR. DAVID: Since the Bureau of Census would make these estimates, presumably they would follow their own definition, that is places under 2500. There are some

qualifications of the definition to take care of the township situation in New England and other special situations, but it would I presume follow the definition of population used for census purposes.

MR. DUDGEON: And that will be adopted for the purposes of administering this?

DR. DAVID: Yes, I presume so.

MR. MILAM: Someone asked me whether this was exclusively for public libraries, and as far as I can recall, the word "public" doesn't appear anywhere in this title, does it?

MISS MERRILL: It does here in Section 301, public library services.

MR. MILAM: Do you think that the bill as drawn would be interpreted to include service from cities to rural areas, and would it be necessary to make a separate accounting to make sure that the money was used for the rural areas? Here is Mr. Dudgeon who is librarian of the Milwaukee Public Library which also serves a county under a separate contract.

DR. DAVID: There is nothing in the report, and I believe nothing in this bill which requires the money to be spent exclusively for the benefit of rural people. The emphasis is on rural people because that is in the opinion of

the Committee the place where the greatest need is, and yet the committee is certainly not opposed to the use of the money where it is needed in terms of relative needs. In other words, a small town or a city which under the conditions prevailing is simply unable to provide library service, or no more financially able than a rural area, would I assume be just as much entitled to aid, but the primary purpose of the fund is first equalization of library service, and secondly, library service as nearly universal as is administratively feasible. The Committee's feeling is that it is justified to call this primarily rural aid because the effect of those two other purposes will be mainly to benefit rural people.

MR. MILAM: I am not questioning the desirability of that feature. I am only questioning the administrative problem that may arise.

MR. DUDGEON: To put it the way it was in my mind, is there any assurance in the actual language of the legislation that the regions which are actually rural will be aided or served even though local initiative is extended to local services from existing agencies to those regions? There are a good many cases where there is an actual extension of service to rural regions. Will this be available? Is there any assurance that this will be available to those regions?

DR. DAVID: You mean, is there any assurance it would be available where service now exists?

MR. DUDGEON: Will those who have had the initiative to get some service be discriminated against or penalized?

MR. DUNBAR: Section 303 (b) provides "for the maintenance of a cooperative and integrated system of library service throughout the state, through which free library service will be available to each inhabitant."

DR. DAVID: There is no doubt of the fact that the allocation of this money within states will present very difficult problems, and I suppose almost a different problem in every state, and that is why the draft of the report at least implied that the legislation should be as broad as possible and leave enough flexibility to take care of the situation which actually exists.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Possibly, Dr. David, the interpretation in various states might be different.

DR. DAVID: I am convinced that the plan in different states has got to be different, but I would think that the problem you are raising, the question of allocation should not be determined entirely or even primarily by what the local areas have done, but rather by what they could do, and an area which has already done something should at least get as much

help as another area which has done nothing, which is equally able.

MR. DUDGEON: It would be simply a question of what channels that should go to help those regions who have already established the service.

MR. SPAULDING: It would be determined by each state. It seems to me sections 303 (a) and (b) are pretty broad, giving the state set-up the authority to devise ways and means, whether through a public library giving service now or by other means, for an integrated library service.

MR. VITZ: Should there be anything in it to encourage service through already existing agencies, or emphasis through enlarging units, or should that be left entirely to negotiation between the federal and the state authorities?

DR. DAVID: I would certainly have no disposition to supplant existing services. I would assume that the language of paragraph (b) under 303, "a cooperative and integrated system of library service," would mean using all the available facilities in so far as they were willing to cooperate.

MR. MILAM: The difficulty with any such statement is the variation in the states. I just challenge you to use

any phrase in this bill which would be equally or reasonably satisfactory to Oklahoma and Massachusetts.

MR. DUDGEON: There is no indication in (b)-- it says "for the maintenance of a cooperative . . ." There may be one already existing.

MR. VITZ: I wonder whether there should be additional emphasis on that in the direction of larger regions.

MR. JOECKEL: As I see it, it doesn't seem to me likely that there is going to be any difficulty in getting library support through an existing library agency, such as the Milwaukee Public Library to the Milwaukee County or the portions of the rural county. To me the question would come over the interpretation of the word "rural" in this legislation, as to whether it could actually go to some community which was over 2500, we will say.

DR. DAVID: Rural is used only in the heading of the title, I believe, and also in the statement of purpose at the beginning of Section 300, but as far as the availability sections are concerned, it is not there.

MR. JOECKEL: You think that is a basis then for your statement that it is not strictly limited?

DR. DAVID: If you want to clear that up, I think possibly it might be wise to insert "primarily" after "in order,"

so it would read, "In order primarily to stimulate and facilitate adequate provision," etc.

MR. MUNN: Mr. President, in the A.L.A. National Plan the approved ways of serving states are fairly well covered, and of course could be much more definitely so. In federal legislation is it in any way possible to tie legislation to standards of somebody like the A.L.A.? In other words, could it be said that so far as possible the service to the rural areas shall follow the practices adopted by the American Library Association in its national plan? Would that sort of thing have any possible chance of going through Congress?

DR. DAVID: I think possibly you could find some precedents somewhere in federal legislation for that sort of thing. I couldn't put my hands on them myself at this moment. Generally speaking, the history of federal legislation has been pretty much opposed to accepting standards from anybody unofficial. I suppose in that it differs quite materially from the English practice, I don't know.

MISS MERRILL: Wouldn't it be possible for the Office of Education in its first communication to call attention to A.L.A. standards. Aren't we going to have to assume some intelligence on the part of Mr. Dunbar, shall we say?

DR. WILSON: After all, your standards are for the

cities; they aren't for the rural areas. We have never developed any for the rural areas. They are all for cities of certain sizes, in terms of expenditures, etc.

MR. MUNN: We could do that though within the next month.

DR. WILSON: We might have to do it in the dark.

DR. DAVID: I should think the standards you would need most would be standards of qualification of personnel.

MR. MUNN: There, too, I was wondering if there was any possibility of using a standard which has been set by some one state, I suppose New York, for instance.

DR. DAVID: Section 303 provides for joint planning with the Office of Education regarding the payment of salaries, for instance. There is a good deal of precedent for requiring federal administrative agencies in considering such matters, to take account of the standards of appropriate professional associations. The Civil Service Commission, for example, where existing professional standards are available, certainly gives consideration to them and follows them I think as much as they can, and I would assume that the standards there in the A.L.A. would have very great weight with the Office of Education. They undoubtedly would use the fact that the A.L.A. had approved them, if called upon to approve them.

MR. CANNON: Do you mean personnel standards?

DR. DAVID: Of course, that is not confined to personnel standards. For example, in material specifications the standards of the commercial agencies that test materials are recognized and copied by the Procurement Division of the Federal Government, and so on.

MR. MUNN: But to set and maintain standards, we would have to look really to the supervision of the Office of Education, rather than write them into the law, am I correct in that?

DR. DAVID: I would think so.

MR. SPAULDING: Are you right in using the word "supervision"?

MR. MUNN: No, I think not.

MR. SPAULDING: It seems to me when Section 304 says, "When a state shall have accepted the provisions of this Act, etc., and when a joint plan has been agreed to by the agency designated to represent the state and the United States Commissioner of Education," that that is the guarantee that no state could set up an impossible plan of action.

MR. JOECKEL: It seems to me that is pretty nearly the business part of the whole thing as far as really getting

what you want is concerned.

MR. SPAULDING: And a pretty good guarantee, particularly if we keep the present personnel of the Library Service Division.

MR. MILAM: May I raise a couple of questions which seem to me of some importance. Section 304 reads, "When a state shall have accepted the provisions of this Act . . . ., and when a joint plan has been agreed to by the agency designated to represent the state and the United States Commission of Education. . . ." then the money shall be available. There are no reservations in this title comparable to the reservations which exist in other titles. To illustrate what I mean, I think we need there some protecting clause such as the one I find on page 33 of the blue copy, under Adult Education, about line 8: "In all cases, the joint plans shall reserve explicitly to state and local agencies the administration of adult educational activities, determination of the contents and processes of adult education, and decision as to the best uses of the allotments of federal funds within the types of expenditures for which federal funds are made available by this Act and the joint plan."

In other words, I don't want a future Commissioner of Education to have authority to insist that Sol Bloom's

book on the Constitution shall be in every library; in other words, providing in every plan that there shall be certain books in every library. I don't think that is likely to happen, but something of that sort might happen and if it is necessary to protect all the other sections, I think it probably is desirable to protect ourselves, and that is entirely in keeping with the spirit of the whole program. It simply is not included here; so far as I can see for no particular reason it is just left out.

DR. DAVID: The problem there does present unusual difficulties, or at least it seemed so to us. I think probably it is possible to write some language of that kind which would be highly desirable. It is perfectly obvious, I think, if you read this whole bill there is as it now stands more federal control in this library section than any other title.

MR. MILAM: Except perhaps buildings.

DR. DAVID: Yes, buildings--that is the most. The reason for that is not a lack of confidence in local library people but simply recognition of the fact that state library set-ups that run state-wide library services are so rare, in the first place, and in the second place that the state governments themselves are appropriating such relatively small amounts of money out of state funds, so that you have now

very little in the way of administrative machinery to administer state as distinguished from local library funds, so that it seemed to the Committee that the Federal Government was almost bound to be more concerned in the administration of state library set-ups than in connection with the State Departments of Education. I think it is possible, however, to write a list of specifics that ought not to be the subject of any federal control at all.

MR. MILAM: That is what I mean, and I would think first of the selection of books. If this bill were to be made available to certain members of our profession whom we know, they would catch at once upon the fact that this could lead to absolute federal control of the purchase of certain books, or the placing of those books in libraries, and that would be contrary to the whole spirit of the Act and of your report.

DR. DAVID: I think it would probably be desirable to add, such as you have on page 5, the proviso that "no provision shall be included in such joint plans other than those authorized in this title."

MR. DUNBAR: Then in Section 6 (a), the last sentence, on page 8, you have this: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to give any federal official or agency authority

to supervise or review the selection of books and other reading and instructional materials for state or local educational authorities."

MR. DUDGEON: That as it is doesn't apply to the library section?

MR. DUNBAR: That is the general education provision.

DR. DAVID: There is certainly no objection to that and I think it ought to be in.

MR. MILAM: Then there is the question about some possible qualification for suitable state agencies--those are the ones that seemed to us to be the most obviously important.

DR. DAVID: You raised the point about the state agency a while ago, about there being nothing in here about the merit of the state agency. Those merit provisions relating to State Departments of Education are tied up directly with specific aid for them. There is nothing in here specifically to provide for money to run a state library agency, although I would assume that this money is available for that purpose, among others.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That is, the administrative cost may be included in this expenditure?

DR. DAVID: It is not prohibited from being

included. On the other hand, you do have this provision in here for the use of federal money at least in the payment of salaries of only qualified personnel, a provision which the Committee was reluctant to put in the educational grants, that is for the elementary and secondary schools. Nothing in this gives the federal agency the discretion to review teachers' certificates. Some day we may think that is a highly desirable situation, but certainly it would be highly repugnant to most people now, I think. On the other hand, you have had so much difficulty with the kind of standards some states have been willing to accept for librarians.

MR. MILAM: I have no objection to that, for my part, but I rather think we would like to have some slight qualification of the state agency indicating that it too, whether it receives any money directly for the salaries or not, should be required to maintain a certain personnel standard.

DR. DAVID: I think you could write in a section very appropriately.

MR. MILAM: Such as Section 53, page 28 in the blue book.

DR. DAVID: You could take that over, substituting library state agency.

MR. MILAM: There is no reason why the state

library official should be a politician.

DR. DAVID: You don't have any that are elected?

MR. MILAM: No.

DR. DAVID: Of course, you are faced with the situation of thirty-two elective state education officials.

MR. MILAM: I know, but we could go a little bit further in our state section.

MISS HOWE: The question was raised about the word "public" library not being in. Is there any objection to taking it out the two instances where it is in?

MR. MILAM: Is there any reason for it, Miss Howe?

MISS HOWE: Just that there may not be any public library service in certain sections.

MR. MILAM: This will establish it.

MISS HOWE: We have certain counties where we perhaps never will want any public library service, it is too small, they haven't any public libraries at all. They ought to have library service.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: What other kind of service can the public get than public library service?

MISS HOWE: The school.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That is provided for in another section.

MISS HOWE: That is what I was wondering, whether there was any objection to taking the word "public" out.

MR. SPAULDING: As I look at Sections 303 (a) and (b), I am wondering if in writing that somebody hasn't used the word "public" and the word "free" regardless of any attempt to define the difference between the two. Section 303 (a) refers to public library service, 303 (b) to free library service. What is the difference?

MR. DUDGEON: Aren't we injecting a definition of an institution instead of a service?

MR. SPAULDING: We are thinking of a definition in our own minds but not in the mind of anybody administering this.

MR. DUDGEON: My thought is that public library service or free library service doesn't necessarily mean service from a public library. It is service to the public. Isn't this really a definition of service rather than a definition of an institution?

DR. DAVID: As a matter of fact, the report once was written in terms of library extension service, and the word "extension" was struck out on the ground that in some states it might be possible to provide it through the locally established library, and in others it would not, and therefore it shouldn't go in.

MR. DUDGEON: Where you use the phrase "public library service," isn't that equivalent to library service to the public? We are defining the word "service" instead of the institution.

DR. DAVID: I think we mean an agency that is a public agency, or at least publicly financed.

MR. DUDGEON: It seems to me all the way through probably what they meant was the character of the service that is available to the public rather than the character of the institution that renders the service.

DR. DAVID: The definition of a public agency, if you know the situation in the school field, is very confused, but I suppose generally speaking it does mean an agency which is at least in the main publicly financed and usually publicly controlled in some way.

MR. CANNON: How would it work out in a state like Arizona, for example? If this bill were passed, how would the thing go into operation? What kind of a service would they give, and through what kind of an agency?

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That is what Arizona would have to decide and set up, I assume, under this bill.

MR. CANNON: I assume so, a joint action.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: They would have to present a plan

to be approved.

MISS MERRILL: Arizona is an interesting example, because that is a state where I hope a library agency would have to be not completely set up, but there is no real library extension agency there now and I think that would immediately force the thing we haven't known how to force, the creation of an adequate agency.

MR. DUDGEON: Where that word "public" library is used in Section 301, it actually means the institution there. "The amounts appropriated under authority . . . . shall be available for the current operating and maintenance expenditures, including salaries . . . . of public library services." That means salaries in an institution, doesn't it?

MR. SPAULDING: For services. I don't think that is the intent anywhere. to use that word "public" with reference to an institution.

MR. VITZ: I don't see why it couldn't cover direct by mail service from state traveling libraries.

MR. MILAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Dr. David explain the legislative situation and his relation to it.

DR. DAVID: As you know, the report was transmitted to the President by the Committee and the President in turn

transmitted it to Congress on February 23. It was referred respectively to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and the House Committee on Education. Parts of it, if they are enacted into legislation, will have to receive consideration by other committees. Those committees don't have complete jurisdiction over the matters in the report.

In transmitting the report, the President's message was very brief. Probably the safest thing is to read it: "I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Advisory Committee on Education appointed in September, 1936," etc.

The implication of that is quite clear, that the President is sending it over for consideration by Congress without any recommendation, either favorable or unfavorable. We have inquired as to the position of the President under the terms of the regulation on legislative activities by federal employees and we are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the Committee participating in legislative drafting as individuals, but no statement should be made as to the relationship of this legislation to the program of the President, no such statement being available as yet.

In terms of what the President actually thinks, the

delegation from the N.E.A. which saw him just before they had their Atlantic City convention, went up to Atlantic City and said they found the President--I think they said he commended the report very, very highly as an excellent job of report preparation; he did not commit himself at all as to what he would do about it and more or less indicated that he expected it to cause a certain amount of commotion on the Hill and expected to sit back and watch it do so.

That puts us in the position where the Committee is not able officially to sponsor legislation, and we are not doing so. On the other hand, the National Education Association is continuing to work with the same people in the Congress that they have been working with, namely, Senator Harrison and Congressman Fletcher, and also Senator Thomas of Utah, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Thomas as committee chairman is very anxious to see a complete draft of the recommendations of the Committee in bill form. Harrison is quite agreeable, or at least it seems that he will be quite agreeable, to substituting the recommendations of the Committee for his own bill, at least in connection with these grants to the states, so the N.E.A. has gone ahead with this draft of a bill which you have before you, which they say they have, and I think they have, tried to make as closely parallel to the

recommendations of the Committee as possible. We have consulted with them a little, primarily from the standpoint of giving them information as to what the Committee meant where interpretation was needed, and as far as I can tell after very careful examination of the bill, it is fully consistent with the recommendations of the Committee except on exceedingly minor points where the Committee I am sure would be agreeable to change.

At any rate, the status of the bill before you is that it is a measure that is now being prepared and presumably will be sponsored by the National Education Association and such other groups as may desire to cooperate. The reason they put this library title in is because it was recommended by the Committee and they were trying to draft a bill which would include the committee's recommendations. I presume that they will look to you people for a decision as to whether you want to sponsor that title. If you don't want to sponsor it, I don't know whether the N.E.A. would care to sponsor it or not. I would think not, but I don't know. In other words, they will take the position that it is primarily your baby if anything is going to be done about it.

The position of the Committee is that it has made its report and completed its official task and unless requested

by the President specifically to give assistance as part of the administration on getting the legislation, the Committee is not in position to do so except as individuals.

MR. SPAULDING: Dr. David, if this amendment is made to the original Harrison-Fletcher Bill, which of course makes this the bill, does that recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which I understand ordered the original bill out?

DR. DAVID: I am not absolutely positive of the parliamentary situation, but my understanding is that under the Senate rules, the Senate committee can consider this whole business in executive session and finally agree upon it without recommitting; that is agree on this draft or any other draft as a committee amendment of the pending bill which is now on the calendar, and then substitute it on the floor and go ahead.

MR. SPAULDING: The House Committee on Education never did report the bill out?

DR. DAVID: No. The strategy is entirely in terms of getting it through the Senate first before anything is done in the House, as I understand the views of the N.E.A.

MR. MILAM: May I report what I learned yesterday, that the Legislative Commission of the N.E.A., of which Sidney B. Hall is Chairman, will have an Executive Committee session on

Tuesday to consider this draft of the bill which is before you. On Wednesday we will hold a meeting to which have been invited representatives of some thirty organizations, including the American Library Association, to consider the various portions of the bill which are of concern to those organizations, and presumably to receive criticisms and recommendations.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That will be the time when we should bring to their attention these various matters that we think could be better stated.

MR. LYDENBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Dr. David one or two questions? Some of this I fear may be rather nebulous, so put me straight as to facts first. Is the concept of this a conference cooperation between the Commissioner of Education and an appropriate state agency for supervision of library work--any agency that the state may choose to designate to represent the state in connection with the receipt and administration of federal funds?

DR. DAVID: I think as I understand your question, the answer is yes, it is set up on the basis of joint planning. As far as the designation of a state agency is concerned, there is no provision in this draft as it now stands which would give the Commissioner of Education authority to approve or in any way control the choice of the state as to the agency, but

that is a provision, of course, which is relatively common in federal aid legislation and no doubt could be written in here if you wanted to.

MR. LYDENBERG: It might be the state librarian, it might be the head of the State Department of Education, it might be the State Department of Archives, it might be any unit of the state government that the state administration chooses.

DR. DAVID: Or a new agency.

MISS HOWE: State Library Association?

DR. DAVID: It would have to be a state agency.

MR. LYDENBERG: I don't know whether it is safe to say there is today a growing or a lessening tendency toward the political point of view of certain state agencies, state libraries or others. I think it is something that many of us are wondering about. The Commissioner of Education must turn to the head of the state and ask him, what is the agency you are appointing to represent this sovereign state in this respect, and that agency once designated would be the agency that works with the Commissioner of Education.

DR. DAVID: It would be determined by legislative action, not by the governor.

MR. LYDENBERG: All right, the appropriate agency.

DR. DAVID: The one thing that is left out of this bill consistently throughout is a feature used in many federal aid acts, that the governor could create the state set-up when the legislature is not in session. This Committee had a very definite conviction that all of this was a matter of sufficient importance so that it ought not to be started in any states until there had been definite action by the Legislature, and that is the major reason why the thing is set up in terms of beginning a year in advance of the time federal legislation is adopted. The reason for postponing the initiation of the grants until a year from now was entirely one of an interval of a year between federal legislation and the beginning of the grants. In other words, if the legislation were not adopted this year, I presume the committee would be in favor of postponing the time of the availability of the grants again.

MR. LYDENBERG: Suppose the Commissioner of Education is convinced that the state has inadequate or improper---

DR. DAVID (Interposing): I think that is just the point, he could object to a state agency on grounds of inadequacy but I don't think he could object on the ground of impropriety. In other words, they could designate any agency under the sun and he would be authorized to determine whether

they were adequate to administer the function, which would mean they would have to have some qualified personnel, and if they didn't have them, they would have to get them. But it might be housed in a department whose major purposes were wholly foreign, conceivably.

MR. LYDENBERG: If he decides that the state is inadequately equipped to carry out the purposes of this, the ideas and the ideals, is the Commissioner of Education authorized to withhold?

DR. DAVID: Yes, he is authorized to withhold in the last section of the title. That language "inadequate cooperating state agency" is from the highway legislation. It was put in the highway legislation originally at the request of the state agencies, for their own protection.

MR. MILAM: In a measure, that really does give the Commissioner of Education some authority to O.K. the agency selected, doesn't it?

DR. DAVID: It is a very broad power.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: He passes as to what is adequacy.

MR. LYDENBERG: His decision is final.

MR. JOECKEL: He can implement the provision by holding up the appropriation.

MISS MERRILL: But they would have to wait for the

next legislature to designate another agency.

DR. DAVID: Another way to take care of this point if you want to attempt to cover it would be to insert at the top of page 36 in the first line the word "appropriate" before "state agency," and then somebody has to decide what is appropriate and there is nobody to decide except the Commissioner of Education.

MR. LYDENBERG: I don't know whether it can be controlled by legislation or by verbal phrasing here. I was just wondering what would happen if this had been in operation for some time and they had been working through the state library and they had been admirably satisfied that it had been functioning well, and suppose by reason of death or political change the state library's attitude and personnel might be shifted. What assurance is there that the Federal Commissioner of Education can insist on maintenance of those ideals?

DR. DAVID: I think you have three resources there. In the first place, you have the auditing on actual misappropriation of funds, and in the second place you have the joint planning on qualification of personnel so far as they are paid out of federal funds, and third you have this merit provision if you write it in, and fourth you have this general power to suspend payments if the state agency is not adequate.

That power of determining adequacy is so broad that most of the federal officials that have it are afraid to use it. It has been used only very, very rarely.

MR. DUNBAR: Section 306 says if the United States Commissioner of Education determines, after notice and hearing, that any state has failed to maintain an adequate cooperating state administrative agency or has failed to make required reports with reasonable promptness, the Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend payments.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That covers your point, doesn't it, Mr. Lydenberg? A failure to maintain is taken care of there.

MR. DUNBAR: Of course, the Commissioner may have difficulty in determining accurately or precisely what an adequate cooperating state agency is.

DR. DAVID: That is the point, it is so difficult to determine that.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: You can't write those things into a law, exactly.

MR. DUNBAR: There will have to be some major statement.

MISS PROUTY: The difficulty would come when there was a change in the character of the agency.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: But that is covered by the words

"failing to maintain."

MR. DUDGEON: It seems to me as broad and general as you can make it. If you try to make it more specific, you get into trouble.

MISS MERRILL: And the very threat of federal withdrawal is in itself a very great protection.

DR. DAVID: I wonder how many of you are familiar with this book, a new book by V. O. Keys, Jr., entitled, "The Administration of Federal Grants to States," published by the Public Administration Service in Chicago, written under the auspices of the Committee on Public Administration of the Social Science Research Council. It is a very excellent book and right up to the minute on that subject.

MR. SPAULDING: I think also in connection with what Mr. Lydenberg said, some of the findings we found at the meeting of the Special Committee on Federal Aid under Dr. Wilson two years ago indicate that under the highway act the Secretary of Agriculture could step right into a state and take over the highways and maintain and repair them if the state failed, but it has never been done and it isn't very likely that it will be.

DR. DAVID: There was almost a complete rupture of relations on highway relations in Georgia two or three years ago, but those are the occasions under which that sort of thing

arises. According to Key's findings, the Experiment Station Service has been more vigorous in using that sort of power than any other federal agency. There have been about three or four outstanding cases where in a given state the director and most of the staff of the Experiment Station have just been fired by a politically minded governor who happened to come into office, and the Experiment Station Service has gone into the state and immediately stopped funds. I think the record in the use of that power in other federal aid systems will indicate that on the whole probably it has been used too sparingly rather than too much.

MR. DUNBAR: Dr. David, a certain member of the educational staff asked me why under (d) of Section 303 the committee was so specific in regard to "suitable cooperative arrangements with school systems," in mentioning the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service. That isn't of great importance, but they were just wondering why.

DR. DAVID: I don't think it is of great importance. It is thrown in as much to give the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service a pat on the back as for any other reason. I think it is desirable and I don't see how it can do any harm. You see, that is partially a result of the vocational study the Committee did first. There is considerable amount of friction

in certain parts of the country between the school system and the Agricultural Extension Service. I don't know whether that is liable to carry over to the library field, but at least we felt it was desirable to have it in here.

MISS MERRILL: Didn't the author of the library monograph include that in his statement?

MR. MILAM: And didn't the American Library Association hold a meeting with that crowd for the purpose of stimulating cooperation? I think it is entirely appropriate.

DR. DAVID: As far as any people provide rural leadership in this country, they come as close to doing it as any other group, and this ought to be a major factor in rural life.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Have you anything else that you want to ask Dr. David?

MISS PROUTY: I wonder if I could ask one question. There was considerable interest in the meeting of the public school administrators in New Jersey recently and the discussion they had as to whether private and parochial schools should be included under this bill. Was that question finally settled? The last account I got was that it was referred to a committee. They had a tremendous row all through the meeting--I think that is the only word for it. How was that settled?

DR. DAVID: First, as to the actual recommendations, aside from this adult education title which is so broad money could go almost anywhere, the recommendations on general aid for elementary and secondary education include no recommendation that any money should go to parochial or other non-public schools. It is purely in terms of services for children of school age and the three things specified are transportation, books and scholarship. There is no recommendation that they be included, but there is no restriction against it.

MISS PROUTY: And health and welfare service.

DR. DAVID: Yes, health and welfare service, but in that connection the children do generally come to the school.

MISS PROUTY: It was made an issue there and discussed in one meeting after another.

DR. DAVID: It has become an issue because there are about five states which either make textbooks available for pupils in parochial schools or provide transportation for them, and the people in those states, of course, have been battling the issue for several years and that made it acute at Atlantic City. But as far as the Committee was concerned, it was simply taking the position that it would be an unwarranted restriction on state autonomy to prohibit them from doing something with federal money which some of them are doing with their own.

MISS PROUTY: Didn't they refer it back to a committee?

DR. DAVID: The N.E.A., after debating it, adopted a resolution which avoided any commitment on it. I have the resolution here. "We note with genuine approval the conclusion of the Advisory Committee on Education that this Federal aid must be given without Federal control of education, for, again quoting the official news release, 'in order that local initiative and responsibility may be maintained, all Federal action should reserve explicitly to state and local auspices the general administration of schools, control of the process of education, and the determination of the best uses of allotments of Federal funds within the types of expenditures for which Federal funds may be made available. The Federal Government should in no case attempt to control the curriculums of the schools and the methods of teaching to be employed in them.'

"However, since the complete report of the Advisory Committee on Education is not available at this time for careful and well-considered study and analysis, before final action is taken committing this organization it is recommended that the report of the Advisory Committee on Education be referred to the Educational Policies Commission and to the Legislative Commission of the National Education Association for study, for the

purpose of evolving a plan by which legislation will be framed and enacted, putting into effect the principles and policies repeatedly affirmed by this organization through which Federal aid for public education will be secured without Federal control."

As you see, they have avoided the issue and referred it to two of their committees. I don't know how active the Educational Policies Commission will be in this. As I understand the activities of the N.E.A., they have no control over their Legislative Commission. On the other hand, the Legislative Commission is entirely friendly to all of the report, with the possible exception of those private school provisions, and it appears that a majority of the members of the committee are favorable even to them. So they are proceeding on that basis, and this bill, although it is not phrased nearly as pointedly as the Committee's report, does in fact carry out those recommendations.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: That question affects schools, not libraries to very much extent, anyhow.

MR. MILAM: There is no provision in the library title, so far as I can find, concerning that. It would be left purely to the state agency and the Commissioner of Education to define what is a public library service.

MISS PROUTY: The word "public" is in some of the paragraphs and not in some of the others, and that question came up a minute ago.

DR. DAVID: It possibly can be clarified.

MR. DUDGEON: Mr. Milam, I understand Dr. David is going to leave before long and I wonder whether this tentative resolution might be submitted to him, and whether he might state whether he felt it would be useful.

MR. MILAM: I didn't take it as serious as that. I thought somebody would come in with a good resolution.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: We would be glad to have Dr. David's comment on it.

MR. DUDGEON: I raise that question for the reason, Mr. Milam, that in that final clause I want a final kick for libraries by mentioning libraries there. My thought was to use the language, "and for adult education through libraries as well as through schools and other non-profit educational agencies." You see, I thought we ought to have the word in the last clause there.

DR. DAVID: This looks very good. The only question I would raise would be purely one of drafting. In the third paragraph, second line, "that it should be made available through state library agencies," I am not sure as to the

meaning of that. I take it you don't wish it to mean that the actual library service shall be provided exclusively by state agencies as distinguished from local.

MR. MILAM: No, certainly not.

MISS MERRILL: "Be allocated" then.

DR. DAVID: On the other hand, do you mean that it should not be done that way in states where it needs to be?

MR. CANNON: It seems to me it should be general because it has been indicated we don't know just what agency is going to do this in the state.

DR. DAVID: What you do mean is that there should be a state library agency.

MR. MILAM: We mean that it should be allocated through an agency of the state which is concerned with library advancement or supervision; that the allocation should be through such an agency.

DR. DAVID: What about the actual provision of local service by such an agency on an extension basis?

MR. MILAM: We are not saying anything about that. We are neither for nor against it, so far as the resolution is concerned. Of course, actually we are for it.

MR. DUDGEON: You say "We mean. . . ." If you put that in here, that would be very good.

MR. VITZ: Isn't this practically going to be largely a recommendation for federal aid for education and school libraries?

MR. MILAM: Isn't what going to be, this resolution?

MR. VITZ: The whole thing, the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

MISS MERRILL: But the two to six million is perfectly clear for libraries.

MR. VITZ: But it will be largely administered through agencies in school buildings.

MR. DUDGEON: I take exception to that. I don't see when you analyze this that it is through the school libraries at all.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: No, it is specified for public library service.

MR. VITZ: The implication in the report is that in rural areas it should be largely done cooperatively and in school buildings, and the only type of librarians for which special training is provided is school librarians and those will be the only type of librarians available in most of these areas.

DR. DAVID: You get back again to the definition of public library service. I have used that term quite

unconsciously, and I would assume that a library service by a public school which was open to public use, was a public library.

MR. VITZ: I have tried to get good public library service through agencies in schools, and it is almost impossible to do.

DR. DAVID: I wasn't debating quality.

MR. VITZ: I don't mean quality; I mean teaching the adults to use it, and the children on the recreation side, reaching them in hours when school is closed.

DR. DAVID: The only point I was trying to make is that that definition of public library service as the Committee interpreted it would not exclude allocation of some of this \$6,000,000 for public library services made available through libraries housed in schools.

MR. MILAM: But it doesn't require it.

MR. SPAULDING: Existing set-ups and tradition would largely govern.

MR. VITZ: The bill is very much better than those extracts from the Committee's report. I was quite discouraged when I read them.

MR. DUDGEON: I take it from the bill, as I read it, that there is no implication that this is pointed at

libraries in schools, or anything of that kind.

DR. DAVID: It is pointed at whatever way the service can best be had.

MR. MILAM: What Mr. Vitz is saying I think is this, that in the report as we extracted it we called attention to the provision of reading materials in school libraries and the school aid feature; to the planning of rooms in school buildings which would be available to the public library service as well as schools; to the training of school librarians; to the emphasis on library cooperation with schools; and then of course there was the general library provision. But reading the thing in that form, he got the impression that the primary purpose of all this was to encourage the development of libraries through schools, but those things are actually separated in separate titles in the bill, Mr. Vitz, and I think there isn't so much to be concerned about there.

MR. DUNBAR: Looking over the definition, Mr. Chairman, in Section 604 of the bill it says regarding changes in plans after they once get started, "The plans provided for in Title I, parts 1, 3 and 4, and in Titles II and III, and the cooperative agreements provided for in Title IV, of this Act shall be subject to revision and amendment by agreement at the request of any party to such plans or agreements." It

seems to me after we get things started in a tentative way, it will still permit of changes.

DR. DAVID: I am not sure that section was even necessary, because most federal aid legislation simply says a plan shall be set up, and then it is revised at some stated interval without any specific authorization, but this does clear it up a little.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: It makes a positive statement instead of leaving it to be assumed.

MR. DUDGEON: May I ask this question? Referring to the last clause of our resolution, is this out of harmony if we should adopt it, which we haven't yet, to say in that last clause, "for education of adults through libraries as well as through schools and other non-profit educational agencies"?

DR. DAVID: I don't see any harm in it unless it is tied up rather closely with that adult education fund. Of course, there is a resolution and it doesn't make so much difference. Maybe I am a little naive about it but it hadn't particularly entered my mind that this adult education fund was available for library purposes. I am not sure the extent to which it would be available and how it would be available. I would not assume that it would be available for the ordinary operating expenses of the libraries. But on the other hand,

presumably it is available for something that libraries do in the way of adult education services.

MR. VITZ: The libraries might as well forget that is there. They won't get a chance at it.

MR. SPAULDING: I am not so sure. In cities where there is an Adult Education Council, isn't it conceivable that some of that fund might be available for books and the preparation of reading courses, and such things?

DR. DAVID: I would think so. I must confess that adult education fund would be the worst "headache" of the crop to administer because it is so wide open in so many respects.

MR. DUDGEON: To be perfectly frank, from that summary we had I assumed a closer relationship with the schools as distinguished from the other agencies, and my thought was that at least it would do no harm for us to express our thoughts that adult education can be obtained through libraries as well as through schools and colleges.

DR. DAVID: I think it is perfectly appropriate for you to put the emphasis that way.

MR. JOECKEL: Possibly we could try to get it in the bill.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: After all, as Dr. David said this

is merely a resolution.

DR. DAVID: I think you may need to give consideration to the bill on that adult education title.

MR. DUDGEON: That is what I thought, that that would lead to recognition of the library as an adult education educational agency.

MR. JOECKEL: The language in the resolution follows the language of the section.

DR. DAVID: I should think any language of that sort is entirely appropriate in the resolution, but as far as the bill itself is concerned, I would like to ponder a little over that adult education title.

MR. DUDGEON: What I had in mind was something Mr. Spaulding started to say, that where there are Adult Education Councils in communities, as there are in several cases, they are headed up very distinctly as a matter of promotion and record and information, etc., in the public library. In other words, they have naturally and normally been recognized as an adult educational agency by organizations in almost every community.

DR. DAVID: Looking at the availability section of this adult education fund, Section 201, that says, "The amounts appropriated under authority of Section 200 of this Act shall

be available for the current operating and maintenance expenditures, including salaries, necessary to provide for workers' education and other civic, general and vocational part-time and evening school adult educational services, and shall be available for expenditures through public school systems, the extension services of colleges and universities, and other non-profit educational agencies and institutions which the states may determine.

MR. DUDGEON: I would like to see the word "library" in that.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: So should I, I would like to see the word "library" inserted in that. Of course inferentially it is included.

MR. DUDGEON: But since you enumerate the others, I should like to have it in there specifically.

DR. DAVID: That is one point, and then another point is the effect of including part-time and evening school adult educational services. In the report that was simply part-time and one of the staff members started arguing part-time in ordinary usage did not include evening, therefore evening school was added, and I am not sure but what the effect of putting both in is to restrict it.

MR. DUDGEON: Is there any objection to the

introduction of the word "library" there in the enumeration of agencies?

DR. DAVID: I would assume not.

MR. MILAM: The question I would like to raise there is on the question of teaching, to see whether we could perhaps put in a suggestion to make it something broader than teaching. That is, self-education ought to be included in there, whether there is any direct teaching involved or not, in our opinion. That is, we think a lot of education is available without classroom instruction.

DR. DAVID: I think you are absolutely right, and yet the mental picture at least that the Committee had in mind in thinking up this adult education fund was primarily one of instruction, and if you once open it up to the operating expenses of public libraries---

MR. DUDGEON (Interposing): It would have to be closely guarded, I realize.

MISS MERRILL: It would have to be for readers' advisers, for systematic study.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: This is entirely instructional, this provision providing for instruction, education and teaching.

DR. DAVID: I had not felt it was so limited that the services would not be available for other than instruction

services. Whether or not you could have it available for services libraries give in immediate connection with instruction, I don't know. I think the thing does need a good deal of thought.

MR. SPAULDING: Dr. David, was the bill that Senator Hatch introduced ten days or two weeks ago for federal grants for adult education supposed to be in line with this?

DR. DAVID: Senator Hatch gave it a puff on the floor of the Senate in which he said it was. It is a bill I believe sponsored on behalf of the adult education division of the N.E.A., but I don't think they are going to fight for it very actively. I think they will swing over to this instead.

MR. DUDGEON: I don't want to be too persistent but I can't help thinking that if the word "library" can be put into that section without violence to the general scheme, subject of course to interpretation, that it should go in because of the actual educational work it does in the instructional sense of reader guidance.

MR. MILAM: We will recommend that Wednesday.

DR. DAVID: You should recognize the fact, though, that you will be getting something set up there that will be extremely difficult to audit, and whenever you do that, that is the kind of situation under which the undesirable varieties of

federal control arise.

MR. DUDGEON: That is the reason I wanted to raise the question. If that phrase can be limited, when you use the word "library" to the negative, not just simply library work on the whole, I think it ought to be.

DR. DAVID: Do you have library accounting systems which would enable you to tell what part of your expense you would allocate to that kind of service?

MR. DUDGEON: A good many libraries have an adult education department that is very definitely instruction and leadership in education of adults--not so much instruction perhaps as leadership and suggestion.

MR. MILAM: This is the kind of thing I think we would all anticipate coming there, that if a program of education under this Act is set up which is comparable to some of the emergency education programs with classes and forums scattered all over the city, and the public library goes and offers its service to place books and pamphlets in the classroom, then the demand is so great that the library can't meet it, and some of the funds ought to be available to meet that demand just as much as to help employ teachers. I think that is the only thing we are thinking about.

MR. FERGUSON: I think that is altogether too narrow

a view of library work as applied to adult education. If a good deal of the library service isn't adult education (I hate the name) then it isn't anything at all. I wouldn't limit our help in adult education merely to instruction in class, and what you will.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Under this particular title, it seems to me we have pretty nearly got to restrict it to that.

MR. DUDGEON: I am perfectly willing that it should be limited within the purview of it, but I want recognition that it performs a function that is within the purview of that part.

DR. DAVID: I think it is entirely appropriate to make part of this money available for that kind of service. The difficulty arises, though, in trying to state specifically something of that kind. You certainly don't want to accept a definition of library services for adult which in effect admits that most of your service is not adult education when I would assume a great part of it is adult education, and yet I wouldn't think you would want these funds opened up--I am sure the Committee didn't want these funds opened up--to the support of all library activities which I think quite legitimately are regarded as adult education.

MR. CANNON: Wouldn't it be possible to put it in the resolution, as Mr. Dudgeon suggests, and leave the question

of the administration of it to the later conference between the state agency and the Commissioner of Education?

MR. DUDGEON: May I give you a bit of history? One of the active functions of the library in connection with adult education was stated to be, to become the school library of other adult educational agencies. That is the thought, you see, and that is what Mr. Milam had in mind. That is historically one of our functions that we have recognized and tried to attain. You see, most of those adult educational agencies have no school library.

DR. DAVID: Exactly, but if you make funds available to provide their school library services, would those funds not be automatically available for all the services of libraries other than those for children?

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: We have set up here in Title III a sum of money specifically for library service that we can use for adult education.

MR. DUDGEON: In rural regions, only.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: In Title II we have a provision for money to be used for instruction for adults. We get it both ways there. I suppose the interpretation of what is adult education under this Title II will rest with the state authorities through agreement with the Commissioner of Education,

won't it, Dr. Wilson?

DR. WILSON: It would seem so to me.

MR. DUDGEON: I realize your difficulty of not opening this up.

DR. DAVID: I think that whatever you decide to do, the language of this Title on adult education should as far as possible be left rather broad. I see no objection whatever to mentioning libraries among the specific adult education agencies that are mentioned, and then let the Office of Education take care of it from there on. It will be a terrible headache for them to set up rules under which they can audit this particular fund, but now that you have your library section, you ought to be able to protect your interests on this point.

CHAIRMAN CRAVER: Dr. David, we certainly appreciate your coming here this morning.

... The reporter was dismissed at twelve o'clock ...

---