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Introduction

S. JANICE KEE

One of the most important links in the chain of operations for public library improvement and development today is a state library agency, empowered and adequately equipped to provide necessary professional leadership and assistance to localities.

If we consider state aid to public libraries in its broadest terms, all states, territories, and Canadian provinces have legal provisions to give some kind of help to local libraries. While they may possess this power, to various extents, none of these levels of governments have indicated even near satisfaction with their “equipment” in the sense of personnel, materials, and operational budget. To perform its widely recognized functions of surveying library conditions, planning, training, advising and counseling, lending materials, cooperating with appropriate groups, and coordinating activities, the state library agency must have an adequate number of highly qualified and experienced staff members, appropriate and sufficient materials, and the necessary supporting budget for operation. And, finally, to engage effectively in promotional activities to develop the state’s network of public library systems, the agency needs a program of grants-in-aid or other direct aids to local libraries.

Although the idea of state aid to public libraries in the United States might be said to be over a hundred years old, significant library developments of 1956 gave it new impetus. A restatement of the national standards for public libraries called for the development of library systems, and important responsibilities were given to state library extension agencies in promoting these systems. The federal government recognized its responsibility for public library development with the passage of the Library Services Act, which required the states to produce a state plan for library development and assigned responsibility for administering federal grants to state library extension agencies.

Miss Kee is Secretary, Wisconsin Free Library Commission.
agencies. As a result, the total operation of the library function of
state government has been greatly enlarged and improved. The li-
brary literature of the past three years is filled with progress reports
on rural library development in which the state library extension
agency's central role is made very clear.

Clearly indicated, also, in the library developments of the past three
years throughout the country is the evident importance of the avail-
ability of grants-in-aids—both federal and state—to the success of
any state's library program. In this mid-1960 period, fifty-two states and
territories are participating in the federal grants program under the
Library Services Act; and twenty-five of these states are making grants-
in-aid to local libraries. Several other states are, at present, actively
engaged in an effort to secure passage of state-aid bills; others are
planning such legislative programs for 1961 or later.

This current activity in connection with state and federal aid plus
the fact that relatively little up-to-date documentation is available
causd the officers of the American Association of State Libraries to
approach the Editor of Library Trends suggesting an issue devoted
to the subject of state aid to public libraries. This issue, composed of
papers written by political scientists as well as librarians closely as-
sociated with state library work, is the happy result.

The content of the combined papers, which was discussed and
agreed upon by the Board of Directors of the Association of State
Libraries, might be summarized as follows: (1) A statement dealing
with the history and philosophy, the why, of state aid to public li-
braries. (2) Brief explanations of the current patterns of existing
state-aid programs, giving attention to concepts, laws, rules, regula-
tions, and administrative codes. (3) Recognition of the relationship
of state and national library service standards to state-aid programs.
(4) Recognition of the relationship of local, state and federal par-
ticipation in public library development. (5) Attention to the need
for continuous evaluation of state-aid programs, and (6) an account
of at least one successful legislative campaign for state aid to public
libraries.

The special purposes of the publication are, briefly, (a) to give
assistance to states in planning and securing new state-aid programs,
and (b) to help the states improve existing programs of state aid to
public libraries.

The papers have been written by highly qualified and experienced
persons who have, for the most part, carried responsibilities in plan-
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ning, securing, and administering state-aid programs to libraries. Although it might be said they were written by professionals, for professionals, it is hoped they will be read and used by library trustees, government officials, and other interested citizens. For, finally, public library development will advance at a pace compensatory with society's rapid changes only (1) if the state library extension agency is adequately supported and furnishes the necessary leadership on a statewide basis, (2) if there is full cooperation between the state library agency and the state associations of librarians and library trustees, (3) if there exists understanding and cooperation of agencies, institutions, and organizations holding allied interests with public libraries, and finally, (4) if there is, most importantly, a deep-rooted interest and support from local citizens, directed into effective channels of action. This book has been designed and prepared to contribute to this development.
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UNITED STATES

M. G. TOEPEL

Today in these United States the maintenance of library services is one of a vast array of public functions which emanate from each state. It is clear that the state has not only authorized or required the establishment of local libraries for the dissemination of information, but that it has also accepted some responsibility for providing aid to these units. The states' purposes have been to stimulate the establishment of these services in areas which have been hesitant to act and to equalize the widely varying abilities to develop and utilize such services. The efforts of the state to advise and counsel, to stimulate by example, to share in the costs of establishing and operating libraries is but a reflection of the trend among states to step up their participation in functions which loom increasingly large in the lives of the people today.

There is no doubt that information is a prime factor in modern living. Every facet of our lives reflects this need. Scientific development, mechanization, improved communications, the shortening of the time-distance relationship, and increased leisure time are some of the factors which have put phenomenal pressure on the media of information, but the trail breaker, the pioneer, the advocate, are still essential in our complex economy to point up and lead the way to the broader horizons which only the discerning see ahead. The state as the constitutional source of the authority to provide public services essential to its people must and has accepted the responsibility to assure information through the medium of the institutions of learning and for a broader segment of its constituents through the medium of the

Mr. Toepel is Chief, Legislative Reference Library, Wisconsin Free Library Commission, Madison.
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public library. Over the years a veritable parade of phases of the learning process have first gained recognition and then assistance from the state. The elementary school, the high school, teacher training, vocational agriculture, audio-visual instruction, vocational rehabilitation, apprenticeship training, post high school education, as well as library services are among the elements of the learning process for which the state now accepts some responsibility.

Today with the heavy demands upon all levels of government for more and expanded services, it is necessary that the functions of government be both efficient and effective. Here again, the state with its corps of experts, its statewide contacts with problems and its opportunity to promote minimum standards brings to the governing process a level of performance which cannot be attained without over-all direction. In this era of performance budgets, work load data, and intricate accounting processes the guidance of the state plays an increasingly important function. This is as essential in the operation of public library services as in the operation of the school system, our far-flung welfare institutions, our highway system, or our law enforcement processes. The soft, kind hand of persuasion, counseling, visitation, all utilized by the strongest regulatory agencies, is the stock in trade of the state level agency.

The pattern of government in the United States is a dynamic thing which has resulted not only in ever-increasing activity on the part of government but also in the constant shifting of functions from one level of government to another. Yet underlying these evidences of change are certain principles which have endured for nearly two centuries. These principles have placed the function of maintaining libraries squarely within the purview of the state.

Every schoolboy knows that in these United States we live under a federal government, a state government, and a multitude of general and special purpose local governments. In 1787 when a group of conscientious citizens from the confederation of the thirteen coastal states assembled at Philadelphia to patch up the faltering Articles of Confederation, they soon discovered that they could not fulfill their charge. In one of man’s greatest efforts to chart the path of future action they formulated a new plan known as the Constitution of the United States. It was reluctantly accepted by the thirteen independent units but it gave life to the system of government.

Basically, those who assembled in Philadelphia conceded that the thirteen independent states could not long endure as a unit unless
they granted specific powers to the national government. They, therefore, set forth in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution a series of functions which were to be assigned to the national government. When the proposed Constitution was submitted to the thirteen states, the suspicion of a strong national government caused them to insist on a provision clarifying the scope of the federal power. Consequently the tenth amendment was added to the Constitution providing that “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Thus, the federal government became a government of delegated powers with the authority to do only those things expressly assigned to it by the Constitution.

It is clear that in the spectrum of governmental functions known to the citizen of 1787 the scope of the powers granted to the federal government was limited indeed, while the powers remaining to the states loomed large. It is equally clear that a whole mass of factors shrunk the boundaries of our nation, made neighbors of Bostonians and Californians, and so blurred the lines dividing the states that the powers so carefully assigned to the federal government by Article I of the Constitution grew out of all proportion to the original intent.

The states became the reservoir of all the remaining powers. No city, no town, no public school, no publicly-supported library exists in this nation, except as the state authorizes it in broad or specific terms. It is the state which is the fountain of all local authority and it is the state which likewise may withdraw the authority it grants. The authority granted by the state ranges from the virtual autonomy of home rule granted cities in some states to the carefully restricted and regulated authority in other fields, such as health, welfare, and education.

The rise of the federal government as the dominant feature of our political life was a phenomenon of the post Civil War period. It is less well known or accepted that the state, too, has broadened its scope both in the extensiveness and intensiveness with which it operates. Phases of government concern unknown at the turn of the century have expanded into complex agencies of state government. As the twentieth century was born the motor vehicle was virtually unknown. Today each state maintains a vast machinery to license vehicles, to assess taxes and fees on them, to tax their fuel, to build roads on which to drive them faster and to restrain people from using them at the speeds of which the motor vehicles are capable. Institu-
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tions of learning from the preschool center to the graduate level. A complex system for assisting those citizens who have suffered adversity has arisen beside another complex of agencies established to reduce the probability of, if not prevent, such adversity.

Government which once was looked upon as a device to regulate and restrain has come to be an agency to advise, guide, and stimulate the people toward more and broader activities. Reluctant as some may be to accept the broadening scope of government on all levels, few exercise any effort to resist it. Thus, for example, a quarter of a century after the inauguration of the broad program of social security, we no longer find the resistance of the early 1930's to such activity on the part of government but rather a tendency to suggest proposals for even broader and deeper coverage.

Parallel with the evolution of the role of the various levels of government in the political scheme of our nation was the growth of education as a public function. It is customary to cite an act of 1647 of the General Court of Massachusetts as an early effort on the part of government to assure the rudiments of learning to all the children. The Ordinance of 1787 provided a major impetus for public education in the Middle West, the opening up of the vast area west of the Alleghenies provided the opportunity for its expansion.

In a large part of our land, the unit of public school administration was the local school district which became a social institution of substantial import. It is not surprising then that public library service early developed within the school district structure. In 1835, New York began the movement by enacting the first state law providing for tax-supported free library service. It permitted the school district to tax for the support of a school district library to be used not necessarily by the students but by all the public and, in fact, some of the libraries were not even located in school buildings. Other states followed the example and by the 1870's nineteen states had enacted similar enabling legislation for the establishment of public libraries. Almost immediately grants-in-aid from the state to the local school district were provided on a matching basis for the purchase of books. While this created an impetus for the expansion in the number of such libraries the school district library was but a passing phase in the struggle to find a unit of operation which had the resources and motivation to be effective. Only in the case of Michigan which early provided a constitutional guarantee of some state support did the school district library continue to flourish.
Instead, the establishment and operation of public libraries became recognized as a function of general units of government. While isolated examples of publicly-supported libraries antedate 1848, it was in that year that the legislature of Massachusetts gave Boston permission to levy a tax in support of a public library. In 1849 New Hampshire passed a general law permitting towns to tax for the support of libraries, and in 1851 Massachusetts followed with a general law providing tax levies for such purposes. The remaining New England states quickly followed so that by 1867 all of that corner of the nation permitted the public support of library services. Incidentally the enactments varied greatly state to state in degree of detail and specificity and the nature of the legislation has had a major influence on the flexibility for the organizational pattern in recent years. As concepts of organization have changed to adjust to changing conditions the legislative hurdles confronting the states in meeting these changing concepts have been in direct ratio to the detail their basic law contained.

As the concept of public support of libraries moved across the nation, their unit of operation reflected the pattern of local government. Thus, the county became the natural governmental agency to operate libraries in the south. As the town library failed in many places because of inadequate support attention turned to the county in other states, and now the full potential value of the county as a unit of library administration is being thoroughly explored.

The evolution of government in the formative period of public libraries also influenced library organization. It was the period in which the commission in government was strong. New functions were frequently assigned to independent boards, and the prevailing library organization reflected this trend. It is conceivable that had the library enjoyed its greatest development coincidentally with the era of city manager development, a different type of public library organization might have resulted.

The second half of the nineteenth century was a period of both encouragement and discouragement. The encouragement lay in the communities with sufficient resources, public and private, to build their library services. The discouragement lay in the struggle the communities of little resources had to maintain libraries of any kind, to say nothing of enriching their services, and in the substantial areas with sparse population which had no services at all. Also, the rise of home rule in the last quarter of the nineteenth century had some
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effect on the freedom of action of municipalities and therefore on libraries. Home rule, however, operates only in some states and only in certain types of local units within those states. The doubts as to the scope of state controls in home rule municipalities may wither away as the unit of administration extends beyond the confines of the city.

As the nineteenth century neared its end recognition of the need to provide library services to all the people including those in the sparsely populated and poorer areas forced the states into the position of taking a more aggressive attitude. The state governments began to take an active part in the stimulation, guidance, and counseling of local library organizations. It was freely predicted that ultimately every state, of necessity, must create such a state library agency. Library service began to be recognized, not as an adjunct of the educational system, but as a parallel independent function.

Massachusetts in 1890 established a Board of Library Commissioners, the first state department responsible for public library administration. New Hampshire followed in 1891 with the State Board of Library Commissioners. In the same year New York enacted a law designating the regents of the university as the state library agency. The Connecticut law of 1893 established the Public Library Committee and in 1894 Vermont became the fourth New England state to create a division of the government concerned with library services.

In 1895, the first midwestern library agency, the Free Library Commission of Wisconsin, was established. The Ohio State Board of Library Commissioners was set up in 1896 and in 1897 Georgia became the first southern state to create a state library commission. By 1904, twenty-two states had created departments authorized to assist public libraries. Of these seven gave direct aids only, eleven provided traveling libraries, three provided both types of service, while two were advisory only. By 1910 more than two-thirds of the states had created a state level library extension service.

The state library agency as it evolved in the seventy years since its inauguration has come to perform three broad functions. First, by reason of the permissive nature of local libraries’ services in most jurisdictions the state agency has been called upon to assume the leadership in stimulating activity by consultation, visitation, planning, research, in-service training, and coordination. This basic function is most widespread.

Its second function, regulation, arises out of the state’s responsibility
for the efficient and effective operation of the function it has permitted, and must of necessity be statewide. The state sets up the basic permissive organizational plan for the local units established within its law. It requires reports, may set standards for personnel and very probably requires that library facilities as public buildings conform to the health and safety standards required of all such structures.

Third, the state level organization may also perform certain line or operational functions. The most obvious examples are provision for book service to individuals in isolated areas via bookmobiles or mail service, supplementary services of materials to public libraries in the state, and the operation of pilot or demonstration libraries in specific places. It is assumed that as the coverage and the quality of the local services improve, this function will decrease.

State level library activity is usually administered by a nonpartisan independent board. In roughly half the states the same board operates the state library and the extension services, although some doubts exist that the two functions should be combined. In a minority, though a substantial one, of the states public library extension is a function of the state educational unit either with or without inclusion of the state library.

The modern phase of state-local relations in the administration of library services developed along two lines roughly emanating from the east and west respectively. Both were predicated on a state agency specifically designated to administer the program of state participation in library services.

In the east the state library commission developed to provide assistance to the locality in the form of grants-in-aid or direct contributions of books to stimulate the establishment of local libraries or to help build them. The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, as first organized, provided up to $100 in books to any town creating a library under state law if the town set up an appropriation and suitable provision for the care and distribution of the books. The authority to advise local libraries on administration was confined to those cases where advice was solicited.

New Hampshire’s State Board of Library Commissioners could grant $100 worth of books to any town for the establishment of libraries, loan books to local libraries, and provide advice on request. New York’s law established a system of grants-in-aid to those local libraries which could qualify. The Connecticut law of 1893 provided a grant-in-aid program by which the state would
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match the local book fund up to $200 upon establishment and $100 annually thereafter.

The Free Library Commission of Wisconsin plan dropped the grant-in-aid feature of the previously created agencies and placed the emphasis on field work and visitation, with a traveling library as an important but subordinate function. In 1896 the Ohio State Board of Library Commissioners was created along the same lines.

Today each state has an identifiable state level agency which has some responsibilities in aiding local library organizations. Most common are the functions of advising and counseling local units. Frequent also are the operation of traveling libraries or loan services for areas not served adequately or for individuals whose needs cannot be met locally. Less frequent are the programs of state grants-in-aid whereby the state agency administers a fund to supplement local resources. These grants-in-aid are usually contingent on local expenditures and on meeting minimum standards set by the state. Notable, too, are provisions which authorize the state agency to administer existing or anticipated funds from federal and private sources. It must also be recognized that the state agency is to a varying degree a watchdog for library legislation. Located near the legislature and cognizant of the library problems it is in a position to at least report the measures affecting library services if not to actively participate in their disposition.

While the original aids to local library services were to a large degree geared to the need for stimulating the creation and maintenance of the traditional units of library service, in recent years the aids have been more specifically directed to the promotion of library services for areas which are large enough to possess both the resources to support good library services and the population to utilize the services effectively. County and regional libraries often created as demonstration projects and augmented by bookmobiles are among the devices rising in prominence. Grants-in-aid in substantial amounts and geared as an incentive to establishing broader, more effective, operating units appear to be the trend. In the 1930's and 1940's legislation intended to develop the larger units of library service administration through state grants-in-aid was enacted in such widely separated states as Arkansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Virginia. These programs sought to spread library services to people without them, encourage effective units of administration, stimulate local effort and strengthen
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existing libraries. The states, however, trod with a light foot, emphasizing advice, counseling, and the insistence on minimum standards as to size of the unit, the amount of local effort, the quality of personnel, and book selection.

Although the current movement for a state grant-in-aid program of substantial scope is roughly a quarter of a century old, and efforts have been made in various states to enact such legislation, the present pressure on the legislature to keep all state appropriations down has made it exceptionally difficult to initiate new programs, especially when they are in part intended to stimulate local expenditures and require a substantial outlay in themselves. The lifting of local and state financial participation to a level adequate to provide the type of service desired in the face of other urgent demands for public funds is not easily accomplished today. Momentarily, federal grants-in-aid have softened the pressure, but the foreseeable future promises no relief from the competition for funds.

Modern grant-in-aid programs for libraries seem to follow three principles. The first principle is illustrated by a flat aid to all libraries granted because the state has a stake in better library service, because it is expedient to continue aid to all who have received it previously, and because it gains support for the aid program. The second principle is demonstrated by an incentive aid based on the effort made by the locality. The third principle is illustrated by the most current program of gearing the aids to the stimulation of more adequate units of administration. This three-pronged attack of providing basic aid, equalizing opportunity, and stimulating effectiveness is not peculiar to the library system, but is a tried and true device which has permeated many grant-in-aid programs essential to modern living.

The evolution of the pattern of state library services is clear. It began in a period when books were scarce, magazine circulation was limited, daily newspapers were confined to urban areas, and distance was a mighty barrier. Initially it provided very limited supplementation of local book funds or supplies on one hand, or the distribution of package libraries to areas with limited or no services on the other hand. It guided the communities in the rudiments of library organization, often only when the community, in desperation, requested help. It got its start in an era when libraries collected and preserved books. As one of the contemporaries said of another service which was being initiated at about the same time “it is to provide something where there is nothing now provided.”
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In the short span of seventy years the emphasis has shifted from assuring that the minimum services were available in those areas choosing to act, to promoting effective organization and operation. All of the factors of modern society have worked to wipe out the differences in the cultural needs of the urban and rural inhabitants. Fewer people remained on the farm, fewer farmers worked full time at tilling the soil, and more people came to realize that the desire to know was not limited by locality. The same concept, which caused one institution of higher learning to claim that the boundaries of the state determine the campus of the university, caused the state library service agencies to look toward statewide services.

In anticipation of more widespread acceptance of the need for allocating more local and state funds to library services the state library service agency began to emphasize its leadership function in showing the way to economical, effective library organization and operation by establishing standards of good library organization, certification of librarians, placement and referral services, and demonstration of how a library unit could be made most effective. This resulted inevitably in the move toward more adequate units of administration, the stimulation of improved organization by grants-in-aid of considerable size, and in the important function of planning a statewide library program.

In a little more than a century the emphasis switched from permitting the creation of libraries on the level of government closest to the people, to laws permitting or even requiring county and multiple county or regional units. Even before 1950 Maryland and Ohio had prohibited the establishment of any new library units which were less than countywide, a reflection of a trend which has also affected such services as education, highways, welfare, law enforcement, and health.

Within this framework of a plan for assuring adequate local services the state has expanded its direct services. Not only has it taken an active part in advising those areas moving toward more effective units, and providing materials to enhance the services of local units as the library's library, but it has strengthened its services to the individual through loaning materials, reference facilities, and specialized collections such as law libraries, historical collections, and materials for the handicapped.

By 1960 the implementation of the pattern of library services as a state function is becoming a reality, the path is increasingly apparent.
The critical problem is to find the financial resources to reach the new goals. It seems clear that the next decade or two will see a major effort to convince the legislatures that library services as well as education, welfare, highways, health, and other functions deserve substantial financial support.

In many states the legislative intent in the enactment of substantial pieces of legislation is set forth in an introductory provision sometimes called a preamble. This is especially true when a state initiates a new program or makes a complete revision of an existing program. Such statements stand as a public declaration of the scope and direction which the legislature contemplated that the function take. Some clue to the acceptance of library services as a state responsibility may be obtained from representative provisions of the library laws of the states.

The Vermont act of 1937 relating to the powers of the free public library commission provides in part: “The free public library commission is authorized to develop and adopt plans to provide more adequate library service for all residents of the state, giving special consideration to some system of regional libraries or other agencies whereby better library service than now possible can be given to the people of the state especially to rural schools and farm homes.”

The preamble of the 1941 North Carolina law relating to state aids for public libraries provided:

Whereas, it is provided in the Constitution of the state that ‘religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and happiness of mankind schools and means of education shall forever be encouraged,’ and that ‘the people have the right to the privilege of education, and it is the duty of the state to guard and maintain that right; and

Whereas, the establishment and maintenance of public libraries is an integral part of the educational program of a great state; now, therefore,

The general assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Sec. 1. It is hereby declared the policy of the state to promote the establishment and development of public library service throughout all sections of the state.

Perhaps the most recent statement of legislative policy which comes to grips with the issue of the state’s responsibility for library service is contained in the 1959 California addition to the education code which states:
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27000. The legislature hereby declares that it is in the interest of the people and of the state that there be a general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence through the establishment and operation of public libraries. Such diffusion is a matter of general concern inasmuch as it is the duty of the state to provide encouragement to the voluntary lifelong learning of the people of the state.

The legislature further declares that the public library is a supplement to the formal system of free public education, and a source of information and inspiration to persons of all ages, and a resource for continuing education and re-education beyond the years of formal education, and as such deserves adequate financial support from government at all levels.

Although the mass of the law relating to libraries is contained in the statutes and administrative rules of the several states, no less than fifteen state constitutions make reference to some aspect of library services. Ten of the states appear to confine their constitutional provisions to the state level library and the provisions in two of the five remaining states relate to the use of certain funds by schools or libraries. The remaining three, however, make express provision for libraries. The Massachusetts Constitution in Amendment XLVI permits an appropriation by any city or town for a free public library and the Michigan Constitution in Article XI authorizes the legislature to provide for the establishment of at least one library in each township and city and assigns all fines in counties, cities, and townships for breaches of penal laws exclusively to the support of such libraries.

By far the most comprehensive constitutional declaration regarding the responsibility of the state toward public libraries is contained in the Missouri Constitution adopted by the people of that state in 1945. Article IX, section 10, provides: “It is hereby declared to be the policy of the state to promote the establishment and development of free public libraries and to accept the obligation of their support by the state and its subdivisions and municipalities in such manner as may be provided by law. When any such subdivision or municipality supports a free library, the general assembly shall grant aid to such library in such manner and in such amounts as may be provided by law.”

While there never was any real doubt as to the ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of public library services, it took the requirements of twentieth century living to force the state into a position of leadership in the development of effective statewide service. The need for vocational and avocational information by people of all ages
in all strata of society has led to planning for statewide coverage, and the competition for public funds necessitated that the plans give real promise of effective and efficient operation. While that promise has not yet been fulfilled, the position of the state as the generator of the energy to carry forth the program has been so clearly established that the path to fulfillment seems reasonably apparent. Toil and courage are now the essential ingredients to success.

References


CANADA

**R. L. DAVISON**

**CANADIAN PUBLIC LIBRARIES** are conceived in provincial statutes and brought forth in municipal by-laws. The central government in Ottawa is not yet involved in their propagation.
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or support; neither is federal aid, for the moment, of primary importance, and in these remarks there will be no further reference to the national government.

Why should the provincial authority be concerned with public libraries? Informed opinion has held for many years that the public library is an integral part of the formal process of learning. Our national constitution places the responsibility for education squarely on the provinces, and if public libraries are educational institutions then they are a part of this responsibility. This has been eminently satisfactory, up to a point. What the originators of the idea did not foresee was the phenomenal growth of the provincial education systems and the fantastically high percentage of the provincial budgets which must be allocated to them. The welfare of public libraries became in most provinces a mere afterthought.

Fortunately, despite their vicissitudes, the libraries have managed to achieve their own legislation. Nine of the ten provinces now have public libraries acts, the exception being the province of Prince Edward Island, which places libraries under the Department of Education Act. This was not true even ten years ago, and its importance cannot be over-emphasized. Naturally, the legislation varies from province to province, some of it excessively detailed, some extremely broad and sweeping. Experience has revealed fundamental errors, such as the specification of amounts of money, despite our inflationary economy, and the detailing of so-called library standards which in fact are subject to fundamental changes. While the argument goes on over specific versus general provisions, it is reassuring to remind ourselves that library legislation is an accomplished fact nine times over.

Historically, the development of library legislation and public library service in Canada covers little more than a century, yet it is possible to see patterns evolving which undoubtedly will affect future measures. For one thing, it is generally believed advantageous to set up a governing agency for public library affairs and to attach that agency to one of the departments of government, usually the department of education because of the conviction that the library is primarily an educational institution. A few provinces, perhaps more enlightened, have ignored the dogma and seconded their library agencies to the provincial secretary or to a ministry devoted to cultural activities, or have made the administration of the act a variable responsibility under any specifically designated member of the provincial
cabinet. The important point is that the agency, whatever its particular niche and name, does exist and has specific powers and duties.

Chief among these powers and duties has been the responsibility to promote, by counsel and encouragement, the establishment and extension of public library facilities. On this point the provinces agree. Theoretically, once a library exists, the municipal administration should be able to maintain and develop the service without "outside" help. Unfortunately, perhaps, this is an outmoded and indeed unworkable premise. Public agencies are interdependent, and the burden of taxation, the chief source of public expenditure, must be shared. This, at any rate, is the current mode of thinking, which is to say that we behave as if all levels of authority and all governmental agencies are part of a successfully integrated whole. Just how far this is true does not concern us here. Public libraries have to be started, maintained and extended, and if the individual community cannot bear the whole cost, by all means let it call upon its senior government.

Financially, then, the government, because of its existing involvement with municipalities, is already in spirit, and in fact in law, committed to assisting public libraries. For obvious and practical reasons, the provision of the bulk of the library appropriation must be left to the local authority. The government enters the scene at the point where grants become necessary to elevate the standard of library service above the mere subsistence level. Provincial grants present a tricky problem, and a nice balance between nominal assistance and all-out subsidy is the desirable goal. There is usually a considerable difference in the degree of need from one library to another, and it behooves the government to study carefully the general situation and to develop a policy and a formula which will come near to providing a fair and efficient distribution of funds.

In Canada, full realization of the need has been a long time in flowering, and the assumption of responsibility for financial aid to public libraries is still a new concept for some of our provincial governments. One of the practical functions of the provincial public library agency is therefore to interpret the needs of individual libraries to the provincial government in terms which will result in tangible assistance. This is no easy task, first because of the number of agencies competing for a limited number of dollars, and second, because along with the quest for money must go a campaign to promote realization of the value of public library service to the community and to the
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province. These things the agency must do and, curiously, it often has a third problem—to convince small, long-established but unprogressive libraries that the government desires sincerely to help, with a minimum of interference in local autonomy.

The provinces also agree on the kinds of organization best suited to public library service. The details of these and their interrelations have been described many times elsewhere. The important thing is the virtual unanimity of conviction among governments that public library service can be reduced to three essential and well-defined units—the community or association library, the county or regional library, and the municipal public library. From this realization it is but a step to the creation of legislation designed to form and strengthen the organizations and to insure their efficient operation.

Up to the present stage of its development, provincial aid to public libraries has demonstrated the need for provincial legislation. In other words, to be effective it must be fitted within a formal pattern. It has already been said that we do not have agreement as to whether library legislation should be broad or detailed, but the provinces with the greatest experience tend to favor a fairly general act which provides for regulations to be made or abolished by order-in-council, without awaiting the pleasure of the legislature. As long as there is a responsible governmental authority to recommend such changes as circumstances require and to persuade the government that they are necessary, this kind of flexibility can be a distinct advantage.

Regulations are particularly valuable if provincial aid is to be considered as more than simply financial assistance. They are used to publish conditions governing the awarding of grants, but they can also specify: the qualifications for the certification of professional librarians; the conduct of short courses in library management; the establishment and administration of library schools; rules for cooperation between library boards, municipal councils, school boards, and the provincial agency, with respect to change and loan of books and agreements to contract for library service; encouragement and assistance to the provincial library association; and the mechanics of providing financial aid to students of librarianship.

Another point of agreement arises in the provision of a public library service by the government itself. Normally this takes two forms: parcel post service to individuals and boxed collections by freight to communities. In one province at least it has been further developed by the establishment of branch offices of the provincial
public library agency, each branch looking after the small libraries in its immediate area and performing some of the functions of a regional library headquarters.

In a sparsely-populated country this kind of operation is likely to be needed for a long time to come. Fortunately the governments are aware of this and are prepared to continue to finance it, though its total cost may be greater than the combined grants to organized public libraries.

Briefly to conclude, it is evident that the governments of Canada's ten provinces have accepted the burden of legal responsibility for the development of public libraries, at the same time leaving individual communities accountable for their conduct and the bulk of their financial support. It is also apparent that assistance in the form of grants and other, less direct financial benefits will be the concern of the provinces alone for some time to come. The parentage of Canadian public libraries therefore abides in the cooperation between provincial and municipal authorities.

SCANDINAVIA

Permissive legislation followed later by mandatory legislation with state grants to persuade authorities to provide at least a minimum standard of service—some form of state inspection or advisory assistance, provision for the setting up of agencies for services which can be more economically provided nationally rather than locally, state assistance for cooperative schemes particularly those designed to help the smallest authorities and the national integration of all library resources—all these are particularly vital in countries whose populations are relatively small compared with their size. This condition applies to all the Scandinavian countries even Denmark and in all four, i.e., Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland, trends in state aid have been with slight variations creating a pattern which is recognizably Scandinavian.

Not that developments have taken place in completely logical

Miss Cook is County Librarian, Lancashire County Library, Preston, England.

[ 22 ]
Legal Responsibility for Public Library Development

State grants in Norway date back to 1876 though the first public libraries act was not enacted until 1935. "County" libraries in the Scandinavian sense started operating the following year though it was not until 1947 that it was mandatory for a municipality to provide a library. The 1947 Act was later amended by that of 1955 and the present position that libraries must be publicly owned in order to receive a grant is unique in Scandinavian countries. The law also provides that the municipality must spend a minimum amount per head of population if it is to receive a state grant. If in a rural area or if it does not have a children's section it must also provide a school library and a small state grant is available for this purpose. State grants for public libraries in Norway are on a sliding scale, varying between 90 per cent where the local expenditure is between £50 and £100 to 50 per cent where the expenditure is £500 with a maximum grant of £500 to any one library or £1,000 to the libraries of a single municipality. State grants can have, therefore, little but psychological effects on the few large municipal library authorities but a very considerable effect on raising the standard of the smallest.

The weakness of the smallest authorities and the need for assistance in addition to local grants is recognized however by the payment of a state grant to a municipal authority of £1,250 if it acts as a central or "county" library. A further grant of £250 is payable if this central library operates a mobile library or book boat and additional grants may be given for reference collections, furniture for new libraries, school libraries, etc.

Where a "national service" is operated and grants are given it is necessary to set up some national agency for this purpose. In Norway this is the Norwegian Library Board which is a section of the Ministry for Church and Education. A director is in charge and acts as the minister's chief inspector. The State Inspectorate takes 2½ per cent of the total grants available for public libraries. This sum is used for special projects and for bibliographical work undertaken by the Libraries Agency.

The Libraries Agency is a company jointly owned by the state and the municipality which exists to provide services which can be run more economically by a single body than by a multitude of small units. It sells Norwegian books at a discount of 20 per cent and all books bought out of state grants must be bought from the Agency, it provides an economical book binding service, promotes the design, manufacture and sale of library equipment, classifies and services
books and provides one catalog card free for Norwegian books and sells additional cards at a small charge. Future developments will probably include a consultant service on library methods and the publication of book lists.

State aid to public libraries in Norway would be incomplete without reference to the part played by the Oslo University Library, the Library of the Technical University, Trondheim, and the Joint Library of the Industrial Research Centre, Blindern, Oslo, since there is much closer cooperation in the Scandinavian countries between public libraries and the scholarly libraries than is general elsewhere. The Oslo University Library is financed directly from the state in recognition of its role as a national institution whose duties include not only the loan of books to institutions and individuals throughout the country but also the preparation of a national bibliography and provision of a national information center for bibliographical queries. It maintains also a central union catalog of the books and periodicals in all the major libraries in the country. As Oslo is largely concerned with the arts and humanities the library of the Technical University, Trondheim, has become recognized as the national library in the sciences while the Joint Library of the Industrial Research Centre, Blindern, Oslo, supported by state funds and football pools provides a library for scientific and industrial research institutes and lends to many outside research workers.

This close integration of either a state library or a university library acting as such is common to Scandinavian countries who therefore receive indirect state aid from such sources. In Denmark, a decree of 1926 limited the scope of the Royal Library to the humanities while the University library undertook to specialize in science and medicine. The former among its other activities includes the publication of the list of the foreign acquisitions of the chief learned libraries and a bibliography of the Danish books in its collection. In Sweden, the Royal Library also cooperates in interlending and has been the center of Swedish bibliographical work. Since 1888 it has published an annual union catalog of foreign accessions in Swedish research libraries. The Bibliographical Institute established in 1953 as a department of the Royal Library is now responsible for the compilation and accessions catalog as well as the Swedish National Bibliography. Since 1958 the Institute distributes catalog cards for all Swedish publications to other libraries. In Finland, the library of the University of Hel-
sinki acts as the national library. It lends to libraries and public institutions throughout the country. It also acts as a national information center for bibliographical queries.

State grants in Denmark have been in existence since 1882 though it was not until 1920 when the first libraries act was passed that they were stipulated by law. The second library act of 1950 has decreed that after 1960 parish libraries must be provided on the demand of 10 per cent or more of the electors and standards of service have been set up. Grants in Denmark, substantially increased in 1959, are more generous than in the other Scandinavian countries and are scaled from 80 per cent of the first £1,250 provided from local funds to 25 per cent of expenditures over £2,500. A library acting as a central library receives an additional grant of £1,000. Denmark is the only Scandinavian country which has not imposed any maximum grant.

State grants in Sweden date from the passing of the first Library Act in 1905. The second Act dates from 1930 and preparations are now being made for a revision. Grants are scaled very much as in Norway except that the maximum is higher. There are also grants to hospital libraries, the armed forces libraries, school library systems, merchant marine libraries, and Swedish libraries abroad.

In Finland state grants have been available since 1921 before the passing of the First Public Libraries Act of 1928. Grants usually equal the local grant with a maximum of about £250. Preparations for a new Act have been under consideration for some time. Finland is the only Scandinavian country where no additional grants are available for central or "county" libraries as development on these lines has yet not taken place.

State grants imply some form of inspection or observance of minimum standards. In Norway, Denmark, and Finland the library inspectorate is directly responsible to the minister of education who in these countries deals not only with schools but also other cultural activities. In Sweden the state inspectorate is not immediately responsible to the minister but is a division of the state school department. Arrangements for advising and inspecting vary in the different countries. In Norway, the county libraries use part-time library councillors who advise the local libraries. These are in addition to the state inspectors. In Denmark, the right of inspection is reserved to the library director and library inspectors, but the county libraries do a considerable amount of advisory work. In Sweden the county libraries
are entrusted with inspection as well as the state inspectors. In Finland where there are as yet no county libraries the country is divided in seven districts each with a resident state inspector.

The general opinion of Scandinavian librarians would appear to be that library development would not have advanced as far as it has without state grants and new draft legislation in Sweden and Finland suggests that larger grants would be helpful. The help, it is suggested, is not only material but also psychological: it persuades authorities to contribute and also emphasizes the fact that the state considers the service sufficiently important to assist financially from state funds. A further point has been made that joint contributions from municipalities and the state help to produce financial stability and planned development. Except in Finland grants have assisted the provision of "county" services. Grants have helped also to provide national bibliographical and other assistance to libraries since it secures a source of income for providing at national level services which could not be economically operated by any but the largest libraries. Finally it has laid down minimum standards which can if necessary be raised as social, educational, and economic conditions require.

NIGERIA

KALU OKORIE

The Federation of Nigeria is divided into three regions, known as the Northern Region, the Eastern Region, and the Western Region; the federal capital of Lagos and the quasi-federal Trusteeship Territory of the Southern Cameroons. Eastern and Western Nigeria became self-governing in August 1957 and Northern Nigeria in March 1959.

In Nigeria the development of public libraries is of recent growth. The gradual conscious realization of the importance of library services in such a rapidly developing area is very much owed to the British Council, Unesco, and the West African Library Association. The West African Library Association is a direct result of the 1953 Unesco Ibadan Seminar on the "Development of Public Libraries in Africa."
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Recently, the Federal Library Advisory Committee of Nigeria was formed at the instance of the West African Library Association “to advise the Federal and Regional Governments and the Government of Southern Cameroons on library and bibliographical policy and problems.”

In Nigeria today the following situation prevails: Northern Region—The Regional Government of the North has no legal responsibility for libraries. Its regional library service which was started in 1952 is under the aegis of the Education Department. The service is comparable to a county library system in Britain.

The regional library at Kaduna gives services freely to all local authorities’ educational institutions, cultural associations, and individuals. It is financed as a division of the Education Department and in its 1958-59 budget, the sum of $45,038 was provided for the service.

Western Region.—Like the Northern Region, the government has no legal responsibility for library development. The Ministry of Education is responsible for the regional library service in Western Nigeria. Its regional library service is now being planned.

At the moment, a lending service for adults and children has been started at Ibadan, the regional capital. There is also in operation a mobile library service to schools, a book box service to approved centers. It is hoped that in the near future, more mobile libraries will be provided for the service and a new regional library headquarters built.

Eastern Region.—In Eastern Nigeria, the permanence and development of its public library service has been assured by appropriate legislation. The control and direction of the service is vested in a state agency—the Eastern Region Library Board. The Board was established by an ordinance—The Eastern Region Library Board Law, 1955. This law, amended in 1958, is the only one of its type in the whole Federation of Nigeria.

The Board is a body corporate having perpetual succession and a Common Seal. It may sue and be sued, and in connection with the purpose of the Ordinance, have the power to acquire and to hold, manage, and dispose of property whether real or personal, whether by investment or otherwise, and may enter into any contract necessary for the discharge of any of its functions. It is the duty of the Board to establish, equip, manage, and maintain libraries in the Eastern Region and to take all such steps as may be necessary to carry out such duty.
The Board consists of six members appointed by the minister responsible for libraries. The members of the Board hold office for two years and are eligible for reappointment. The chairman is appointed by the minister and holds office "for such a period as shall be stated in the Instrument by which he is appointed."

The Eastern Region was fortunate to have attracted Unesco's assistance at its early stages of library development. The basic agreement between the Government of the Eastern Region and Unesco on the project provided that the government should allocate a minimum sum of $35,000 annually for a period of five years (1957-61), and should provide suitable premises for the pilot library. Unesco, on the other hand, undertook the provision of an expert on the organization and operation of public libraries for about twelve months, financial aid during each of the five years that the agreement was in force, and the award of a fellowship in the field of public libraries to enable the staff of the pilot library to have some practical insight into the overseas libraries.

The above basic agreement paved the way for the planning of the "pilot" library known as the Regional Central Library, Enugu. The new Regional Central Library is the third such project in the world. It was jointly planned by Unesco and the Library Board. It comprises the usual public departments and, besides serving the needs of Enugu, the regional capital, it also acts as a regional center for bibliographical information and research, organizes regional, national, and international loans, encourages and coordinates the development of public and special libraries in the region.

The cost of the building which was about $135,000 has fallen wholly on the Library Board, but much of its equipment has been provided from funds made available by Unesco.

The Library Board runs its services almost entirely on a subvention from the Eastern Nigeria Government. Its estimates are prepared each year and presented to the Eastern Legislature. It is hoped that small grants-in-aid would be made by the various local authorities when divisional libraries are being opened up in the region. The accounts of the Board are audited annually and are examined by the Public Accounts Committee of the Eastern Legislature. The annual budget of the Board for 1959-60 was about $61,800. It is a public library, and in the true tradition of that service, its services are entirely free to all users.

The importance the regional government attaches to the provision
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of library service to the people of Eastern Nigeria can best be sum-
marized in the following words spoken by the former Premier Nnamdi
Azikiwe at the formal opening of the Regional Central Library in
March 1959:

I would like to say a few words about the importance of libraries
in the development of a nation. In a fast developing community such
as ours, it is important that progress be made on a number of fronts
at the same time . . .

In providing books for the readers and students of this Region, we
are mindful that books are essential for the development of the per-
sonality of the young; . . . they add stature to learning and convey
from one man to another the accumulated knowledge of centuries of
enquiry . . .

I feel that the public library has special functions which however
small, add something to human development, and spread the demo-
cratic ideal, is almost as much a requirement for any community of
people as the food they eat. A full opportunity for any person, of
whatever faith or belief, to make contact with the world of ideas con-
tained in books is as necessary for the proper growth of individuals
as it is for nations. And I cannot think of any institution more suited
at this moment to help us achieve such an object as the library
service . . .

The Federation of Nigeria as a whole has no over-all library policy,
plan or legislation. Some of the services of a national library are pro-
vided by Ibadan University Library but this is entirely without official
recognition. The federal government has, however, established its
Library Advisory Committee. This committee is gradually feeling
its way in the scheme of the library development. Recently it decided
to communicate the various governments of the Federation, in respect
of library legislation in the following words:

It was considered that one of the functions of the Committee should
be to advise the Governments of the Federation on library legislation,
in order to ensure that legislation introduced by the various authorities
(libraries being a residual subject under the Constitution) was in
harmony. The Committee took note of the existing position, viz. that
only the Eastern Region so far had library legislation; the West was
contemplating legislation on the subject, and the other parts of the
Federation were not at present considering the introduction of such
legislation. The Committee recommended that the Governments of
the Federation should be asked to seek the advice of the Committee
before introducing any fresh legislation.
RUTH JACOBS WERTHEIMER

This action of the Committee is most encouraging. Public library provision in Nigeria is still in swaddling clothes and the problems which face us are a challenge to the few trained personnel in the field. There are certainly good prospects for public library provision in Nigeria and it is hoped that those in the field will continue to pioneer in a cause which means so much for the future of the country.
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SOUTH AFRICA

RUTH JACOBS WERTHEIMER

The principle of library support by government was introduced, in the Cape, in 1818 when a wine tax was directed towards the establishment and maintenance of the free South African Public Library. It was further strengthened when the Cape Parliament, in 1862, voted the first of its continuing annual grants-in-aid to the S.A.P.L. It was consolidated in the Molteno Memorandum of 1874 which established a system of pound for pound grants to public libraries. But the principle of entirely supporting a town’s public library from rates and taxes is still making its way, for all South African public libraries were begun as subscription libraries, and a number continue as such to this day.

By the South Africa Act, 1909,1 the four self-governing colonies of Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Transvaal, and Orange River were united under a central government which entrusted, in the four provinces which they had become, certain named powers. In the Financial Relations Act of 1913, which clarified this delegation, the administration of libraries was among the miscellaneous items for which the Union government relinquished responsibility, i.e. the provinces were permitted to assume responsibility if they so desired.

The prime purpose of the Financial Relations Act was, as its title implies, to make equitable the burden borne by each governing unit
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in relation to the income available to the nation. By Clause 6 "there shall be paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the provincial revenue fund of each province, in respect of every financial year, a general subsidy of an amount equal to fifty per cent of the net expenditure . . . of the province during that financial year." This clause has remained unaltered.

It was necessary, of course, for the provinces to place the activities delegated by the Financial Relations Act within the framework of law. Libraries were affected in two ways, first, through the Provincial Ordinances (acts) regarding the scope and function of municipalities. The right to establish and support libraries was granted, also the right to give grants to nontax supported public institutions, e.g. subscription libraries. The total amount which could be spent on public institutions of this nature was not to exceed, in the Cape, more than 2½ per cent of the municipality total revenue.

The second way in which libraries were affected by the Financial Relations Act was by the implication that libraries were the responsibility of a province as a whole. The Act entrusted libraries to the provinces; their acceptance of the trust then had to be proclaimed. This was done by the Cape in 1913, the Transvaal in 1914, the Free State and Natal in 1949. These proclamations meant not a great deal. In fact, the willingness of the province to carry on the pound for pound grants began in 1874. But only the Cape has continued consistently with this small aid; and it ceases this year. The Transvaal gave it for a decade, withheld it for another, restored it in the 1930's, and then withdrew it. Since Natal and the Free State did not formally accept their responsibility for libraries, the Union government continued the pound for pound grants until 1922, after which they withdrew.

Possibly not a great deal was intended by the library clause. What the Act of 1913 entrusted to the provinces was the "administration" of libraries, their regulations and control. Provinces did not have the power to "establish" as had the local authorities, and, of course, there was no specific compulsion to do anything about libraries, neither upon the provinces nor upon the municipal councils.

In the thirty years between the passing of the Financial Relations Act and the next legislation of importance, the concept of libraries and library service evolved from that of the independent, subscription library to that of a free library service to all inhabitants, urban and rural, of all races.
A high point of a semi-legislative nature in this long period was the publication and acceptance in 1937 of a report by a Union government committee on the status of libraries and the government's role. The report determined that the responsibility should rest with the provinces and that they should take "immediate steps" to set up a free rural library service by appointing advisory committees and library organizers to formally establish provincial library services. The Union was asked to subsidize the services on a pound for pound basis. In 1942 the Union government placed £2,000 on the estimates for the salaries of the library organizers, if appointed.

Although the draft of the first Provincial Library Ordinance, that of the Cape, was prepared in 1945, it could not be passed until 1949 when an amendment to the Financial Relations Act permitted the "establishment" of libraries.

The Cape Ordinance provided for the compete support by the province of all libraries in towns less than 15,000 population. The province was empowered to take over existing libraries and to develop a system which would bring library service to all. A library hierarchy was planned with one central headquarters library, eighteen regional libraries (the Cape is larger than France and England combined), town libraries, and village depots. The principle of sharing costs between province and local authority, ignored here, had always been advocated by librarians and laymen. Their theory was soon proven the more suitable. In 1954 the burden of bearing the full cost of the service proved to be too severe for the province. A new ordinance, gazetted in 1955, was drawn up, and it, plus the Conditions Governing Participation and the Service's Regulations form the basis of the present provincial service.

In the Cape, since 1955, an urban area of over 25,000 population and believed capable of supporting an independent service may be declared an urban library area. Towns over 25,000 have been admitted to the service; 40,000 is felt to be the maximum size for consideration. Urban library areas are not considered part of the provincial library system. A provincial subsidy up to 50 per cent of a municipality's expenditure on libraries may be granted. There is no ceiling. Separate facilities for European and non-European borrowers are to be provided in urban areas and throughout the service in general. The conduct of the direct service to small towns and villages is loosely defined: "For the purpose of the service the Administrator [head of the provincial executive committee] may take such steps and measures for
The provision of free library facilities as he may deem fit, including (a) the admission of public libraries to the service on such conditions as he may in each case determine and the aiding of such public libraries in such manner as he may deem fit . . .”

The conditions of admission require “all members, i.e. libraries, to provide accommodation as approved by the library organizer . . . the organizer may allow up to 5 years to provide satisfactory accommodation; all local authorities are required to provide an amount not exceeding six shillings per annum per capita of the European population for the salary of the library personnel and any other administrative expenditure.” European in this sense means those of European descent.

In return, the headquarters organization provides books, films, recordings, and art prints which remain the property of the province. Books include serious reference works as well as all types of general reading matter. Periodicals are generously provided. A library may buy materials for its permanent retention out of its own independent funds. Provision is made for each of the eighteen regions to be in the charge of a professional librarian who visits regularly member libraries to give administrative advice and assistance. Books are brought by bookmobile to the libraries where the librarians make bulk exchanges. Loans are not made to individuals. Provincial headquarters staff promote the idea of free libraries, help in the re-organization of former subscription libraries, advise local government officials, conduct training courses for the local librarians, etc., and, of course, acquire and process all materials.

A provincial library board is provided for of whom the majority are nominated by the Provincial Administration.

The Transvaal Provincial Library Service Ordinance was gazetted in 1951. The pattern of service is similar to that provided under the 1955 Cape Ordinance, and, indeed, its introduction precedes that of the Cape. There are the following differences. “The Transvaal Provincial Administration holds the local community primarily responsible for the establishment and proper maintenance of libraries and library services, but . . . renders certain supplementary services by means of the Transvaal Provincial Library Service. In addition the Administration also provides leadership in the library field.”

The population limit was first set at 10,000, raised to 25,000 in 1956 and to 50,000 in 1958. The annual contribution required from the local authority ranges from two shillings in the case of a village council.
to seven shillings, six pence in a municipality of over 25,000 European inhabitants. There is no compulsion to provide services for non-Europeans and libraries not in the service may receive grants-in-aid only under certain conditions. None do. Recently direct library service from bookmobiles was introduced in the peri-urban areas of the Rand where scattered population and scarcity of premises have made the establishment of libraries most difficult.

In the two smaller provinces, Natal and Orange Free State, where library service is not so advanced, the model followed is that of the large provinces. The population limit in both is 10,000. Natal requires from the local authority three shillings and the Orange Free State two shillings per head of European population.

These are the instruments of a free library service. The government’s complete acceptance of responsibility for free libraries was not achieved without a struggle. A struggle which has been won through the energetic efforts of a few librarians and others who from 1930 to 1949 never lost an opportunity for pressing upon government and public alike the cause of free libraries. A government can do little more than follow in the steps of a community’s leaders.
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Current Concepts in State Aid to Public Libraries

ERNEST E. DOERSCHUK, JR. AND DAVID C. PALMER

This paper will deal with two basic forms of state aid to public libraries; (1) aid in the form of services and leadership and (2) aid in the form of financial grants to local libraries or library systems. "Normal" services of state library agencies to public libraries will be reviewed, and concepts underlying existing and contemplated programs of grants-in-aid will be discussed. Actual operation of grants-in-aid programs under existing law is analyzed in a separate chapter.

Aid in the Form of Service.—Although standards for state library services have yet to be formulated and accepted, preliminary work in this area by W. T. Brahm and H. F. Brigham 1 presents an outline which is helpful in determining current concepts in state aid through supplemental services. These authors analyzed, extracted, and coordinated the contents of The Role of the State Library 2 and Public Library Service; A Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards. 5 Working with the state library services outlined in the Role and direct references from among the seventy-two "guiding principles" and 191 "standards" enumerated in the latter, the authors remind us, however, of limitations in this approach. Many of the principles compiled in Public Library Service "have a ready application to the state library, with appropriate modifications." These, combined with the conclusions reached through the concerted efforts of a state library standards committee, would undoubtedly elaborate and further expand the Brahm-Brigham list of services. At the 1959 Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association, the Executive Board of the American
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### TABLE I

**Supplementary Services of State and Provincial Libraries to Local Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>No. of agencies providing service, 1956</th>
<th>No. of agencies providing service, 1960</th>
<th>No. of libraries indicating weight of importance, 1960</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reference information</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject bibliographies</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Library Loan Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Serious/expensive materials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Popular printed materials</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recordings (discs/tapes)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Slides and filmstrips</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Films</td>
<td>19b</td>
<td>33b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supplies locations through Union library catalog</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Consultation at state lib.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Field visits</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. By correspondence</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conducts local surveys</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational &amp; Promotional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Workshops or institutes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In-service training</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Group leadership training</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Short term demonstrations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Develop publicity materials</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Publishes newsletter or journal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gathers and disseminates library statistics</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Develops state-wide library standards</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Resource Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. State historical collections</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. State archives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. State documents</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Research collections in particular subject fields</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Storage of little used materials</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Processes library materials</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Maintains union catalog</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Distributes state publications</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Provides deposit collections</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Provides traveling displays</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Administers grants-in-aid</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Contracts with stronger libs. to extend services to neighboring libraries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Financial aid to students of librarianship</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Develops library legislation</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Certification of librarians</td>
<td>31⁴</td>
<td>23⁴</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Association of State Libraries approved a project for a survey of the functions of state library agencies, one of the objectives being the development of standards for state library services.

The canons of librarianship relentlessly stress the library systems concept as an essential basis for achieving objectives of quality library service for all. As the agency in state government with responsibility for library affairs, the state or provincial library must judge its services and activities against how effectively it furthers the coordination of all library services within the state or province under the systems concept.

The underlying concept of state library service to local libraries is stated thus: “The various library systems within the state should function together as a network to make the full resources of the state available to every resident. An agency within the state government should carry responsibility for guiding and reinforcing adequate local service.”

In an effort to determine the methods by which, and the extent to which, the various state and provincial library agencies are “guiding and reinforcing adequate local service,” and to find out whether any trends are apparent since the analysis by Carma R. Zimmerman and Ralph Blasingame, Jr., in 1956, each state and provincial library was asked to indicate on a checklist those services which are being performed by the agency concerned. The results, showing a comparison with the Zimmerman-Blasingame report wherever possible, are tabulated in Table I.

The questionnaire used for the 1956 report was not available, and therefore direct parallels cannot be drawn for each question. Also the former questionnaire was sent to fifty-five state and provincial libraries, from which there were fifty returns. The present survey is based upon

\* Each agency was asked to indicate which three services are regarded as being most important. Many checked the title of the service category rather than the specific question. These are underlined and entered beside the heading.

\* Including 8 which lend only films on librarianship.

\* Including 5 which lend only films on librarianship.

\* Of the 31 agencies reporting, 18 operate under a mandatory certification system; 13 under a voluntary system.

\* Of the 23 agencies reporting, 15 operate under a mandatory certification system; 8 under a voluntary system.

[37]
fifty-one returns from the fifty state libraries and ten provincial agencies. Granting these limitations, however, the table gives some indication of trends and will serve as a listing of supplementary services to local libraries. Conclusive indication of the general course which state library services is taking will have to wait for subsequent studies, since it would take more than two instances to plot such tendencies accurately. Furthermore, a mere checklist does not reveal the efficacy of the services listed, nor does it indicate the degree to which such services fulfill the principle of developing a fully coordinated library system for the entire state. An evaluative survey of these factors is needed on a national scale.

The balance of this section is a comparison of the 1956 and 1960 returns. Reference services and interlibrary lending of materials were combined in the Z-B report as one of the six broad headings covering supplementary services to local libraries. Figures for 1956, therefore, are not available under this heading. Extensive provision of subject bibliographies was a service noted in the 1956 returns when agencies were asked to list major services not covered by the inquiry form. Virtually all state and provincial agencies provide supplementary reference service and five consider this their most important function.

Two areas under interlibrary loan service show significant change. First, in the matter of popular printed materials, the 1956 report noted that "23 agencies indicated that they buy popular materials in some degree. Of these, six either emphasize the more expensive materials or buy popular items only of certain types." Although the 1960 returns offered no qualifying remarks as to provision of popular printed materials, the number of agencies engaged in this type of interlibrary loan has almost doubled over the 1956 figure. Second, the number of state libraries lending films has increased 42 per cent and it may be noted that fewer of these agencies restrict such films to the subject of librarianship.

The decrease indicated in question eight warrants a word of explanation. Z-B remarked that twenty-one agencies "maintain or have access to a state or regional union catalog." Presumably some of them did not habitually supply locations. The 1960 question was specifically directed to whether the state agency supplied locations to the inquiring library and the figure 19 may be considered to be more precise and not indicating a decrease in this service.

As in 1956, the later returns bear out the primary importance attached to advisory services. Almost half (21) of all those replying rank
Current Concepts in State Aid to Public Libraries

this function among the most significant. A lesser but growing number of states will make local surveys of library services and, with Z-B, we may presume, make recommendations for action based on findings.

Of the eight items listed under the heading of Educational and Promotional Services, the sharp increase (10 to 25) in short term local demonstrations of library service may be ascribed to state programs under the Library Services Act. It is somewhat surprising that this method of local assistance and stimulation was not cited as among the most important. Although the development of statewide standards of library service may be viewed also in the light of an advisory function, it is considered here as both an educational and promotional service. Thirty-two agencies are actively involved in establishing and promoting library standards, and one of them considers this its most important service.

There are a number of state library functions which may be considered indirect services to other libraries. In many cases this is a question of taking responsibility for a service which is necessary to the whole area, but which through centralization relieves other agencies of needless expense and effort of duplication. Building a research collection in a particular field is such a function. Because of the diversity of patterns of state library organization within state government, it is difficult to interpret the figures relating to state historical collections, state archives, and documents. Although the maintenance of collections relating to the history of the state or province has been “a widely accepted function of state and provincial libraries,” this activity would seem to have diminished by 44 per cent since 1956.

As for technical services again a marked increase is found which relates to Library Services Act projects. It is puzzling under the circumstances, that particular importance is not attached to this activity.

Two points should be brought out concerning items under this heading of Miscellaneous Services. The increase noted in question thirty-one relating to grants-in-aid, could be deceiving since the grants in some states are made possible only through federal funds. In regard to question thirty-five, while Z-B reported eighteen mandatory and thirteen voluntary certification systems in effect, the 1960 inquiry specifically asked if the state library administered certification of librarians. The two figures are not, therefore, comparable and it may be assumed that some of the state certification systems noted in 1956 were administered by other branches of state government.

The 1960 inquiry also asked for a listing of other services not
covered by the questionnaire. Although most of the additions could be interpreted as falling within the definition of the services on the checklist, two deserve special mention. One agency reported that it conducts a placement service for library personnel and is also engaged in recruiting; two agencies note a microfilm program for state newspapers.

The Z-B report also investigated the number of states and provinces which had had comprehensive surveys and had developed written programs for public library development. Likewise, the 1960 questionnaire asked for information on this subject. A comparison of the 1956 and 1960 returns shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of surveys</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(since 1954)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of written plans for public library development</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program developed by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Library agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Library Association</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Both</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*b Includes four in process (Idaho, Michigan, New Hampshire, Tennessee).

Neither the 1956 nor the 1960 inquiries attempt to evaluate the quality of over-all state surveys and programs. It would be interesting to see whether the availability of federal funds to finance such studies has improved their quality. As of 1958 three states, Michigan, Nevada, and Pennsylvania, had devoted federal funds to state survey studies, and it is quite possible that some of the surveys and resultant plans indicated above are due to the impetus offered by the Library Services Act. In any event, a significant number of states and provinces have formulated and formalized well defined objectives through statewide programs for library development since 1956. Some of these, however, may have brought their former studies up to date rather than added to the list of states and provinces studied. Unfortunately the names of the states reporting in 1956 were not available for this report.

An intangible but vastly important service to libraries for which state and provincial libraries have accepted responsibility is that of
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leadership in library development. Such devices as the publication of trustee manuals, holding of workshops and conferences for trustees and librarians, conducting surveys and developing statewide library standards and library service plans, formulating library legislation, cooperating with state library associations, and conducting vigorous consultant services are almost universally practiced. In recent years trustee conferences have been held with the sponsorship of the governor in several states. It is perhaps enough to say that the concept of state responsibility for leadership service in library development is (or ought to be) universally accepted and is one which calls for imagination, consummate skill and tireless effort on the part of state library personnel.

Joint effort by several states in providing leadership services to libraries is a concept that has become a reality in "North Country Libraries," published jointly by the State Library of New Hampshire and the Free Library Commission of Vermont. Another project involving cooperation among state agencies is the tri-state film circulation plan of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Looking toward expansion of this multi-state concept, the Library Legislation Committee, Governmental Relations Section of the American Library Association, Library Administration Division has prepared a "Suggested Draft of an Interstate Compact for Library Service" and "Draft of an Act to give Congressional Consent to Interstate negotiations for Library Services Compacts." (1959)

The idea of extending state library services through state operated regional offices or branches is not a new one. In 1931 an experiment in regionalization of services was begun in Vermont with the Billings Library of the University of Vermont serving as headquarters and a Carnegie Foundation grant paying the bill. In 1937 the Vermont Legislature passed a bill which set up statewide regional service under the direction of the state library agency, and by 1958 there were five regional libraries functioning. In 1956 twenty-five different regional state library centers were operating in six states. That other states have found state regional library centers desirable is indicated by the provision for establishing or strengthening such centers in fourteen of the state plans for use of Library Services Act funds for the 1958 federal fiscal year. These projects are summarized as follows: 

Establishment of an auxiliary State Agency, e.g., a branch of the State Library, is a new development in several States; in others, such a branch has been established for some time. The branch services vary
from State to State. Some State library branches offer a majority of the services available at the main State library; others, only advisory and consultative staff services. A few branches offer only one service, such as direct bookmobile service to an area of the State. In some States, the direct public service is the only library service in the area; in others, the branch offers indirect assistance in the form of materials or staff to supplement the resources and services of small local libraries.

One state has at least partially changed its mind about the desirability of state library services being given from a regional office. In 1948 the New York State Library set up the Regional Library Service Center in Watertown to perform the following services for libraries in three counties: (1) book collection for loan; (2) film collection; (3) delivery service; (4) cataloging service; and (5) advisory service.\(^\text{10}\)

The Commissioner of Education’s Committee on Public Library Service, 1957, found that the Watertown experiment was eminently successful on two counts; (1) it provided easy availability of a wide selection of good books to libraries in the area and (2) “a feeling of unity grew among librarians and a parallel development of in-service training and improvement of local libraries.”\(^\text{11}\)

On the other hand, the Committee pointed out that the Center, while “performing to approximate saturation the traditional services of the Education Department,” did not embrace all the features of a regional library system; i.e., there was no bookmobile service, no cooperative services such as part-time children’s librarians, and no system-wide advisory or governing board. These considerations, and adherence to the principle of local responsibility for library service, led the committee to recommend that the three counties now served by the Regional Library Service Center establish county or regional boards and, as in the case of other systems established in the state, “the regional board would be required to present its plan for state aid for approval by the Commissioner of Education.” If desired by the regional board, the present Regional Library Service Center could be continued either by a contractual arrangement with the state library, or under the direct administration of the regional board, but not as a branch of the state library.\(^\text{12}\)

In contrast to New York State’s withdrawal from direct operation of a regional service center is the Ohio State Library’s proposal for extending library service in Ohio. This plan\(^\text{13}\) proposes approximately
nine storage and service centers to be established in strategic areas of the state to provide loans of individual books and special book collections to libraries, storage of infrequently used books, loan of films, display collections, duplicating services, publicity aids, operation of bookmobile service to areas not now operating or not wishing to administer such service, professional advisory or consultant service, and professional librarians to hire on a temporary basis. One or two centers would be created to do centralized processing and/or purchasing for the entire state. A further feature of the plan is the proposal that the state employ skilled library personnel in key cities like Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, Toledo, and Youngstown who would draw on the total library resources of the city concerned to provide assistance to researchers or information seekers.

While some state library agencies are seeking to effect regionalization of library services through the device of state library branches or regional service centers, others are using different methods to achieve the same ends. In New York State, for example, systems are growing rapidly as a result of far-reaching legislation which makes it easy for local libraries to take the initiative in forming systems and provides incentive in the form of financial aid and guidance by the state library agency. Here the services of the state library, so far as they relate to the concept of regional library systems, take the form of leadership, regulation, and the administration of state aid rather than the direct service offered by the Watertown Regional Library Service Center.

The Pennsylvania library development plan proposes that the state library designate twenty-seven to thirty library districts, each district to have a center, based on an existing library, of some strength. In a few instances district library centers would be based on college libraries. Operating under local administration, the district library center would coordinate library service within the district, i.e., extend the services presently offered by the State Library Extension Division such as advice and counsel to local libraries in the district, interlibrary loan, rotating book collections, film circuits, and the like. Each center would be in a good position to offer centralized book purchase and processing services, although this would be a matter of local preference. Where college libraries would serve as district centers, the State Library would retain some of the extension functions for the district (provision of advice and counsel, and encouraging new libraries within the district, for example), since these functions would be foreign to
the general college library program. In this form of de-centralized, locally administered regional service, the State Library's aid takes the form of financial grants, review of plans submitted by district centers and local libraries for the use of state funds, a minimum degree of regulation, certification of personnel, and increased leadership in the form of promotion and demonstration.

This last method of extending state aid in the interest of regional library development would call for state operated demonstrations over a period of several years, with the locality taking over as the demonstration ends. The state may hire the people and buy the books and equipment, or it may, through contract or grants, provide funds to the locality for its own demonstration with some degree of supervision by the state. Library Services Act funds are being used for both kinds of regional demonstration; the Tri-County Library Service Center of New Jersey being an example of the former, and the Lehigh County project in Pennsylvania of the other.

Which of the concepts for encouraging regional library service by the state will in the long run prove most effective has yet to be seen; again a comprehensive study in depth seems to be called for.

A concept, as yet radical, representing the ultimate extension of library service by the state agency, is the idea of a statewide or even nationwide library system. Public library systems in the four provinces of the Union of South Africa, as described by Ruth J. Wertheimer elsewhere in this issue of Library Trends, come close to this, since the provincial administrations are empowered to establish free libraries, with the locality providing building facilities and a given amount of money per head, and the province supplying books, mobile libraries, technical services, and other assistance. In America, this concept has been expressed by Brahm at Ohio State Library, who suggests: "one library system, one library board, one librarian, one budget—that may well be the organization of library service in Ohio in 2050 A.D."16

The current stress of library literature on system building, with the idea that a system is good and a larger system better, might be interpreted as moving in the direction of the monolithic, single library system for an entire state on which Brahm speculates; but at the same time the literature also emphasizes at least partial local responsibility for library service. A general principle stated in Public Library Service, for instance, is that "The public library should be an integral part of local government." R. D. Leigh in the Public Library
Inquiry, while he acknowledges that it is possible to conceive of state owned and operated library systems,\textsuperscript{18} says "It is one of the assumptions of the Inquiry that in a large-scale modern democratic, industrial society there are advantages both in local initiative and participation and in larger units of administration; that neither should be neglected, but that governmental structure should be contrived to give the greatest possible scope to both principles";\textsuperscript{19} and in a later writing he stresses the probability of slow piecemeal advances toward realization of library systems through cooperation rather than the sudden emergence of a full-blown state wide organization of library service.\textsuperscript{20}

**Grants-in-aid.**—*Public Library Service* says of grants-in-aid only that the state library agency should administer them. While the constant stress on the library systems concept contained in that document clearly implies that grants-in-aid ought to be used in the building of library systems, one must look elsewhere for a detailed discussion of the concepts underlying state grants-in-aid to libraries.

A good starting point for a discussion of this subject is *A National Plan for Public Libraries* which makes the following basic points about grants-in-aid:\textsuperscript{21}

1. The unrestricted grant which may be used for any purpose is clearly preferable to restricted grants.

2. Reasonable effort on the part of localities to provide adequate financial support to their libraries should be a prerequisite to any state grant-in-aid.

3. State grants should be of sufficient size and should be administered in such a way as not to perpetuate ineffective libraries. Standards of service and personnel should be required of those libraries receiving grants-in-aid.

4. Grants-in-aid ought to be administered by the state library agency but such administration should avoid an excess of state control and interference.

5. While population is the easiest basis for distribution of grants-in-aid, provision should be made to equalize the total state and local amounts available for library service in communities of varying economic wealth, i.e., provide larger sums of state money to the poorer communities.

6. Grants to county and other large unit libraries should be stressed, especially where library service to new areas is an objective.

Leigh, in *The American Public Library*, reinforces the principle
of state grants of "authority, of funds, of books and skilled personnel—or all four—to create and maintain larger units," but finds (as of 1950) "no state system of financial aid to local libraries designed solely and without compromise to attain this objective." 22

Alice I. Bryan, in her contribution to the Public Library Inquiry, relates state grants-in-aid to the problem of personnel, advocating grants "large enough to enable each public library system, in conjunction with local financial support, to provide professional salaries on a decent minimum standard." 23 She further recommends that the state library agency administering grants should also accept responsibility for administering compulsory certification of librarians, classification of positions and accreditation of library schools. To this might well be added the allied responsibility of recruiting able people into the profession.

While a strong program of grants-in-aid would tend to alleviate personnel shortages, one State Public Library Commission believes that rules and regulations governing state aid can be minimized if the state will insist on a properly state-certified "regional librarian" being at the head of state-aided regional libraries. 24 Thus grants-in-aid are expected both to improve the supply of qualified librarians and to require qualified librarians to carry out the state-aided program.

With the above principles in mind, the following classification of types of grants-in-aid, by which is meant "a grant or subsidy from public funds paid by a central (in this instance, the state) to a local government in aid of some public undertaking" (here meaning public libraries), 25 will be useful.

**Establishment Grant.** The state may provide a once-only sum of money to a locality to assist in the establishment of new library service or of a new library system involving existing libraries.

**Continuation Grant.** A state may provide a sum periodically to a locality to help the local library or library system meet its operating costs. In the proposed Florida state aid law this is referred to as an "operating grant."

**Incentive Grant.** Availability of state funds may be contingent on the local library or library system achieving stated standards of support or service. The grant then becomes an incentive for such localities to achieve the standards required. The term "achievement grant" is sometimes used (e.g., in Georgia).

**Per Capita Grant.** The size of the state grant may be determined by the number of persons served by the agency receiving the grant.
Area Grant. The size of the area served by the receiving agency, such as number of square miles or number of counties, may determine the size of the grant.

Equalization Grants. If a locality served by a library agency is economically depressed, the size of the grant (usually on a per-capita basis) to that locality may be increased so as to provide total state and local funds available for library service relatively equal to those available in wealthier communities.

Integration Grant. For the purpose of strengthening existing libraries through unification of small units into larger systems, state grants may be awarded to a small library when it joins a system, to a large city library when it combines with a district library, or to a district library when it combines with another district. (Term used in Washington State.)

Restricted and Nonrestricted Grants. The purpose of a state grant may be to provide funds for the purchase of specific items, such as books. This is a restricted grant. A grant which, though for the broad purpose of improving library service, may be spent for any item is nonrestricted.

Personnel Grant. State funds may be granted specifically for augmentation of librarians' salaries (as in Rhode Island and North Carolina).

Scholarship Grant. Library education of individuals may be subsidized by state funds, as in Arkansas where $35 per semester hour for a maximum of ten hours at accredited library schools is granted.

Experience of various states with grants-in-aid programs has revealed at least three major pitfalls. One, already mentioned, is the awarding of sums so small as to have no real effect on the quality of library service in the locality receiving the grant. A pittance grant by the state tends to encourage pittance support by the locality receiving it.

A second pitfall is the encouragement of large area units of service without providing the necessary funds, strong central collection, and administration to produce quality service throughout the area. L. A. Martin comments thus: "I have seen size and larger territory pursued for their own sake, without the central base and without adequate support. It is not surprising that a feeling of bewilderment and frustration arises when the larger unit simply results in a bigger stretch of territory with definitely substandard service." 26

A third pitfall is the failure to relate grants-in-aid to standards of
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achievement by the localities receiving the grants, and failure to set up machinery to check on the way the grants are spent. The state aid law of Pennsylvania is a good example of these last two pitfalls; the law encourages countywide systems by restricting grants to county libraries only, but the grants are too small ($4,000 maximum) to provide real incentive, and the only check by the state on expenditures is the requirement that an annual county auditor’s report of the library’s expenditure be sent to the State Library.

Selection of the “building blocks” for state-aided library systems is a matter of concern in planning grants-in-aid programs. Shall the unit within the system be a town, township, county, or any combination of these? There are instances where political boundaries do not represent logical or politically feasible borders for the organization of library service. A grants-in-aid program which is designed to build systems must therefore be accompanied by legislation which permits arrangement of library service according to logical and workable patterns.

Where rapid growth of library systems takes place, the provision of adequate buildings, and procurement of personnel become acute problems. State aid for building purposes, common in public school aid programs, is not presently incorporated in state aid to libraries, although the library receiving a nonrestricted state grant-in-aid may of course elect to use a portion of it for building improvement. In 1959 an act was placed in the Pennsylvania legislative hopper which would have provided two million dollars annually for a ten-year period for library buildings, the state grant to be matched fifty-fifty by the locality, and the maximum total state grant to be $200,000, except in the case of district library centers where a slightly different formula for capitalization was proposed. The act failed to pass. In British Columbia the Public Library Commission in 1956 reported that “the Commission intends to ask for Provincial aid in financing construction”27 of library buildings.

To meet the personnel shortages resulting from rapid library growth, and other causes, some state aid plans have incorporated the idea of scholarships for library trainees. These may take the form of grants to individuals, on the basis of competitive examinations, as in New York; state support of library schools within state universities; or the provision for library traineeships whereby nonexperienced persons are hired with state funds for a specified period, and during part of the period of state-aided employment these persons attend an ac-
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credited library school while receiving normal pay. This plan was written into a Pennsylvania law which failed to pass in 1959.

One clue to the direction of trends into the future exists in the record of how the various states are making use of federal funds under the Library Services Act. It is significant that almost all states participating in the Library Services Act program have made a project of strengthening the state library; the clear implication is that state library agencies want to be and think they ought to be stronger than they are. This new strength takes the form of increasing extension personnel, augmenting resources, and adding new services. Recruitment, in-service training, and scholarships have been included. Most of the techniques and concepts used in Library Services Act projects were ones that had been tried somewhere before.

Increased aid in the form of services from the state library is thus seen to be one goal toward which those agencies are aiming; they have had a chance at more money and that is one of the things they have chosen to do with it.

But that is not the only goal. “Every plan (under the Library Services Act) includes the goal of larger units of library service. Cooperation is the key word in all.” Thus, twenty-eight plans have projects for regional or multi-county library systems, and fourteen include projects for state aid.

Which of the two basic forms of state aid, i.e., services from the state library agency or grants-in-aid, will be more effective as a means of attaining the ultimate goal of quality library service for all? The phenomenal growth of systems in New York, resulting from substantial grants-in-aid coupled with legislation to permit flexible patterns of system organization, is clear evidence that grants-in-aid do achieve results. At the same time, the State Library Agency in New York is a strong one which provides quality services in the form of leadership and back-up resources to local libraries. It does not attempt to provide local library service in any community, but takes steps through counseling, provision of financial aid and a flexible organizational framework, to enable every local community to help itself.

Whatever type of aid a state library offers, it can make such aid effective only if the agency is itself strong and has a position of strength in state government. The fact that a first priority for Library Services Act programs has been the strengthening of the state library agencies is evidence that those agencies were weak and that undergirding the state library with state funds has high priority for the
future. The Public Library Inquiry pointed to the need to strengthen state agencies. While many things have been done since 1947, obviously many agencies have had to use federal money in areas which are "normal" services. One gets the impression that state library agencies, had they achieved adequate financing and governmental status, might have been able to use Library Services Act funds in more imaginative ways. At any rate a combination of strong state library agencies which provide effective backup and leadership services to libraries and well designed financial aid programs appears to be the trend.
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American Laws Governing State Aid
to Public Libraries

WILFRED L. MORIN

This chapter will study state grants-in-aid programs to public libraries of the states which have such programs. Thus it will be limited necessarily to this type of state aid. It must be emphasized at the very outset that it is not the only form of effective state aid; there have been examples of very efficient and effective programs of nonfiscal assistance which, though they did not involve the flow of funds to the local governments concerned, enabled a better accomplishment of objectives for that very reason. An example is the Watertown Regional Library Service Center. However, this study will examine grants-in-aid, or state intergovernmental expenditures, which involve the actual payment of money to local governments, or directly to the library unit.

In outline, the chapter attempts to report the existing legal conditions under which grants are made, citations to the specific state statutes authorizing the grant programs, the amounts of the grants over the past few years based on available data, the number of library units to which grants were made if, again, this information is available, and brief descriptions of the grant program. The material is presented on a regional basis as set up by the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Grants imply a concept that the state recognizes some responsibility for library services and thereby recognizes one or more of the following factors and purposes of grants:

1. An equalization factor. This is an attempt to apportion funds in accordance with need and the ability to support the program by the transferring of funds from an area with above-average income to one with a below-average income.
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[52]
American Laws Governing State Aid to Public Libraries

2. A stabilizing purpose. The grant enables localities to meet extra local needs by stabilizing revenues.

3. The more equitable distribution of tax proceeds. Needs common to the several localities are met by grants based on the superior fiscal capacity of the larger unit of government.

4. A stimulation factor. Grants are made to aid localities finance new services.

5. A supporting purpose. The grant is made to achieve a better standard of performance. It may also be made to meet a need common to several governmental jurisdictions, any single one of which could not support the needed program at the desired standard.¹

Before the grant technique was ever used, the concept of state responsibility, in whole or part, for certain functions of its civil divisions had to be hammered out painfully and slowly by whatever legal means the people of the state could fuse into a program of service.

State and local functions and spheres of taxation are two phases of the relationship between the state and the locality which are interesting historically. The functional phase has, in the past, been sharply differentiated; but this has not been the case in the sphere of taxation. In the giving of service, the state remained very much aloof. Not so in the field of taxation, however. Though the state limited itself to the provision of judicial systems and the machinery of political government, it derived its revenue from the property tax superimposed upon local rates. It left to the local government the responsibility of maintaining such services as it could afford in the field of fire, police, and education, to name but a few.

It was inevitable that problems arose once the necessities and needs of all the people had to be limited only to those necessities and needs which could be met by the revenues available to the local jurisdiction. As these needs became more and more extra-local and even extra-state, the problems of financing the essential programs became more acute. Many studies have been made in this area of intergovernmental relations and some of the problems discussed have centered around which governmental agency should support functions of extra-local character and how should this be accomplished, to the study of at which level are the merits of political democracy and alert civic responsibility achieved more fully.

Needless to say, it stands to reason that some of the functional needs are better met by the governmental unit having the broader tax base,
TABLE I

State Grants-In-Aid by Library Unit
New England Region—Fiscal Year 1958-59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Kind of library unit to which grant is made</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency issuing rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Town units</td>
<td>Sum equal to amount appropriated and expended by town but not over $500 for each unit</td>
<td>General Purpose</td>
<td>Yes: By State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. S. 1958, Rec. Sec. 11-24 As amended 1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Town units</td>
<td>Minimum Grant $20. Maximum Grant $200</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Yes: By State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 42, § 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>6 or 7 Town units</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>For project to be approved by State Library Commission</td>
<td>Yes: By the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. S. A. 201:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Town units</td>
<td>$20,000 budgeted</td>
<td>1. Books</td>
<td>State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 23: § 1, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Salaries</td>
<td>State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Town units</td>
<td>Up to $100 each</td>
<td>1. Establishment</td>
<td>Yes: By the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 V. S. A. 181-85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To Small towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the better ability to collect the tax, and the distribution of that tax to the units which form the larger governmental jurisdiction.

There have been no clear cut solutions to the problem of inter-governmental relations. The attempt to shift some of these functions directly to the state level has met with resistance, as contravening the principle of “functional fitness.” The pattern which seems to be more nearly expressive of the common will at the present time is for the state to aid local governments in financing these functions by shared taxes, separation of revenue sources, supplementary local rates, extension of local taxing authority, city-suburb relationships, and state-local grants-in-aid.²,³

State grants-in-aid to public libraries in the United States vary greatly from state to state. In only one area is there any similarity and that is in the amounts paid; in all but one state (New York) the amounts are very small and though they are called grants they do not, in most instances, have any of the factors or purposes enumerated
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above. Rose Vainstein in her nationwide study reports that in the 1956 fiscal year the total amount paid out in grants to public libraries amounted to only $4,364,945 while the total of intergovernmental expenditure for all purposes in fiscal 1957 amounted to $7.3 billion.

New England Region

The pattern of direct state grants-in-aid for the New England states is one of grants to individual library units, usually on a town basis. However, the development of library service for the region, it must be remembered, is not in the direction of direct grants but rather of the central library concept, either from the state library if that agency is a comprehensive one (New Hampshire and Maine; also from the Library Bureau in Connecticut), or from state established and supported centers in cooperation with city libraries—for quarters—(Vermont and Massachusetts), or centers established by the state (Massachusetts and Connecticut).

The grants are small. In the Maine statutes, to be eligible for state aid a municipality must appropriate at least $200. In Massachusetts, at present, there are no provisions for direct grants-in-aid to local library units nor is there any enabling legislation to permit such grants. However, there are bills, such as H2275, being considered by the 1960 legislature which would provide both the enabling legislation and the state grant-in-aid to libraries program. In Vermont the public library making application for a state grant must also satisfy the commission that it is rendering useful assistance to the public schools. In Connecticut, the grant consists of a maximum of $500 per library on an equal matching basis with town funds.

The laws for the most part, are succinct and laconic. Provisions are

TABLE II

State Grants-in-Aid, Public Libraries Only
New England Region, Fiscal Year 1958-59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Amount of Grant 1958-59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total: New England</td>
<td>$119,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>81,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>14,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>20,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,500*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Amount budgeted—No report on amounts actually expended.
made in the statutes for application to the Free Library Commission, or to the State Department of Education, or the state librarian who, after approval, then issues authenticated vouchers to the proper state officials for payment to the free libraries the sums appropriated by the legislature for grants-in-aid.

All precautions are taken to insure the autonomy of the individual library unit. The statutes in the New England states are noted for lack of supervision of the public libraries by the state. The only requirements for receiving the grants are such items as local appropriations; local appropriations relative to grand lists; limiting the grant to grand lists of a certain amount and below; satisfactory local public library service to schools; voting by the town electors of a library board and instructions to ask for the grant; personnel aid to libraries with a salary of $500 or less; stipulation that state aid, in establishment grants, is for purchase of the first five hundred books, and the limiting of grants to six or seven libraries deemed, by the State Library Commission, to have a project which is worth-while and will be maintained as a continual service by the town.

Middle Atlantic Region

There are three states in the Middle Atlantic region with state aid. These are New Jersey whose state aid bill passed in the 1960 session of the legislature; New York whose original state aid bill was passed in 1950 with amendments in 1953, 1958, and in 1960, and Pennsylvania whose state aid program to counties dates from 1931. The latter's proposed 1959 state aid program based on a statewide survey completed in 1958\(^6\)\(^7\) failed to pass the legislature. Table III indicates the amount of aid for these three states.

New Jersey.—The New Jersey State Library Aid law provides four types of state aid: (1) minimum aids of either 5 cents per capita or 35 cents per capita (2) equalization aid, (3) county library or countrywide federation establishment grants, and (4) emergency aid. All municipalities (cities, towns, boroughs, townships, and villages) that support a public library in whole or part, with tax money in accordance with state law qualify for this aid. The municipal populations used in determining this aid, as well as the other types of aid, would be those in the last federal decennial census.

Instead of the 5 cents-per-capita aid, all municipalities can qualify for 35 cents-per-capita aid by meeting two additional requirements: (1) spend each year a local fair share of its public money for library
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service and (2) satisfy one of the following three conditions: (a) belong to a county library system, or (b) spend at least $50,000 annually for public libraries or (c) belong to a federation of libraries, provided that the member municipalities spend an aggregate of $50,000 or more annually for public libraries.

Local fair share is used as a measure of local, or municipal, ability to support municipal services. It is used as a measure of the minimum amount each municipality ought to spend each year for libraries in order to qualify for the higher 35 cent-per-capita aid. The rates of local fair share, on each dollar of equalized valuation, are: during the first year, \( \frac{1}{20} \) mill; during the second year, \( \frac{1}{10} \) mill; during the third year, \( \frac{3}{20} \) mill; during the fourth year, \( \frac{1}{5} \) mill; during the fifth year, \( \frac{1}{4} \) mill; and thereafter, \( \frac{1}{4} \) mill.

Each participating municipality certifies annually how much it appropriates for library purposes. This may, in some instances, be larger

---

**TABLE III**

*State Grants-in-Aid by Library Unit, Middle Atlantic Region—Fiscal Years 1958, 1959, 1960*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Library units for which grants are made:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency issuing rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Towns</td>
<td>None 1959</td>
<td>2. Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Boroughs</td>
<td>None 1958</td>
<td>3. Establishment*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Townships</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Emergency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Individual Library Units</td>
<td>$3,950,000 1959</td>
<td>3. Per capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Books</td>
<td>$3,450,000 1958</td>
<td>4. Books, Periodicals and Binding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Reference Books</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Geographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Incentives to Multi-county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania a. Counties</td>
<td>$117,000 1960</td>
<td>1. Supplemental</td>
<td>Yes: By Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$91,214 1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$88,288 1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not in 1960.*
than the appropriation specified in its budget. For example, if library quarters are afforded or maintained outside the regular library account, a reasonable amount may be charged to the library for this purpose.

The Legislative Commission to study library services in New Jersey concluded in its report, *Better Libraries for New Jersey,* that most of the libraries in New Jersey are too small to provide adequate service. Minimum requirements for quarters, books, equipment, and personnel for any library, the Commission decided, is $50,000 annually. This requirement for 35 cents aid, therefore, was established to encourage municipalities to spend at least that much each year or, in the case of small municipalities for which this is impractical, to join county library systems or join in federations.

A federation, by law, is a group of two or more libraries within a county that voluntarily contract with each other for cooperative library services, including interlibrary loan services and the free reference use of their library facilities by all residents of the contracting municipalities. The commissioner of education, with the approval of the State Board of Education, promulgates such other standards and regulations for federation to insure the public convenience.

Municipalities of less than 35,000 population that qualify for the above 35 cent-per-capita aid may also qualify for equalization aid. This aid is devised to “equalize” library services by offering additional state help to the smaller municipalities less able to support effective library services on their own.

Annual establishment grants of $20,000 for a period of three years have been provided for nine counties now without county libraries. Similar grants are available to countywide federations of libraries including all municipalities within these counties. These grants are in addition to the other aids and help meet the original capital expenditures in establishing county libraries or countywide federations.

In addition to the above aids, there are provisions for an annual appropriation of $50,000 to be distributed among the participating municipalities by the commissioner of education. This will provide means to alleviate any emergency or unforeseeable conditions that might arise in any municipality or county and that cannot always be reasonably met by a fixed state aid formula.

All minimum and equalization aid are to be paid by the state to the qualifying municipalities except when the municipalities are members of county library systems. Such aids accruing to municipalities be-
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longing to country library systems will be paid to the counties. The county library commissioners may then allocate as much as 15 cents per capita to any or all of the member municipalities.

In some instances, members of county library systems also maintain local library facilities. That portion of state aid allotted to them by the county can be used to supplement these local library facilities. Some county library members, however, do not maintain any local library facilities. In such instances, their share of state aid can best be utilized by improving the services now extended to them by the county libraries. This state library aid program is a cooperative one and participation is entirely voluntary. Each municipality and county will have to decide to what extent it will participate. The program is devised to encourage each municipality to qualify for the highest amount of state aid possible.

The new legislation called for an appropriation of $1,600,000 but the final amount voted was only $400,000. Therefore, for fiscal year 1960, the state aid will be a percentage of the provision provided for by law.

New York:—This state's grant-in-aid program is one of the most effective, conceptually and financially, in the United States. The formula is set up so that both the heavily populated and the sparsely settled rural areas are as equalized in benefits under the grant program as it is administratively feasible to accomplish. By means of establishment, annual, per capita, geographical, and book related material grants, the state is achieving its objective of effective book resources, optimum size library service systems, non-discriminating residential access to library services, and financial support at a level where adequacy of library service is a realizable goal.

Legally, the state has also achieved an efficient balance between the statutory and regulatory functions of government. In the statutes are found the broad outline of the legislative framework leaving to the regulatory agency, the Education Department under the rules of the Board of Regents, the policy of framework in the Regulations. The library extension division is the agency, under the state library, which administers the grants, and under Section 269 of the Education Law, provides the needed informational and advisory, and to a much lesser extent, the supervisory elements of the regulations and statutory perceptions.

The funds are appropriated by the legislature, paid by the Commissioner of Taxation and Finance on the warrant of the comptroller,
according to an apportionment made by the Commissioner of Education in accordance with his regulations. The law provides for conditions under which counties and certain cities are entitled to alternative state aid (§272) and the apportionment of state aid (§273).

The Statutes (§272) set forth a definition of system, the area served, what an approved plan means, conditions for approval of such a plan, the standard of service set by the Commissioner, provisions for reporting to the Commissioner, provisions for withholding funds when the localities attempt to consider state aid funds as supporting rather than supplemental, and what considerations should go into the promulgation of regulations and approving, rejecting, or revoking plans of library service.

The companion section, §273, provides for the apportionment of state aid. Here is embodied the concept of the central library and the provisions for achieving such a unit, the annual and per capita grants, the geographical grants based on the square miles for the area served, the special provisions for the New York Public Library, the establishment grants, the computation of grants, and the methods whereby the state reclaims funds not expended according to the provisions of the statutes.

The Regulations of the Commissioner, formulated with the advisory recommendations of professional librarians, are complementary to the statutes. These consist of standards for central libraries, registration of libraries, standards for registration of public and free association libraries, approval of categories, and the certificates for librarians in registered and free association libraries. Other regulatory provisions are those for employment, examination, allotment for libraries serving populations under 5,000, and traveling libraries.

The essential elements of the state aid legislation are greater structural flexibility for library systems, emphasis on the availability of large collections of books and staff to the rural areas of the state, and an increase in state aid.

Section 255 of the Education Law makes it possible for the trustees of the public and association libraries of an area to authorize the establishment of a library system and by vote of the boards of trustees of the participating libraries to elect not less than five nor more than twenty-five trustees for the library system. The trustees then apply to the Board of Regents for a charter as a library system. This same section of the Education Law makes it possible for the board of trustees of a cooperative library system to contract with the State
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Education Department for services, facilities, and staff. Public and association libraries that are not included among the libraries participating in a cooperative library system may by resolution request the cooperative library system to admit them to participation in the system subject to approval by the commissioner of education.

Section 255 adds a feature of library structure that is new to New York State. Authority is granted to the board of supervisors of a county to create a department of county government to be administered in the same manner as other county departments. An advisory board may also be appointed if desired.

Under Section 272 of the Education Law full approval of a plan of library service requires service to at least 200,000 people or 4,000 square miles of area. Provisional approval may be given to a library system which will serve at least 50,000 persons and three or more political subdivisions in addition to submitting a planned program of service for the five-year period following approval. For the purpose of determining the population of the area served by the library system, the latest federal census figure is to be used.

The new Section 273 of the Education Law makes provision for the following state aid payments:

a) Annual grant
(1) Library system serving less than one county $5,000
(2) Library system serving one county or more than one county $15,000 per county

b) 30 cents per capita of population of the area served

c) Area grant
Library system serving 1 county or less $ 6 per sq. mile
Library system serving 2 counties 9 per sq. mile
Library system serving 3 counties 12 per sq. mile
Library system serving 4 counties 15 per sq. mile
Library system serving 5 counties 18 per sq. mile

d) Establishment grant
(1) Library systems serving one county or part thereof $10,000
(2) Library systems serving more than one county $20,000 for each entire county
(3) Existing library systems under the old state aid law shall receive $20,000 for each additional entire county not pre-
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previously served which joins the library system under a new plan.

e) Central libraries—Library systems which have less than 100,000 volumes in the central library may present a plan to build up the central library to 100,000 volumes by the end of a ten-year period. Under an approved acquisition plan the State Education Department will supply to the central library annually four times the number of volumes which the library system buys under this plan from its own funds exclusive of state aid.

There is also a provision added, or re-inserted, by which system expenditures for books, periodicals, and bindings are 100 per cent reimbursed if such expenditures are 30 cents per capita and over, to a ceiling of 50 cents per capita. The state will pay no more than 20 cents per capita for this phase of the aid program.

Section 271 of the Education Law does not change the payment of the $100 matching grants to the individual libraries which are not participating in a library system. In addition to this matching grant, the nonsystem libraries serving less than 5,000 population may receive annually $100 worth of reference books. These libraries may elect to receive all or any part of the $100 grant to which they are entitled in the form of reference books rather than direct payment.

A library system may be approved for state aid under sections 272 and 273 of the Education Law, if it complies with the provisions of the forementioned sections of the Education Law and if it meets the following Regulations of the Commissioner. Full approval cannot be given to a library system unless it serves at least 200,000 people or 4,000 square miles of area. Provisional approval may be given to a library system which will serve at least 50,000 persons provided the area includes three or more political subdivisions and that a satisfactory plan is submitted for expansion of service during the ensuing five year period.

In order to qualify for full approval a plan submitted by a library system must provide for the free use by all residents of the area served of the total library resources within the system by acceptance by all libraries in the system, to be honored on the same basis as that specified for cardholders in each individual library. Provisional approval is granted provided that each member library of the system may have the right to borrow for one or more of its cardholders from any other member library of the library system any book or other material on
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the same basis as that provided by the lending member library applicable to its resident cardholder. Also, each system submits a plan which shall include a description of the means by which the various economic, cultural, civic, and age groups are to be assisted by qualified personnel in deriving maximum benefit from library resources.

Each system certifies that there will be employed within the library system at least one full-time staff member (or the equivalent) for each 5,000 residents of the area served by the system, exclusive of janitorial, cleaning, and maintenance workers. There must be employed within each fully approved system of libraries at least six professional librarians engaged in system services. There must also be employed within each of the provisionally approved system libraries at least four professional librarians engaged in system services.

For full approval each system must add annually at least 4,000 titles not previously held by the system. For provisional approval each system must add annually at least 2,000 titles not previously held by the system. Each system must provide a means of location of materials added in the libraries of the system.

The standards for central libraries stipulate that a system applying for state aid must submit an acquisition plan for building up the collection of the central library. If there are less than 100,000 volumes of adult nonfiction, bound periodicals, and books in foreign languages in the designated central library, the holdings that the central library does have become the base from which state aid is computed in this category. If, after approval of the acquisition plan, the system expands its service area to include either another library system receiving central library book aid, or expands its service as to include a library with a larger adult nonfiction book collection, the system must amend its statement.

The central library collection of adult nonfiction must be physically assembled so as to provide maximum use of the collection by residents of the area served by the system. If the system provides that the central library collection is to be housed in more than one location, the system must: (1) Show that such separation of the central collection will not weaken the scope of the collection or the quality of the reference and informational service available to readers through such collection, and (2) Provide that there must be a unified means of location of the total adult nonfiction holdings of the several libraries in which the central library collection is housed.

The central library of the system must provide information service
and bibliographical assistance to readers, and the system must annually submit to the Library Extension Division, as a supplement to this acquisition plan, an application stating: (1) The number of volumes for which the system intends to apply under Education Law (Section 273, subdivision 1) in the succeeding year, and (2) The number of adult nonfiction volumes, books in foreign languages, and bound periodicals which the system and its member libraries have acquired in the preceding year from sources other than state aid.

The volumes to be acquired under such plan by the system must be adult nonfiction or books in foreign languages.

It is interesting to note that for the fiscal year 1959, the state expended in the $100 grant category a total of $59,693.84 to 610 individual public library units. In the category of systems the state expended $3,217,373.35 to twelve systems. In 1958, $58,447.53 went to 603 libraries in the $100 category, while system grants amounted to $2,282,174.77. In 1960 the total state aid will move up to over $6,000,000. The latest information available indicates that as of February 1960, eighteen systems were organized, composed of forty-four counties in whole or in part, with a population served of 12,560,965. This is eighty-five per cent of the population and represents 55 per cent of the square mileage of the state.13 State library grants-in-aid amounted to less than 1 per cent of the total funds appropriated for education in the local assistance fund even though the grant program is substantial, varying approximately .052 per cent, from .624 per cent to .676 per cent for fiscal 1960.

Pennsylvania.—State grants-in-aid in Pennsylvania are limited to counties of the 3rd through the 8th class. The maximum amount available is up to $4,000 on a matching basis. The state will pay to each county library a percentage of funds appropriated to the county library by the county government. This percentage varies from 80 per cent for the 250,000-800,000 population group to 125 per cent for counties with less than 20,000 population. In 1957, twenty-nine counties received these grants; in 1958, twenty-nine; and in 1959, thirty.

Southern Region

The grants-in-aid program for the Southern region,14 at the present, is one of the most dynamic of any region in the United States. Eleven states have grant programs and the increasing effectiveness of library service in the region is due largely to the sound structure of these programs. The table below gives an outline of the states’ program.
TABLE IV

State Grants-in-Aid by Library Unit
Southern Region—Available Data for Fiscal Years 1959, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Library unit to which grants are made</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency issuing rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas ASA 6-301</td>
<td>County Multicounty</td>
<td>$130,453 - 1960</td>
<td>Establishment, Multicounty</td>
<td>State Library Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Ga. Code 1948-49</td>
<td>County Regional</td>
<td>$851,352 - 1956</td>
<td>Establishment, Annual</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky KRS § 171.201-205</td>
<td>County Library Region</td>
<td>$100,000 - 1961</td>
<td>Basic, Equalization, Incentive</td>
<td>Public Library Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland MAC Art. 77 § 178</td>
<td>County Library City</td>
<td>$318,992</td>
<td>Book Grant Current Operations</td>
<td>Superintendent of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Miss. Code § 6210-04</td>
<td>Region (at least 2 cos.) County</td>
<td>$60,635 - 1960</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Mississippi Library Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Carolina GSNC Art. 1 - Ch. 125 Art. 8 - Ch. 160</td>
<td>County Region</td>
<td>$456,448 - 1960</td>
<td>Annual, Regional Incentive, Personnel, Adult Film Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>N. C. State Library Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina S.C. Code 1952 Ch. 5 § 42-204</td>
<td>County Region</td>
<td>$70,755</td>
<td>Books, Salary Supplemental, Other Library Materials</td>
<td>Board of Directors of State Library Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Tenn. Code § 70-11</td>
<td>County Region</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Va. Code § 23-32</td>
<td>County Region</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Development of Library Service</td>
<td>State Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two classes of cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alabama.—State aid in Alabama is authorized in Section 280 of Title 55, Code of Alabama 1940, amended 1959, as follows: “The Alabama Public Library Service . . . may receive and shall administer all funds, books and other property, from whatever sources, under such conditions as may be deemed necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this article.”

There is no separate appropriation for the state aid function in Alabama and funds necessary for books, equipment, and allocations to approved library systems are included in the proper categories of the biennial appropriation for the state agency. State aid is not a money grant-in-aid but an allocation of funds authorized by the board of the state agency to be used by the state agency for any county or regional library system meeting conditions set by the state agency.

In the case of a qualifying county or regional library system, such library receives an annual establishment allocation for the purchase of books for the first three years and a smaller continuation book allotment annually thereafter. Books are selected by each approved library system and the order forwarded to the state agency and placed by it with a state contract jobber. Books are shipped directly to the approved library. Upon receipt of a “materials receipt form” from the approved library the state agency pays the invoices for such books.

In equipment, the state agency lends the approved library systems a bookmobile for a period of eighteen months after which the library system purchases its own bookmobile. As state funds are available, library furniture or equipment may be purchased by the state and placed in an approved library system. Title to such equipment and/or furniture remains with the state but may be left in the approved library system so long as the system continues.

When sufficient salary funds are available in the state budget, personnel may be employed by an approved library system with approval of the state agency. Such personnel, under the agreement between the state agency and the approved library system, are paid by the approved library and reimbursement of such salary costs is made by the state to the library upon submission of the proper forms.

Arkansas.—In this state the only reference in the statutes to state aid is a sentence in section 7 of Act 139 outlining the duties of the commission. It states that the commission “may administer the State aid to libraries.” The administration of the grants is thus wholly accomplished by the commission.

There are five phases to the state’s grant program: establishment,
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effective 1958; annual continuation; multicounty continuation, effective 1958; demonstration, effective 1942; and personnel (scholarship and in-service training).

Payments are made to county and multicounty units from the amounts appropriated and distributed on the basis of population at a specified rate per capita. The establishment grant allots 35 cents per capita for the purchase of books if the state requirements, of legal organization, local support, budget, quarters, reports to state agency, and qualified personnel are met. The continuation grant is three cents per capita plus $500 if the county supports the system on the one mill level. The regional system grant is also three cents per capita, plus $500 for the one mill levy, plus $500 more for one headquarters for the entire system.

The scholarship grant amounts to $35 per semester hour, up to ten hours, for a qualified librarian to take library science courses at an accredited library school. In-service training grants pay the actual expenses of librarians and trustees to attend workshops sponsored by the Arkansas Library Commission in the state.

Delaware—The Delaware statute is very specific. It provides for the State Library Commission as the agency to administer the grant program. The administration of the grant is given a statutory framework both for the State Library Commission to follow and the purpose for the grant. The grant is made to the school district library commissioners for the purchase of books. However, the school districts are placed in categories according to population and each category, that is, districts of the first, second, third, and fourth class, each cannot receive funds over the amounts specified in the statutory limit for its class. The State Library Commission also has statutory control over the books to be bought by the grant funds since it has to approve the list of books submitted by districts for purchase.

Georgia.—The grant-in-aid program in Georgia is not, technically, a cash grant program. It establishes credits, as it were, at the state agency upon which the county or system can draw for the specific purposes the funds are set up. The state, upon authorization, pays for the salaries, the library materials, travel, and other authorized items the system is entitled to. Special state allotment funds are made in cash upon the basis of approved budgets.

There are four phases of the state grants-in-aid program for Georgia: establishment, annual, achievement, and special state allotment grants. It must also be realized that when the state’s minimum Foundation
Program for Education was enacted in 1949 it included public libraries. The establishment grant is given only to regional systems, that is, counties cooperating together to form a multicounty system under the supervision of trained library personnel with the objective of giving improved library service throughout the region. This aid is limited to the purchase of materials.

There is also an annual grant of $3,600 to the region for the purchase of materials. Each county in the region is also given an annual grant which varies from $450 to $20,000 and is based on the number of teachers in each county. The requirements for the regional and county annual grants are that the units be legally set up, strive towards qualitative library service in the county and region by employing certificated librarians, coordination of service, and the implementation of an approved plan of service. County librarians must hold at least a Grade I certificate issued by the State Board for the Certification of Librarians. Regional directors must hold a Grade V professional certificate issued by the same board. Other factors considered are the stabilization of local funds for the support of the county and service, the provision of a central headquarters, the selection of materials from approved sources, the placement of orders through the state agency, annual reports to the state agency, and that service be free.

The achievement grants are also to county and region. The grant is $3,600 to $5,700 for salary of qualified personnel, if the regional or county plan budget is not less than $10,000. It also provides $480 for travel for the state paid librarians within the work area and also outside if it is necessary to do so for professional business connected with the library program. Then for each system over two counties there is an additional $1,000 for each such county for material. The special state allotment is predicated on the amount of the federal grant allotted and is granted for salaries, materials, equipment, supplies, rent, bookmobile, and operating costs. Since it is based on the federal grant the ratio of rural to urban population within the definition of the Library Services Act is a factor in making the grant. Special needs of a particular library system for bookmobiles, equipment, personnel, etc., are important factors along with rural population in determining the amount of special state allotments. Regional library systems receive one state salary per county according to the number of counties in a region, e.g., two county region—two salaries; three county region—three salaries; etc.

Kentucky.—Kentucky State aid program requirements are detailed
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in the legislation. The statutes also make provision for a public library service commission which makes the rules and regulations for the allocation of state grant funds. This commission is made up of the commissioner of finance, the attorney-general, and the director of the Library Extension Division.

The objectives of the legislation providing for grants are to promote, aid, and equalize public library service. The funds for the grant are from the general expenditure fund of the state treasury. They are paid out by the state treasurer on warrants drawn by the commissioner of finance on order of the chairman of the Public Library Service Commission.

The grants cannot be used for building, equipment, or furniture purposes. They are limited to expenditures for books, bookmobiles, technical assistance, educational, and promotional purposes. The payments are made to counties on a basic, equalization, and incentive payment basis. In fiscal 1959, ninety-six county library units received basic grants, twenty-nine equalization, and sixty the incentive payments. The grant program became effective in 1952. No county may receive more than $5,000 and at least 5 per cent must be expended for countywide public library service. The statutes provide a legislative intent section in which such intent is stated to be that grants are supplemental, not supporting.

Maryland.—The Maryland state aid program is one geared to books and current expenses. A county library established under the provisions of § 178(a) may receive an annual book grant if the county commissioners have levied a tax of not less than two cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation of taxable property subject to the full rate, or if they appropriate a lump sum equivalent to what the former method would bring. The superintendent of education authorizes the payments to be made and he may withhold such payments if the county fails to levy the amount prescribed by law or fails to meet the requirements of the law. The amount of money appropriated is distributed at a specified rate of per capita of population. The amounts vary; for counties having a population of 30,000 or less the grant is .08 cents per capita while counties with a population of 200,000 or more the grant is .02 cents per capita.

For counties, and Baltimore City, in which public libraries have been established under § 178(b-1) there is a state aid fund for current expenses which started July 1, 1954. These funds are in addition to the book grant under § 178 (a) & (b). These funds must be used for the current expenses of the library and cannot be used for
the purchase of land, the erection of buildings, or for debt reduction.

Mississippi.—Mississippi bases its authority for making grants on the statutory delineation of the duties of the Mississippi Library Commission in which it is stated that "It may . . . establish county and regional libraries and may use any funds, separate and apart from the general funds of the Mississippi Library Commission, which might come into its custody from any source, for such purpose, and for the purpose of establishing, stimulating, increasing, improving, and equalizing library service in the various counties within the State, under such rules for the safe keeping, preservation, care, handling, and management of the same as may be fixed by the Mississippi Library Commission."

Grants are made to regional systems, with a system comprising at least two counties. The administrative activities of all the libraries must be combined or coordinated to achieve maximum efficiency and service. The system director must be a professionally qualified librarian. The budget of the system must be at least $25,000 and each county in the system must provide a sum equivalent to a one mill tax on the assessed valuation of all property within the county. The service must be free and available within a radius of not less than two miles to every person in the area. There are also provisions for an evaluation of the system's program of service by the state board of commissioners and the board of trustees of the library system.

North Carolina.—The authority for state aid in North Carolina is based on the general statutes of North Carolina, Article 1, Chapter 125, and Article 8, Chapter 160; § 125-3, creates the board of trustees, and subsection (3) of § 125-7 sets up the rules and regulatory making power of the board to administer state grants.

The statutory provisions leave the detailed arrangements for the allocation and administration of the state grants to the State Library Board. The statutes stipulate the legislative intent by providing that the grants shall be made "to improve, stimulate, increase, and equalize public library service to the people of the whole State, . . . shall be used for no other purpose . . . and shall be allocated among the counties in the State taking into consideration local needs, areas and population to be served, local interest and such other factors as may affect the State program of public library service."

Chapter 160, § 160-174, § 160-175 provide for two very important statutory authority sections: authority for governing bodies of counties and municipalities to contract for library service with other counties
and municipalities, associations or corporations maintaining a library; and authority for two or more counties or municipalities, or a county or counties and a municipality or municipalities to join for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a free public library. This is accomplished by resolution of the governmental units participating. One of the features which the resolution must contain is how the distribution of property is to be made in the event of a dissolution. Another feature of the organization of the joint library is an agreement between and among the participating units as to the amount each participating unit shall contribute to the establishment and support of the joint library. The state funds are paid directly to the treasurer of the board of trustees. The statutes also make provision for the withdrawal of a municipality or county from the joint library.

The regulations provide for the state grant funds payment to county and regional libraries. For each qualifying county there is a basic grant of $4,000 plus an additional allotment for each qualifying regional library. The regulations also provide the qualifications which the library unit must meet for receiving the state grants. Among these are the legal establishment of the library unit; qualifications of the library director; central location of the regional headquarters; library service to be provided to all the people in the area; the area to provide a minimum of $3,000 or 15 cents per capita, whichever is greater, by tax levy or appropriation; and a yearly audit. Other features of the regulations are submission of an area plan of library service, trustee by-laws, library unit budget, and properly filled out application for state aid, to the State Library Board.

The grant is not made automatically every year to the system. To continue to qualify a county or regional library system must maintain its trustee structure, and professional qualification of the library director; its central headquarters; standard of library service for all in the area; secure appropriations or tax funds to finance improved library service; and use the funds available for library service. If a balance of $1,000 or more occurs, the system has that amount deducted from its basic state aid allocation amount on the next payment. The systems also must submit any changes in its five year plan, changes in by-laws, its yearly budget, and its yearly audit to the State Library Board. The regulations also provide that basic state aid funds may be used only for books, salaries of qualified librarians, purchase of bookmobiles, and the bonding of the library treasurer.

There are also additional allotments from state or federal funds
which are considered as regional incentive grants. To obtain this grant, which is on a matching basis, each county in the region must realize, by appropriation or tax levy, a 3 cents tax on the $100 valuation. When it accomplishes this it receives a regional grant of $4,000 per county. For each 1 cent per $100 valuation increase by each county the regional grant is increased $2,000 per county until the maximum tax levy vote of 10 cents on the $100 valuation is reached entitling the region to $18,000 per county. However, the regional grant may not exceed $100 per capita. There is also a personnel grant allocation initiated in the 1960 fiscal year. This grant is determined by the basic allocation grant of $4,000 per county. The allocation amounts to $1,200 for an additional full-time professional staff member in the system; meeting the requirements of a fully trained and qualified director and ability to meet the remainder of the salary for that position.

In 1959 there were 322 public libraries in North Carolina classified as follows: 76 county libraries (4 county with 2 county systems each), 9 regional (25 counties), 24 branch, and 23 independent town and city. There were 105 bookmobiles serving ninety-four counties, and the total book stock amounted to 3,543,201 volumes, or .8 volume per capita. The total circulation was 12,269,873. Of the 4,061,929 population of the state 3,911,417 had access to the library service provided, 150,512 had not. Counties showing state aid numbered 94; those showing federal aid, 27, and counties with tax votes, 23.

South Carolina.—The state aid program payments are made to county and regional libraries and the authority for such is based on the statute creating the board of directors for the State Public Library Association. The board has the power to receive and disburse funds that can be classified as public funds; create library districts as it deems proper; allocate public funds to these districts; set standards; issue librarian certificates; and to take such action as may be deemed advisable to foster and encourage adequate public library service within the state.

Cash allotments were made to thirty-nine qualifying out of the forty-six counties in the state in the 1957-1959 biennium, with Edgefield County qualifying in fiscal 1959. The amounts paid to these libraries has increased from $200 in 1943 to $1,500 per county in 1958.

Libraries with a professionally qualified librarian in charge receive cash allotments; libraries directed by nonprofessionals get an equivalent state aid in the form of books or equipment.

The first $1,000 in state aid is for books and must be on a dollar per dollar matching basis. The next $500, which requires no matching
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by local funds, may be used to purchase books from standard lists; to supplement the salary of a qualified chief librarian or department head; purchase of periodicals; book re-binding; and purchase of actual library equipment. As a further service to the smaller county libraries, the State Library Board processes book orders to be paid from state aid funds. These funds may also be used to supplement the purchase of bookmobiles. The funds may not be used for salaries of unqualified personnel, rent, construction or repair of a building; regular office equipment; tables or chairs; operating expenses; travel; publicity; supplies or custodial supplies.

Tennessee.—The Tennessee library grant program partakes of much of the grant-in-aid characteristics that have been examined in other states. There is, for instance, a contract executed between the state agency and the local regional library board. The terms of the contract stipulate that the regional library board shall be responsible for certain provisions of the contract and the state agency for others. On this basis, Tennessee has been included under this chapter of state grants-in-aid in order to give a clear picture of all types of state responsibility.

The local regional boards agree to administer the state funds allocated to them; prepare and submit a budget to the state agency; employ qualified personnel; provide suitable quarters for the regional headquarters and bookmobile service; budget travel allowances; replenish book collection regularly; maintain adequate records; provide library materials, communications as needed, for inspection by the state agency; and furnish expenditure statements, monthly and annually. The state agency on the other hand will furnish the state funds within the limit of the state's appropriation available for this purpose, and such other advisory and consultative service as will serve to integrate library service within the region with the state's total program.

Virginia.—The Statutes of the Virginia Code provide, as a part of the public education of its citizens, for the establishment and development of public library service throughout its various political subdivisions. The Virginia State Library Board administers the grants from such appropriations as are made. If the appropriations are not sufficient to meet the grant request of established libraries which have qualified, the available funds are prorated by the State Library Board so that each unit receives a proportionate share.

Regional libraries serving over 35,000 population are entitled, in grant aid, up to 35 per cent of local funds appropriated for libraries to a maximum of $15,000. County libraries serving less than 35,000 population receive 35 per cent of such local funds up to $5,000. If the
state appropriations reach 100 per cent of the applications for state aid received and approved, the regional and county libraries are entitled to an additional 20 per cent, if they have received an increase of local funds over the previous fiscal year.

**North Central Region**

Four states in the North Central region of the United States have state aid programs. The following table gives in outline form the programs in effect in each state.

**TABLE V**

*State Grants-in-Aid By Library Unit*

**North Central Region—Fiscal Years 1959, 1960, 1961**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Library unit to which amount is made</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency issuing rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Individual Public Library units</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes: Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act 315 of 1937 amended by P. L. 1956</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>State Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Individual</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>County and Regional Library Units</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes: State Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 3 § 2 Subd. 10 Extra Session Laws 1957</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Individual Library Units</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes: State Equalization Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSM 181.021 § 7 Extension Library Centers</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Individual</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes: State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. County and Regional Library Units</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td>Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Newly formed County and Regional Library Units</td>
<td>$271,800</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>County Extension Library Centers</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. County</td>
<td>$271,800</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes: State Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Other Public Library Units</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michigan.—State aid for Michigan is based on the state aid for Public Law Act 315 of 1937 as amended by P.A. 193 of 1956. The law is comprehensive and detailed. Practically all aspects of the grants-in-aid program are written into the law and leave interpretative matters to regulatory discretion. The limitations are that grants other than those from the County and Regional Library Development fund “may be used for any expenditure except the purchase of sites or buildings, the erection of buildings or addition to buildings, the remodeling of buildings, and the payment of principal or interest charges on any indebtedness.”

The monies appropriated are apportioned to funds of which there are three: a General Library Fund, 70 per cent; a County and Regional Library Development Fund, 20 per cent; and a County and Regional Library Establishment Fund, 10 per cent. For each fund there are certain objectives to be attained and requirements to be met. Objectives of the General Library Fund are to enable local communities to increase their public library service and to consider these funds as supplemental, not supporting. Only libraries meeting maximum standards are awarded grants and the payments are on a per capita rate. The requirements are that each governmental unit must make an appropriation equaling at least \( \frac{3}{10} \) mill on state equalized valuation of area served and local support to include all income appropriated by local government sources, exclusive of estimated allowance for housing and maintenance.

The County and Regional Library Development Fund was set up to aid these systems to meet the standards set by the State Board. It is an incentive grant to each county and regional library to provide a qualified head librarian. It also refunds the salary of each qualified head librarian up to $4800 per year but not more than $400 per month. The requirements are that the head librarian must be a college graduate and have a library school degree, plus four years administrative experience. The county or region must also certify that it has appropriated not less than $3,600.

The County and Regional Library Establishment Fund was set up to provide incentive for new county and regional libraries. The grants are made to cover capital costs. A grant may not exceed $15,000 per county. For regional libraries, a grant is made for each county in the region plus a grant for the region as a whole. The requirements are that the county or region must have a population of 20,000 or more persons. The appropriation to be raised by the county or region must
not be less than $\frac{3}{10}$ mill on the state equalized valuation of the area served. Cities of 5,000 and over may elect not to join.

Requirements common to all grants are that the libraries must meet minimum standards for personnel, hours of opening, book collection, and services set by the State Board for Libraries. The grants must be kept in separate funds, and an annual report of expenditures must be made to the State Library Board.

Minnesota.—State aid grants are geared to the state amount needed to match for the federal funds. The amount appropriated in 1960 and 1961 totals $125,000 for each year of the biennium. The statutes further stipulate that only 10 per cent of this amount may be used for the administration of the grant; that the grants can be made only to rural (Library Services Act definition) areas of the state; the system must have a 20,000 population minimum and receive one mill tax income from public funds. The area to be served takes the initiative in applying for the grant and submits a plan. The plan contains a description of the area to be served by the proposed system, the ability of the local government to finance operations out of public funds, how much it will cost to operate the system, and how it will reach the people with library service.

The awarding of the grant by the Board of Education is made on the basis of the economical and practical aspect of the proposed plan, and the amount of funds available. The Board of Education makes all further rules for the administration of the grant within the framework of the Library Services Act and the legal provisions of the Minnesota state law. Among the other than statutory provisions are: that the area to be served by the library system receiving aid must include rural areas and one or more counties; the system must have a legally constituted and appointed library board; the proposed plan of library service must meet minimum standards of personnel, services, bookstock, and equipment; and be under the direction of a fully qualified professional librarian.

Since the money for grants-in-aid is limited the Board of Education has established the following priorities: the practicability and economy of the plan, including the potentiality of the area for continuing the operation of service after the aid program ends; the number of persons which the proposed library system will serve, the proportion now unserved, and the proportion now inadequately served; a higher priority will be given library systems which serve more than one county; the economic need of the area to be benefited relative to the need of
American Laws Governing State Aid to Public Libraries

other areas making applications; and the date the application is received in the Department of Education.

Missouri.—State aid to public libraries in Missouri is intended to supplement the local income of libraries so that a minimum quality of library service can be given by each library.

The first 50 per cent of the state aid monies is allocated on a per capita basis to all tax-supported libraries which have a one mill library tax. The second portion of the grant, 40 per cent, is used to equalize the income of those county and regional libraries which have a one mill tax, but receive less than $1.00 per capita in library tax income. The remaining portion of the grant, 10 per cent, is used to encourage the development of library service through establishment grants to newly formed county and regional units.

In Missouri there is also a constitutional provision. Section 10 of the Constitution makes provision for the establishment and development of free public libraries and for the payment of state aid by the General Assembly when such a subdivision or municipality of the state qualifies.

Ohio.—The greater part of the state aid grant program is accomplished by regulatory rather than by statutory provisions. The state aid grant program in Ohio is known as a subsidy for public libraries. It is predicated on appropriation acts, biennium by biennium. The act stipulates that this aid shall be distributed by the Ohio State Library Board and that it shall make such rules for its distribution as it shall see fit. The funds, in the intent of the appropriation acts, are to be used to increase, improve, stimulate, and equalize library service to the people of the whole state. It is allocated among the counties taking into consideration local needs, area and population to be served, local interest as evidenced by local appropriation, and such other facts as may affect the state program of library service.

The libraries in the state are divided into two groups: extension center libraries, and all other public libraries. Extension center libraries are those which, with the approval of the State Library Board, has assumed responsibility for extending library service to all the territory not within the territorial boundaries of other established libraries within the county. Aid to these libraries is based on the county intangible tax collection. This tax collection is used as a key to the ability of the county to support a library, and to determine the basic allowance for the county. If a county supports its libraries only to 10 per cent of its ability to do so the state will limit its support to 10 per cent of the county's basic allotment from state aid. Other fac-
**Table VI**

**State Grants-in-Aid by Library Unit**

**Western Region—Fiscal Year 1959, 1960, 1961**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Library unit to which grant is made</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Agency issuing rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Legally established individual library units (City and county—also sponsored units)</td>
<td>$20,000 - 1959</td>
<td>1. Books 75%  2. Salary 25%</td>
<td>State Library Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>County, regional and library units extending service</td>
<td>$89,943 - 1959</td>
<td>1. Exhibit Bookmobile  2. Demonstration  3. Project</td>
<td>State Library Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alaska.*—The reorganization of Alaska from a Territory to a state has resulted in the transfer of the Territorial Department of Library Service from the Executive
New Mexico.—New Mexico’s State aid program was started in the mid 1940’s. The grants are made to properly constituted city and county libraries on a matching basis. The minimum aid is $200 and the maximum is $700. Only funds from public sources can be used for matching. The library applying for the grant must indicate that it is giving free library service to the residents of an entire county. It must also state that it is open a sufficient number of hours to give reasonable service; provide sufficient equipment and supplies to conduct the work of the library; provide an adequate card catalog; and submit lists of books to be purchased with state money to the State Library Commission for approval before ordering. At least 75 per cent of the grant must be spent for books and 25 per cent may be spent for the librarian’s salary. There are also provisions prohibiting the expenditure of state grant funds for rent or repair of buildings, for buying equipment, or for maintenance purposes. The authority for the state to make grants-in-aid is found in the statute setting up the New Mexico State Library Commission, entitled “Duties and Functions of Commission.”

Oregon.—In Oregon the Library Services Act was the catalyst for the state aid program. The 1957 legislature appropriated the funds to provide for the first grant aid to public libraries. The amount was geared to the state’s matching requirements to obtain the maximum federal funds. The statutes are explicit. Policy is provided for in the statute itself and extends the duties of the trustees of the State Library Administrative Agency in regard to making the grant, determining eligibility, and advising public libraries. It further stipulates that allotments of state funds for grants-in-aid cannot be made unless the trustees of the state library feel that the unit receiving the grant is capable of continuing the program after the grant period ends and that, except for certain conditions, the grant shall not be for more than one year. The state law also provides for qualified consultants to the State Board of Trustees to advise on standards and eligibility provisions and stipulates legal conditions under which they may be
employed and reimbursed. A further section authorizes a staff for the administering of the Act. Another section provides for the appropriation of funds and the amount for the current biennium.

The grants are made to county, regional, or other public libraries which cooperate or combine to extend the coverage and increase the efficiency of library service and which meet standards approved throughout the state by the trustees.

Washington.—State aid for Washington was first authorized by law in 1901 but no funds were ever appropriated. The law was repealed in 1935. In 1945, $283,000 was appropriated for the biennium and in 1947, it dropped to $100,000 and remained at that level until 1953 when all aid was lost. Between 1953 and 1955 the Washington Library Association re-assessed the program and abandoned the idea of direct grants to all public libraries and adopted a three-point program of integration, establishment, and grants to those libraries most heavily tapped by the interlibrary loan program.

Two parts of the grant program are in operation. The state has $50,000 for 1959-1961, which will be expended in 1960 for the integration phase. The second part, the establishment phase, which is at present in the form of all state aid in this category to the Columbia River Regional Library Demonstration, consists of $113,271 in state expenditures for fiscal 1960 and $92,587 for fiscal 1961. The third phase has not yet been implemented.

Basically, the law provides that grants may be made to libraries which merge to strengthen their services. A merger may be that of a city and district to form a regional library; the merging of two districts to form an inter-county library district, and contractual agreements between small towns and districts. These are called integration grants and are nonrecurrent for the same units. The commission judges the awarding of a grant on the basis of whether the funds to support the new program can be raised locally and also if the units requesting the grant can carry on a strengthened program after the initial help from the state grant. There is also an establishment grant for a new library.

Requests for an establishment grant are reviewed on the basis of what funds are available locally; the people and area to be served, and whether the library will be able to support the service adequately in the future. An operating library may request an establishment grant to initiate service to a new area which has requested such service and has legally become part of the system. The criteria used to review re-
quests for an establishment grant for a new library are also used in this instance. Both types of establishment grants are nonrecurring.

State grants-in-aid for public libraries in the United States are few and generally ineffective. The trend can be but faintly discerned. Many of the state aid programs center around the county as the library service unit. By means of various types of grants—establishment, annual book, personnel, incentive grants to enable several counties to cooperate and work together—the state has attempted to enhance local responsibility.

But progress has been slow, by and large, with the South responding more dynamically than other sections in the country. New York's substantial program and New Jersey's recently enacted grant program have given the Middle Atlantic region a better trend toward realization of system objectives. Stumbling blocks of no mean proportion yet remain in the attitudes of boards of supervisors of county governments.26

Research and study at present seem to indicate that “county and regional units are gaining even less financial support than city and town libraries.” 26 It is also thought that the change in level of support from town or district or other division of a county, to county support is not commensurate with the changes in the need for information and continuity of education affecting the daily life of the citizen in today's complex world. The vertical trend is more from locality to state level than to some intermediate level.

The trend that can be discerned is that library leaders are seeking the appropriate partnership of state and locality in building cooperative systems of library service. Such systems protect the right of the individual library and delimits the county as a component part of the system rather than the limiting and fragmentation of the library service role it tends to exert.
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STATE GRANTS-IN-AID TO PUBLIC LIBRARIES are being provided in twenty-five of the fifty states in 1960. As has been apparent in earlier discussion, the grant-in-aid patterns vary from state to state in method of distribution and amount. In common, the grant-in-aid programs are administered by a state library agency which is either a part of the state department of education or an independent state department. Frequently the agency or the grant-in-aid program is governed by a board or commission having certain quasi-legislative powers conferred upon it by law.

During the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century state functions were greatly expanded. As new functions were added and old ones expanded, both at the state and federal level, boards and commissions were developed to provide administrative machinery to carry out the increasing functions of government. With the growth and complexity of government, legislative bodies were faced with the need to delegate a great deal of “subordinate legislative power” or rule-making power to administrative bodies.¹

Reasons for this development of delegated or administrative law, i.e. rules and regulations, Julius Cohen, professor of law, Rutgers University, has summarized as “(1) the requirement of greater flexibility in the details of a law than the legislature can supply . . . (2) the need for freeing the legislature from concern with details in the initial consideration of a law . . . (3) the desirability of expert determination of numerous matters involved in modern legislative schemes such as those affecting . . . public services of many sorts. . . .” ²

As outline legislation supplanted the older detailed legislation, administrative agencies were faced with an increasing responsibility in
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the formulation and promulgation of rules and regulations having the force and effect of law. Furthermore the rules had to be applied and interpreted by the responsible agency.

With the development of outline legislation difficulties arose at both the federal and the state levels. Rules were not consistently made available to the public, sometimes their existence was ignored by the agency which had promulgated them. To overcome laxity in publication of rules and regulations, legislation was adopted by the federal government and various states during the nineteen-thirties, and in subsequent years, requiring central filing or publishing of rules and regulations. Massachusetts in 1932 was the first state to adopt legislation requiring central filing of rules and regulations. In 1937, South Carolina became the first state to require publication. In 1951, twenty states required central filing of rules and regulations, fifteen states required publication, and four, including Michigan, required legislative approval.³

F. E. Cooper, professor of law, University of Michigan, in Administrative Agencies and the Courts has discussed in considerable detail the practices and procedures involved in the making of rules. His definitions and distinctions should be helpful to state library agencies facing the task of promulgating rules for administration of grants-in-aid. Like other legal authorities, he appears to use “rule” and “regulation” interchangeably. According to the dictionary, the two words are practically synonomous. Regulations may be conceded to be quasi-legislative, or binding like laws, while rules tend to be interpretative, if one follows the thinking of another legal authority, Reginald Parker, professor of law at Willamette University, in his study of Administrative Law.⁴

Cooper makes an interesting distinction between interpretative regulations and legislative regulations. “If the statute provides a sanction for violation of the regulation, and it is written pursuant to specific delegation of power, then the regulation is legislative. If . . . the statute does not provide for such delegation of legislative power, and the regulation represents only the agency’s opinion as to what the statute requires, then the regulation is interpretative.”⁵ “Sanction” is used by Cooper with its legal definition: “The detriment, loss of reward, or other coercive intervention, annexed to a violation of a law as a means of enforcing the law.”⁶ In addition to the two categories, legislative and interpretative, Cooper cites procedural rules as a third. He subdivides “interpretative” into three groups, e.g., (1) A regula-

[ 84 ]
Rules, Regulations, and Codes Covering Grants-in-Aid
tion which requires filing of reports, keeping of records. (2) Agency
interpretation or definition of statutory interpretation which the
agency will follow. (3) Discretionary policies of agency—i.e., setting
standards, granting certificates.7

The statutes authorizing grants-in-aid to public libraries in certain
states authorize the state agency, state library board, commission or
a commissioner to set standards or certification requirements and re-
quire compliance with standards or certification requirements for re-
ceipt of state aid. Since noncompliance with standards or certification
requirements results in a loss of state aid, the statute provides a sanc-
tion for violation or noncompliance. In such instances it would appear
that regulation setting standards or listing certification requirements
would be considered legislative rather than interpretative.

Some examples of statutes which authorize sanctions for noncom-
pliance with standards or requirements as set up in rules and regula-
tions authorized by law follow:

1. New Jersey. State Library Aid Act, 1959. (Chapter 177) (Sec.)
12. Regulations. In order to participate in any apportionment
made according to the provisions of this act, municipalities and
counties shall comply with the regulations and standards which
have been . . . prescribed by law or formulated by the Com-
missoner of Education subject to the approval of the State Board
of Education. . . . The Commissioner of Education is hereby
authorized to withhold all or part of such apportionment for
failure to comply with any such regulation or standard.8

2. New York. Education Law Section 272 (paragraph) 8. Each li-
brary system receiving state aid pursuant to this section and
section two hundred seventy-three shall furnish such information
regarding its library service as the commissioner may from time
to time require to discharge his duties under such sections. The
commissioner may at any time revoke his approval of a plan of
library service if he finds that the library system operating under
such plan no longer conforms to the provisions of this section or
the regulations promulgated by the commissioner hereunder.
. . .9

Any public library in order to receive an apportionment of funds
appropriated by the state for aid to public libraries must conform
to such certification requirements for personnel as are or may be
established by the state board for libraries. . . .10

To differentiate between rules and regulations which would be
classed as legislative because the statute authorizing them provides a sanction for violation or noncompliance, and interpretative or procedural rules examples are listed below, which in the judgment of the author belong in the latter two categories:

Examples of interpretative rules:

1. Kentucky. Public Library Service Commission. Regulations. PLSC: 5. “Local Agency. (1) The local agency administering a public library program supported by grant from the Public Library Service Fund may be any of the following:
   (1) A county library board;
   (2) A municipal library board within the county which is willing to assume the responsibility for county-wide public library service under contract with the Fiscal Court;
   (3) An institution of learning within the county which is willing to contract with the Fiscal Court for county-wide public library service.”

2. Michigan. State Board for Libraries. Rules and regulations. 5. Standards for public libraries. R 397.51. Definitions. The term “public library” includes any and all libraries maintained in whole or in part by any county, township, school district, city, village, or other municipality, or by two or more such governmental units or local communities, as defined in the state aid for public libraries law.
   The term “staff” includes professional, clerical, and full time pages but not part time pages nor those employees doing building or janitorial work. . . .

Examples of procedural rules:

1. Kentucky. Public Library Service Commission. Regulations. PLSC: 6. Applications. To qualify for a grant from the Public Library Service Fund, a county must file an official application on the forms provided by the Public Library Service Commission. Applications shall be filed for each year during the month of October 1-31. The application must be accompanied by a brief outline of the proposed plan (bookmobiles, branches, stations, etc.) for the distribution and use of books throughout the county.

2. Michigan. State Board for Libraries. Rules and regulations. R. 397.2 Rule No. 1.2. Whenever a public library or a governmental unit agrees to receive any or all of its library service through a second library, the board of trustees of the public library or the governing body of the governmental unit receiving
such service may waive any or all allocations of state aid funds in favor of the library giving the service. A copy of the agreement shall be filed with the state board for libraries. Thereafter, and as long as the agreement is in force, for purposes of allocating state aid funds, the population of the library or governmental unit receiving such library service shall be added to the population of the governmental unit supporting the library giving the service.\(^{14}\)

Having discussed the three major categories or rules, interpretative, procedural, and legislative, attention should be given to rule making practices. Cooper has stated that good administration requires an agency to obtain and consider all comments of interested parties as to contents of proposed rules.\(^ {15}\) As mentioned earlier, several states have provided for publication of a state code which includes rules and regulations of all agencies, assuring that rules are available after promulgation. In Michigan, for example, the Administrative Code Act (88, 1943) provides for the making, filing, compiling, codification and publication of the rules and regulations of state officers, boards, departments, agencies, and commissions. A further axiom suggested by Cooper may be common practice of state agencies: “Legislation providing for the deferred effectiveness of regulations having statutory effect . . . is to be recommended.” \(^ {16}\) Financial requirements, standards of personnel and similar regulations need to be made known in advance of the effective date in order that governmental units, library boards and librarians may make plans to meet them. This is particularly needful if requirements have been upgraded.

Suggested steps to be followed in rule making are:

1. Announcement of intent to make rule.
2. Fact gathering.
2a. Conference or hearing of interested parties.
3. Publication of tentative draft.
4. Public examination and criticism.

Frequently, state library association committees or special committees involving laymen as well as professional librarians have been involved in studies which have formed the groundwork for drafting of state aid legislation, library standards and certification requirements. The actual formulation of the text of a law or rule has been the ultimate responsibility of the agency. Rules and regulations must conform to the statutory authority granted in the law. For this reason,
statutes setting forth rule making procedures may require approval of rules and regulations by a state legal department or officer, e.g. approval of the attorney general, and, in certain states rules are reviewed and approved by the legislature.

Examination of state aid laws of various states shows that at least eighteen authorize rules and regulations, requirements or standards. Three laws apparently contain no such requirement. In two the wording suggests that standards or rules and regulations are permissive but the authorization is not definite.

Although not all states require publication of rules and regulations, it appears to be a desirable practice. Publication should insure that rules and regulations are more readily available to affected parties, in this instance libraries and librarians. Since the rules and regulations frequently detail conditions under which libraries may receive state aid grants, knowledge and compliance by librarians and library boards is desirable and, to some degree, may be dependent upon ease of access to the information.

Responsibility for rule making is allocated by statute to the agency responsible for distribution of grants-in-aid. In some instances the agency is a state library board or commission, in others a state board of education or commissioner of education is responsible. Kentucky has two rule making bodies sharing responsibility for requirements on which grants are dependent. The Kentucky Public Library Service Commission has promulgated rules applying to grants-in-aid. This commission in its rules delegates responsibility for certification qualifications to the State Board for the Certification of Librarians. Rules and regulations of both the Commission and the Board for Certification are published in the state official code. It would appear that a single board or commission and one body of rules would simplify day-to-day administration of both the certification program and grants-in-aid.

One important result of grants-in-aid programs has been improvement in quality of public library service. This is particularly true where mandatory certification is embodied in the statute and public library standards are authorized as criteria for receipt of grants. One advantage of inclusion of certification requirements and standards in rules and regulations, rather than in laws, is the greater flexibility

which can be embodied in rules. Adjustment or alteration of rules, while not a simple process, should be easier to accomplish than amendment of a law. A very important function of rules is the interpretation of the statutes by the responsible agency. While the agency may not interpret the statute in a manner inconsistent with the legislation, it can define terms in the manner in which they will be applied under the statute and detail procedures which the agency will follow in administering the grant program. Rules setting forth standards for public libraries are only effective if the grants-in-aid, authorized by the statute, offer sufficient incentive to meet standards. Orderly procedures which are detailed in regulations serve to simplify the administration of a grant program and improve the climate of acceptance of “state control” which is inherent in any program designed to upgrade and equalize a public service.
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The Relationship of State and National Library Service Standards to Grants-In-Aid Programs

CARMA RUSSELL ZIMMERMAN

What is the relationship between financial grants-in-aid from state and national governments to local public libraries, and state and national library service standards? Does a cash grant-in-aid from a higher level of government to a local government for public library purposes affect the service standards of the local public library? Twenty-five of the fifty states had enacted state grants-in-aid to local public libraries in January 1960, according to a tabulation by American Library Association headquarters for The Book of the States. This number did not include Hawaii, where all support of all public libraries has since the beginning of the public libraries come from the territorial—now state—government. As Hawaii has complete coverage of all its area by county public library systems, the number of states with grants-in-aid to public libraries should, perhaps, for this discussion, be twenty-six, or one more than half of all of the states. The tabulation for The Book of the States excludes all federal grants for public library service.

We are not here discussing “state aid” in the form of services, as contrasted to “state grants-in-aid” which are cash financial grants, with or without conditions or standards for receiving such grants to public libraries. Service aid is covered more fully in another chapter of this issue of Library Trends. Such services have, of course, played some part in the establishment and development of much local public library service which exists in localities. All modern local public library standards call for continuance and strengthening of state library services to local libraries, appropriate to the need.

With one more than half of all the United States having state financial grants-in-aid to or state support of local public libraries, it should be possible to learn what effects these grants have had and are having upon local public library service standards. It should also
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be possible to answer the question, "What is the effect of state grants-in-aid on local control?" Up to the present time, however, there has been no comprehensive, nationwide study of these effects. Individual states have made some attempts to evaluate the effects of their own grants-in-aid programs. The American Association of State Libraries has, since its establishment as a division of the American Library Association in 1958, had as its major program objective the securing of a nationwide survey of the state library agencies in the fifty states to determine the present status of state library activities. From this survey which will begin in 1961 under a grant from the Carnegie Foundation standards are to be developed for state library service which would supplement the present standards for public libraries. From this survey, and the subsequent development of standards for state library service, it is expected that, in addition to other accomplishments, the survey's examination of the functions, services, and governmental-legal-administrative settings and organization of state library agencies will reveal more factual and documented information than is now available as to the relationships between state (and, probably, also, federal) grants-in-aid to public libraries, and the effects of such grants on local library service standards and local control.

Meanwhile, some observations of a general nature may be made as to these relationships and effects. The Public Library Inquiry general report, a decade ago, opened its chapter on "Library Financial Support" with the sentence, "The quality of public library services depends upon the amount of financial support." The Inquiry's discussion of state financial aid to libraries pointed out that the amount of state financial participation in support of local public libraries then varied considerably in different regions of the country, and did not exist in some regions. Study of the tabulation which follows shows that this variation still exists.

A review of state financial grants-in-aid shows that the early forms of the grants were simply uniform amounts of $50 to $100 given to each existing library. Few if any requirements were made for a library to qualify for the grants. It is not recorded whether these grants served as enough incentive to localities to establish libraries where none existed. While these small "flat" grants obviously added, at least slightly, to the financial support of existing local libraries, they were of no fiscal significance for the building of a modern local library service. Nor were they used to establish minimum public library service standards of any importance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of agency and functions</th>
<th>Budget Period</th>
<th>Appropriation for agency</th>
<th>Appropriation for grants-in-aid to public libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Public Library Service Division, State of Alabama 1, 2, 18</td>
<td>1959–61</td>
<td>$359,390</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Department of Library Service 1, 2</td>
<td>1957–59</td>
<td>41,212</td>
<td>$8,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Department of Library and Archives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16</td>
<td>1950–60</td>
<td>121,157</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas Library Commission 1, 2, 14+</td>
<td>1950–60</td>
<td>226,103.60</td>
<td>130,453.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 14+, 16, 18</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>759,133</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 11</td>
<td>1958–59</td>
<td>96,102</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Bureau of Library Services, Conn. State Dept. of Education 1 in part, 2, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>1959–61</td>
<td>234,034</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>State Library Commission 1, 2</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>51,970</td>
<td>10,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 14+</td>
<td>1958–59</td>
<td>148,976</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Div. of Instructional Materials and Library Service,</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>$1,440,327</td>
<td>1,302,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>No state library agency (Library system being surveyed; all public library support comes from the state.)</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>1,440,327</td>
<td>1,302,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 14</td>
<td>1957–59</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 11, 14</td>
<td>1957–59</td>
<td>1,564,290</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 14+, 15, 16</td>
<td>1959–61</td>
<td>668,498</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>State Traveling Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 4, 11, 14</td>
<td>1959–61</td>
<td>69,100</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Traveling Libraries Commission 2, 14, 14+</td>
<td>1958–59</td>
<td>61,100</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Library Extension Division 1, 2</td>
<td>1958–59</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 4, 8, 10</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>284,894 d</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>347,963</td>
<td>28,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Division of Library Extension 1, 2, 11</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>129,556</td>
<td>318,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Division of Library Extension 1, 2, 10, 14+, 15</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>132,908 d</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 5, 6, 8, 14</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>551,174</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Library Division, State Dept. of Educ. 1, 2, 12, 14</td>
<td>1958–59</td>
<td>167,102</td>
<td>135,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Library Commission 1, 2, 14</td>
<td>1958–60</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>49,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 11, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>1959–61</td>
<td>323,500</td>
<td>515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>State Library Extension Commission 1, 2, 14</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>78,544</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Public Library Commission 1, 2, 8, 14+</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 4, 5, 14+</td>
<td>1957–59</td>
<td>178,558.91</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14</td>
<td>1959–60</td>
<td>178,558.91</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Functions Provided</td>
<td>Budget Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Div. of the State Library, Archives and History, State Department of Education 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 14+, 15, 16</td>
<td>1959-60 350,293 e 400,000 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>State Library Commission 1, 2</td>
<td>1958-59 179,000 20,000 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Library Extension Division, State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 14+, 17, 19</td>
<td>1958-59 1,390,610 d 3,383,935.04 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 4 in part, 8, 14+</td>
<td>1959-60 121,375 456,448 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>State Library Commission 1, 2, 12, 14+</td>
<td>1959-61 109,930 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 6, 7, 14</td>
<td>1959-61 870,468 543,600 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 4, 5, 6, 8, 14+</td>
<td>1958-59 400,000 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 14+, 15, 16, 17</td>
<td>1959-61 876,760 169,886 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11</td>
<td>1957-59 505,000 180,000 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13</td>
<td>1959-60 123,486 20,000 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>State Library Board 1, 2, 14+</td>
<td>1958-59 104,572 65,755 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>State Library Commission 1, 2, 4, 14</td>
<td>1959-61 116,000 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>State Library and Archives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>1959-61 1,150,000 d none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14</td>
<td>1959-61 201,261 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>1959-61 125,000 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Free Public Library Commission 1, 2, 14</td>
<td>1959-61 284,246 5,000 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14</td>
<td>1958-59 603,565 150,000 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 3 in part, 4, 6, 14</td>
<td>1959-61 672,635 50,000 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Library Commission 1, 2</td>
<td>1958-59 99,000 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Free Library Commission 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15</td>
<td>1959 273,551 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>State Library 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11</td>
<td>1959-61 79,643 none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by the American Library Association

The functions of state library agencies reported are:

1. General library service, including reference.
2. Library Extension, including traveling libraries and/or establishing public libraries.
3. Archives and History.
4. Legislative reference.
5. Law Library.
7. Genealogy.
8. Service to the blind.
9. Special Education library.
11. Service to correctional institutions.
12. Special service to schools.
15. Placement service.
17. Science and Technology.
18. Service to State Employees.
20. Medical library.

a. Grants-in-aid are included in the agency appropriation.
b. Grants-in-aid are not included in agency appropriation.
c. Includes funds for books and locally employed librarians.
d. Includes funds for state supported county (or parish) and regional library demonstrations or centers.
e. Does not include building maintenance, janitors, etc.
The next general form of state grants-in-aid in a number of states had as its direct purpose encouragement toward the formation of larger local units of library service. This type of grant is in two forms: an establishment grant given to county or multi-county libraries at the time when larger units are formed to help provide the initial stock of books and other equipment; and annual grants thereafter for partial payment of operating expenses. Thus began the conditional type of state grants-in-aid to public libraries. A typical condition required the local library to meet minimum standards for their personnel. In some cases, formulas were and are used to assist poorer areas financially without pauperizing them.

An example of a state grants-in-aid program representative of the transitional period between the earlier type of grants and the later ones carrying sufficient amounts of money to be a substantial factor in creating strong local library systems capable of achieving minimum modern standards is that of Washington State. Washington began state grants-in-aid to public libraries in 1945 when the state legislature voted an appropriation for this purpose, implementing what is probably the briefest statute governing any state grant-in-aid program: “In order to provide, expand, enlarge and equalize public library facilities and services and thereby promote and stimulate interest in reading throughout the entire state, the State Library Commission shall, from time to time, make studies and surveys of public library needs and adopt rules and regulations for the allocation of money to public libraries to be expended on vouchers approved by the Commission.”

The regulations which the commission subsequently adopted included provision for establishment grants of several thousands of dollars, to be granted only once to each county that voted for the establishment of a county library. In elections immediately prior and immediately after the enactment of the state grants-in-aid program, fourteen Washington counties voted for the first time to establish county libraries. It is not known to what degree the availability or expected availability of state establishment grants influenced the majority of voters in these fourteen counties to vote for a county library. It is certain that the grants enabled the new libraries to organize on a more substantial scale and provide a better quality of public library service than would have been possible otherwise. For example, many of the new county libraries immediately purchased bookmobiles for rural and suburban service, with the state funds.
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Other regulations of the Washington State Library Commission provided continuing annual grants of much smaller amounts, based on a few cents per capita, with special grants to areas of unusually low assessed valuations, to all existing public libraries. Conditions for these grants included evidence of compliance with a state law passed in 1935, which took effect two years later, requiring that positions classified as professional be filled by professional librarians, in all public libraries serving over 4,000 population and in every library operated by the state or under its authority, including libraries of institutions of higher learning, except state and county law libraries.

Another condition made it necessary for the existing library to keep its annual tax appropriation up to an amount not lower than the average of the previous three years, not including amounts received from state grants-in-aid in the previous three years. These per capita grants, while fairly substantial for cities or counties of high population, frequently amounted, for libraries in areas of very low population, to less than $50 or $100. While these small amounts could do little to raise the standards of the individual local public library, several towns used the grants to apply toward the cost of contracting with county library districts for county library service, thus bringing to the towns the advantages of the wider tax and population base.

In 1948-49, Washington State, faced with the need to make the most effective use of a reduced total amount of money for state grants-in-aid to public libraries, abandoned this latter type of per capita grant. The commission voted to use all of the aid funds either for establishment grants available only to larger units of library service that might be voted in additional counties, or for “integration grants” to larger units that might be created when existing libraries contracted together to form a larger library system.

The more recent systems of state grants-in-aid have as their clear objective the stimulation of the development of larger local public library systems having a staff and a book stock adequate for modern library service meeting certain basic, minimum standards. The most extensive such system is that which began in 1950 in New York State, for which in April 1960 the New York State Legislature appropriated six million one hundred thousand dollars. New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller signed the new library aid bill on April 10, 1960, to take effect immediately. A full statement of its provisions is given in Morin’s article elsewhere in this issue.

In 1950, the “Report of the Governor’s Committee on Library Aid”
in New York State, during the administration of Governor Thomas E. Dewey, announced a definite change of policy in the use of state grants, in the following words:

The Committee is of the opinion that the chief support of libraries should continue to be derived from local revenues. It feels, however, that sufficient state aid should be provided to encourage and assist the people of counties in the development of library systems which will serve residents of the State now deprived of library service and the improvement of the service to other areas where service now fails to meet minimum standards.

The State has provided financial assistance to libraries for well over a century but the basis for payment of this assistance has not been reviewed or changed in more than fifty years. It now bears no relationship to the size of a library, the number of people served or the quality of service provided. Neither does it provide an adequate incentive to the improvement of library services in a given area or to their extension to areas now without service.

New York State still retains in its now expanded state grants-in-aid program the system of small grants to the decreasing number of public libraries which do not yet qualify for the much larger grants available under the 1950 and 1958 laws.

The generally low standards of public library service existing throughout most of the United States were officially recognized by Congress in 1956 when it passed the Library Services Act. The purpose of this Act is to assist financially (maximum possible annual appropriation, $7,500,000) the establishment and improvement of public library services in rural areas of the states and territories. Even with the token programs of small flat grants of a few states, plus the later conditional types of grants of a few more states, added to exclusively local support of public libraries and state library services other than cash grants, these standards were the best that localities had demonstrated themselves thus far able to achieve.

Besides the large areas with substandard existing public library service, the device of organizing public libraries only by local initiative and control had, up to ten years ago, resulted in the creation of public libraries of any kind in less than half the municipalities of the country. At the same time, no public library of any kind was available to more than one third of the nation’s population that lived outside cities, towns, and villages, in unincorporated rural territory. Because of this latter condition, it is obvious why Congress chose to make the benefits
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Such evaluations as have so far been made of the effects of this federal grants-in-aid program point conclusively to improved standards of public library service in the limited areas of the United States that have been affected by the approximately twenty million dollars that have been allocated to states and territories up to April 1960.

Fifty-one senators, as of mid-April 1960, have cosponsored a single bill in the current 1960 session of Congress to extend the Library Services Act for another five-year period. Fifty-two House bills have been introduced by Congressmen from thirty-three states for the same purpose. Some bills call for raising the population definition of “rural” from 10,000 to 25,000. It must be supposed that only reports from localities of the beneficial effects of this relatively small expenditure of federal funds could account for the widespread support of the further extension of this program. There are numerous additional evidences in each state that this program of grants-in-aid is succeeding well, within its financial and other limitations, in improving local and state standards of public library service.

This federal money is all administered by state library agencies, and once the state’s own plan for the use of the money is approved by the federal government as being within the purposes of the law, the money becomes state money and is administered in the same way as other state money. No further federal control has been or can be exerted, except a post audit to insure that none of the funds have been used for other purposes.

The Library Services Act carries its own provision for research to be carried on to determine the effects of the program. Until the research can be done and its results reported in research terms, we shall have to depend upon the voluminous and enthusiastic reports from recipients of the new and improved public library services that are resulting, to evaluate the effects of the program.

Some knowledge of the way current, modern state and national public library standards have developed is necessary to an understanding of their relationship to grants-in-aid programs. Prior to 1943 little existed that could be recognized as a body of standards for public library service. In that year, the American Library Association published Post-War Standards, which, among other more useful standards, set up some per capita dollar standards for financial sup-
port. These were in practice too literally interpreted and applied to all sizes of populations served, regardless of the total amount of money the library received. Considerable misunderstanding about minimum standards still exists in smaller communities that appropriate relatively higher amounts per capita for public library service than communities with larger populations and lower per capita appropriations. The misunderstanding centers around a belief that because their per capita support is higher than that of cities and counties with larger populations, their standards of library service must necessarily be higher. This belief persists despite the lack of many of the elements of a more complete and modern public library service in the "richer" but smaller community.

In 1953, the California Library Association and California State Library together developed and adopted Public Library Service Standards for California Public Libraries, based, primarily, upon a broadened concept of the educational functions, the quality of the performance of the services of the public library, and the way in which those services are organized. The California standards recognized that minimum standards for such functions and services are usually attainable at reasonable cost only when the population and tax bases of the library or library system are sufficient to yield a total amount of annual support that will pay for a modern public library program with minimum standards. The concept was adopted that costs should be revised with the changing value of the dollar.

By 1956, the American Library Association had amplified all existing public library standards and published Public Library Service, A Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards. A separate statement of 1956 costs was published, as was done in 1953 by the California Library Association, and the national statement of costs was revised in 1959.

One unique feature of the 1956 A.L.A. public library standards is that they differentiate clearly between qualitative and quantitative standards; statements that describe quality of services and other elements of a modern public library program are set out as "guiding principles," basic to the establishment of standards. "They are neither objective, concrete, nor statistical. As principles, they require interpretation when applied to individual libraries..." On the other hand, under the guiding principles, are stated, in quantitative terms, the actual, measurable standards, 191 of them! Both principles and stand-
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ards must be used together in measuring an existing library and in planning a public library program. Only such quantitative standards were included as have a direct and positive relation to quality of library facilities and services. “Measures that are quantitative but not, in fact, qualitative have been excluded.”

Neither the current A.L.A. public library standards nor the standards that preceded them were conceived or built as tools for the administration or management of state grants-in-aid programs. With the recent growth of modern state grants-in-aid programs, designed to stimulate the development of larger library systems capable of providing services of minimum standards, the state of New York has selected a few standards, many fewer than are embodied in the current A.L.A. standards, which it uses as the minimum “conditions” that localities and local libraries must meet in order to qualify for state grants. These conditions were simplified and made fewer by an amendment to the 1958 New York State grants-in-aid law.

New York also incorporated into the 1958 amendments to its library aid law the “principle of gradualism,” to a greater degree than this principle had been present in the 1950 enactments. For example, under the 1958 New York State law, full approval is not given to a library system unless it will serve at least 200,000 people or 4,000 square miles of area. Provisional approval may be given to a library system which will serve at least 50,000 persons provided the area includes three or more political subdivisions and provided further that a satisfactory plan is submitted for expansion of service during the ensuing five-year period.

Although the libraries of New York City qualified as library systems under the 1950 law, it was not until the 1958 amended law that there was a rapid growth of systems serving rural populations. While the population served by library systems increased only 5.4 per cent from 1950 to 1958, it has increased 17.6 per cent from 1958 through 1959. Eighty-three per cent of the people are now served by library systems, demonstrating that the new legislation, based on the use of a few basically important and administrable minimum standards appears effectively to meet the needs of both urban and rural areas.

The New York State Library estimates that service from library systems to all the people of New York State will approach 100 per cent in 1965. At that time, they estimate that the total cost, with all systems qualifying for full financial grants-in-aid, will reach its peak and level
off, varying primarily with changing dollar values, and related costs of services. No more than 20 per cent of the total cost of New York public library expenses can by law be supplied by the state.

The California Public Library Commission, in state grants-in-aid legislation proposed to the California State Legislature in 1959, but not passed, also proposed the establishment of several minimum standards as conditions to the receipt of grants. These standards would have required the adoption by each system, and by each constituent member, of a policy statement of objectives and a statement of policies for the selection of materials; annual addition of minimum stated numbers of current adult and juvenile titles of books and periodicals; the central processing of books and similar library materials; the separation of routine clerical work from professional work, adoption of a position classification plan with at least three levels of professional and three levels of nonprofessional positions in the entire system, a pay plan; certain management aids such as an organization chart and an estimated program of major work to be accomplished annually; a minimum current population figure in the system area of 100,000 or more persons; or, if the population density is less than thirty per square mile in the entire service area, an area of 3,000 or more square miles; and provision for a local library tax expenditure for current operating purposes equal to the proceeds of 95 per cent of a tax of ten cents per hundred dollars of assessed valuation.

Common characteristics of the recent actual (New York) and proposed (California, Pennsylvania, and others) state grants-in-aid programs are that they are based on the belief that the quality of library service which an individual enjoys is determined by the range and depth of the book collections to which he has access, more than by any other factor, and that smaller libraries can buy scarcely more than a token few of the 12,000 or more book titles published annually in the United States alone. They recognize, further, the need for improved administrative, management, and professional skills in the operation of all libraries.

What is the effect of state grants-in-aid on local control? Obviously, there can be very little effect one way or the other when the amount of money involved is negligible, as in early programs, and in some present programs. In New York State where the largest amount of money is devoted annually to state grants-in-aid to public libraries in any state, the amount of local money spent for local public libraries has increased. Local financial responsibility is still the bulwark
Relationship of Library Service Standards to Grants-in-Aid

of public library service in New York's and other state and federal grants-in-aid programs. The level of government that provides the largest percentage of the total support controls the institution.

In a good program the control of book selection and the selection of all other library materials rests and should rest exclusively with the local library; the state's role in book selection is to stay out of the field altogether as far as local libraries are concerned. This leaves all important controls—those over personnel and the selection and provision of materials—at the local level; there is centralization only of such mechanical and administrative processes as will promote efficiency and economy.

To realize the good library service that could exist, one must either have experienced good library service, or must have a creative imagination that can develop the situation from one's own thoughts. Almost unimaginable inequalities of library service exist throughout the United States. Those people who, in some part of the country, have experienced good library service become the most persistent developers of the better library service when they move to areas that are backward in library development. Those who have creative imaginations and see in their minds' eyes what library service could be, beyond the nonexistent or inadequate service available to them, also become developers of good library service.

The leaders and responsible people in a community where poor or no library services exist have usually not studied modern public library standards, but they are developing or failing to develop libraries just as surely by standards as if they held the A.L.A. public library standards up to their communities as a measuring stick. The standards in the one instance are the best that they have experienced, and, in the other case, the best that they have imagined. With these standards, however good or poor, in mind, the plan for library service is developed. There is then the necessity to "price it out" to see whether the revenue potential in the community can pay for it. If the present financial ability of the community cannot afford the modern, minimum standards, the next question is, how can the community get library service of minimum standard?

There is little doubt that most local governments could do a much better job than they are now doing in the establishment and support of public library service; the fact is that most local governments have not provided adequate support. Where even rather small incentives of cash grants, with reasonable but not authoritarian conditions for their
receipt, have been provided by state and/or federal governments, local governments are making very rapid strides in the provision of minimum standard services. In general, where these grants are absent, public library service is standing still, and, in areas of great population increases, slipping backward. The “outside” funds make it possible for two or more local governments or libraries to “get over the hump” of taking the practical steps that make it possible to centralize the mechanical and certain administrative functions at the local and regional level, and perform them more efficiently.

Relatively few legal barriers exist in any state—in many states there are none—to prevent two or more library jurisdictions from “cooperating” to improve public library service. But until some outside funds are available, the record shows that almost no “pairs” or other groups of political subdivisions or library jurisdictions can or will take the complicated and difficult-to-figure-out-who-should-pay-for-what steps that result in reorganization and improvement. Meanwhile, the people who pay for whatever library service does exist go without the better service they could have if relatively small outside sums, collected from the whole state, were available on a rational basis for local library improvement.

Where state grants-in-aid programs exist, providing significant amounts of money but no more than approximately 20 per cent of the total, the question of state infringement on local autonomy and control of public libraries has virtually ceased to exist. This is not to say that local fears of control by higher levels of government suddenly dissolve into sweet reasonableness when a modern state grants-in-aid program is adopted. There is very little disagreement as to the desirability and importance of good public libraries. They are accepted as an essential institution in the American way of life. This is in spite of the fact that millions of Americans are without any public library service whatever, or have inadequate library service that meets no minimum standards. It would be the consensus of almost any group of present-day citizens that all of the people of the United States are entitled at least to minimum quality public library service, that public libraries should be well-supported, and that most people would not want to live in a country where good, free, public library service was not available—even if they themselves did not use it! Increasing numbers of progressive citizens would agree that the librarian’s function is not simply a “custodial” one, and that there is more to the work of a professional librarian than serving only as a “keeper of books.”
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From these points of probable agreement on, however, agreement would end in these citizen groups. When the discussion develops further into the quantity, the quality, the organization, and the financial support of public library service, agreement ends, and differences of opinion are often strong.

The “political” factor of local autonomy, as well as an imagined greater tax cost than could ever be required if the public library service were organized efficiently to meet the needs of all the people, are the two factors that give rise to the greatest disagreement, emotion, and fear. These can be allayed, at least in part, by more information as to the actual workings of existing cooperative support of public library service by different levels of government. A number of factors can contribute to acceptance of such cooperative plans. The provisions of the law can be designed to secure greater acceptance, by placing limits upon the percentage of the total support each level contributes, so as to show clearly where control will be; the conditions for grants should be positively related to quality of service in such ways that reasonable people can understand and accept them. The conditions should be as few as possible in numbers. The plans for local library systems should be developed by localities to fit local needs, within a very broad and flexible legal framework, and should contain provision for gradual improvement over a foreseeable period of years.

In the operation of the system plans and the administration of the grants-in-aid programs, the degree of acceptance seems to depend on the confidence and understanding developed by the administrators in dealing with local authorities and the publics served. There is no guarantee that could be written into any program that would insure the absence of all administrative and other frictions. Experience indicates these can be reduced to a minimum under capable administration at all levels. Given a sound law and sufficient funds, the solution to the problems of the intergovernmental relations involved in state grants-in-aid and other library programs depends largely on the sensitivity of the administering personnel to a major working rule of sound administration—direct and perceptive relations with the people served.

Increasing numbers of states have recognized in law their obligation for library service as an educational function of government at all levels, including the state; most states have thus far made only token effort to discharge this obligation. Under present conditions,
money for libraries in most states comes primarily from local property taxes. This means that the local property taxpayer is carrying the load, almost exclusively in his property tax. It is probable that the local property taxpayer has in most areas been taxed about as heavily as an equitable or progressive taxation system can possibly tax local property. This means that numerous localities are simply not going to have enough money to run libraries of anything like minimum standards if they are limited to local property taxes.
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Relationship of Local, State, and Federal Participation in Public Library Development

LAWRENCE L. DURISCH

The Library Services Act of 1956 marks an important forward step in library development. In signing the bill passed by the 84th Congress, President Eisenhower noted that the federal program it established represents an effort to stimulate the states and local communities to increase library services, particularly library services available to rural Americans. The legislation, thus based on the concept of complementary local, state, and federal responsibility, is the product of long evolution in the library field. The provisions of the Library Services Act and the experience under it to date provide a starting point for a brief consideration of cooperation which has developed among levels of government in the public library field.

The general term, "intergovernmental relations," it has been pointed out, was not found in the vocabulary of American political science until the twentieth century. Earlier discussion of intergovernmental affairs was chiefly in terms of constitutions and statutes and narrow analyses of specific rights and privileges of the various levels. Only within the last generation has there been any extended examination of intergovernmental relationships with reference to broad matters of public policy, economics, financial responsibility, and administration. The library field is no exception; not until comparatively recently have both state-local and federal-state relations been identified as major considerations in library development. In April 1953, Paul Howard, writing in Library Trends, identified a series of activities which indicated an acceleration of federal and state interest in library extension, but concluded, "It is generally accepted as a historical fact that public library development in the United States has been, up to now, predominantly local." 2

Mr. Durisch is Public Administration Analyst, Tennessee Valley Authority.
Standards for the evaluation and development of public libraries published by the American Library Association in 1956 were based on the recognition that the plan or structure of development must be built up from the local community. Illustrative of the recognition the report gives to shared responsibility for the tasks ahead are the following:

The public library should be an integral part of general local government.

In each state a program of supplementary library service must be maintained at the state level to back up separate libraries and library systems throughout the state.

The Federal Government should support at the national level a program which supplements and stimulates library facilities of the states.

The basis of the interest of the national government in education generally was well established by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The commission quoted with approval President James Madison: "A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both." The commission, however, felt that there was nothing incompatible between strong national interest in an educated citizenry and the tradition of leaving primary responsibility for general public education to the states. The commission recognized the importance of incidental federal activities in support of education, but did not favor a general grants-in-aid program.

The Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the agency of the federal government established "to promote the cause of education." The office has in general discharged this function through the collection, interpretation, and publication of statistics; through research and publication of its findings, and through rendering consultive and advisory services. Since 1937 the Office of Education has had a special unit, now known as the Library Service Branch, to carry out the above functions in the library field. The role of the Branch has been one of technical services and professional leadership. Much of its research activity has been carried on in cooperation with state library agencies and the American Library Association.

The activities of the Library of Congress should also be noted at this point. It too supplies technical services and active leadership and
its staff has had a part in most programs of public library development. In maintaining the Library of Congress the national government has provided for the entire field an institutional resource of major importance.

The Library Services Act established a system of conditional grants-in-aid. Unconditional grants, with no strings attached, have been used in various federalisms, including our own, but the system which has developed here is one of conditional grants. Both types of grants serve to bridge the gap between disparate state functions and revenues, but the more immediate motive behind conditional grants has been the desire to stimulate state action about matters in which there is a national interest.6

The principal provisions and conditions in the Library Services Act are summarized in a bulletin prepared by the Office of Education.7 These provisions show the governmental relationships established by the Act. Some of the more important summary statements follow:

The determination of the best use of funds, the administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials—insofar as is consistent with the purpose of the act—shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

State plans are formulated by State library administrative agencies in each of the States and submitted for review and approval of the United States Commissioner of Education.

Funds can be used only to provide library service in places defined as rural in the act—places of 10,000 or less according to the latest U.S. Census, although funds may be used by urban libraries to extend public library service to rural areas.

In order to remain eligible for the Federal grant, State expenditures for all public library service must be maintained at least at the same level as in fiscal 1956 and State and local expenditures for rural public library service must also be maintained at the 1956 level.

Federal funds must be matched with State or local funds . . . The programs under the act are State and local programs in which the Federal Government pays part of the cost.

The prohibitions in the Act are few, but definite. Federal funds, for example, may not be used for the purchase of land or erection of buildings. The provisions of the Act as a whole are positive and give evidence of careful planning to encourage action on a wide front. In order to make clear the general intent of the statute in reference to choice of methods and general administrative responsibility, an interpretative section was included, Section 2(b).8 This section makes
it certain that the key decisions establishing a developmental program will be those of the state:

The provisions of this Act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

The Library Services Act authorizes annual appropriations of $7,500,000 for five successive years. The recommendations of the President and the appropriations to date are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Budget Estimate (in millions)</th>
<th>Appropriated (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put the amount available in perspective, it can be noted that federal aid to state and local governments from budget and trust funds reached a grand total of $6.8 billion in the year 1959 and increases in both 1960 and 1961 are assured or in prospect. It should at the same time be emphasized that grants-in-aid are far smaller in amount than direct federal expenditures which can be allocated on a state basis. For example, in the year ended June 30, 1959, the portion of defense expenditures alone which can be traced to states amounted to well over $32 billion.9

On January 14, 1960, Senator Lister Hill introduced a bill in the 86th Congress to amend the Library Services Act by extending for five years the authorization for appropriations. Senator Hill, who introduced the original Act in the 84th Congress, based his request for extension on the record of progress to date and the needs which still exist. Only half of the job will have been done by the end of fiscal 1961. In many states time was needed for necessary legislation and for appropriation of matching funds. Senator Hill placed in the record excerpts from the January 1960 issue of the American Library Association Bulletin, in which J. G. Lorenz summarized the extent
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to which the states have benefited during the first three years of operation of the Act.\textsuperscript{10}

The general picture is of new equipment, increased book stocks, more personnel, the establishment of regional libraries, patterns of interlibrary and even interstate cooperation, research and survey activities, conferences and training, and many other items denoting progress and accomplishment. The Library Services Act is credited with stimulating in one state the first program of state grants to local libraries. A total of fifty-two states and territories are now participating in the program and the gains recorded in each are impressive. The request for an extension of the 1956 Act could thus be made on a record of solid achievement as well as on the basis of continuing needs.

In 1955, appearing before a committee of the House of Representatives, R. D. Leigh stated that the development of strong state library agencies has high priority in the public library program for the years immediately ahead.\textsuperscript{11} This objective can be considered part of the general movement to revitalize state government in the best interest of basic federalism. The states must be able to plan broadly,\textsuperscript{12} and assume leadership in many fields, some traditional and well-established, others now emerging as governmental responsibilities.\textsuperscript{13}

States and local governments are spending well over $50 billion per year. It is estimated that this amount will more than double in the next ten years. This estimate, considered conservative, is based on the established fact that the demand for better public services grows as incomes climb. Population increase in the next decade will be in the age groups that require the most public services—children and old people. Population shifts will mean more expensive services—not only in new or expanded metropolitan areas, but in rural sections in which both farm and nonfarm population must receive consideration. Rural people generally now demand urban-type services, and ways and means of providing them is part of the problem of the adjustment of institutions to population.

Rapid changes in the economy and in the size and distribution of population cause many of the greatest public needs to emerge at the local level. Unfortunately at the same time the traditional sources of revenue available to local governments are proving progressively less adequate. The deterioration in administration of the ad valorem property tax is widely recognized. As a result cities and counties must turn to other tax sources, many of which are not well adapted to use by local jurisdictions. The financial plight of these governments
strongly suggests increased grants-in-aid from the states for such locally administered institutions as the public schools; presumably public library services have an equally valid claim to support from the same source.

Local government often is inefficient, costly and confusing because necessary services are rendered by overlapping and competing agencies. Students of government view with misgiving the number and variety of governmental units in the United States. Over one hundred thousand local governments exist to supply various services. In spite of the need to consolidate counties into larger units, the number has shown no reduction in modern times. In recent years the number of school districts has decreased but other special districts continue to grow in number. A few municipalities merge with others, but new incorporations swell the total. No local governmental organization broad enough to cope with metropolitan problems has appeared, or at least none has been widely approved or accepted. Plans for extending local governmental services to urban fringes and for supplying urban type services in rural areas present many unsolved legal and political problems as well as financial and administrative difficulties. Adjusting service areas in the library field is made difficult by the fact that the structure of local government is relatively inflexible, with unit boundaries not coinciding with natural administrative areas. A state responsibility, usually not well exercised, is to appraise the adequacy of local government organization and to make or encourage needed adjustments.

The legislative and executive branches of state government are faced with the necessity of providing more assistance and guidance for services traditionally local in character. State agencies, having as one of their functions service to municipal, county, and regional libraries are general among the states. In some instances state grants for library service are available to local governments. Equally important has been the unique arrangements for pooling of library resources, often under the guidance and direction of agencies at the state level, where local libraries or groups of libraries share facilities and responsibilities with each other.

Functional consolidation of county and municipal services is sometimes feasible when more comprehensive reorganization is not. Intergovernmental contracts and special working arrangements, some of them quite informal, are increasingly used. State plans and reports of activities under the Library Services Act indicate a great deal of prog-
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ress in the establishment and extension of regional libraries and regional library centers. Contracts between municipalities, between counties, and between counties and municipal governments are in common use in many states. In certain phases of public library service, as, for example, reference and research assistance, intergovernmental cooperation offers opportunity for the widest and most effective use of scarce library resources.

Public Library Service in outlining standards gave due recognition to the factor of cooperation. "The central library and the community libraries in a natural district should function together in a 'system' or affiliation for library service." This type of cooperation is needed in any governmental function for which responsibility is in any degree shared. The development and elaboration of the standard will be difficult as long as the horse and buggy form of organization characterizes the local government structure, but the professional outlook of librarians generally, and a service concept which transcends narrow political boundaries, can facilitate continuing progress in intergovernmental cooperation.

Intergovernmental relations in the library field may appear to be especially complex and difficult. They are of special significance in public library development, in which the center of decision should remain the individual citizen and his local government. The importance of intergovernmental relations in this field is shared with other functions of government—local, state, federal. Frank Bane, chairman of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, recently observed: 15 "I believe we can all agree that world peace and disarmament are and will continue to be the leading problem in the field of international relations. The leading domestic problem is and will continue to be, however, intergovernmental relations and the internal strengthening of our federal system of government for the freedom and well-being of our people in the future."

Bane's belief in the importance of the task of his newly established federal agency will lend perspective to the over-all problem of local, state, and federal participation in public library development.
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Evaluation of State Aid to Public Libraries

CHARLES F. GOSNELL

Many older librarians can recall the Indian medicine man, or the old pitchman, on the downtown street corner with the little box on the tripod, selling the snake oil: “good for man or beast, falling hair or fallen arches” and practically everything in between. To the skeptic, he would boldly assert: “You don’t have to believe me, you don’t have to take my word for it, ladies and gentlemen! This information is printed right on the bottle!”

Librarians can be rightfully proud of the extent of their collections and services, and of their essential nature in modern society. Yet it must be recognized that the modern world wants to see some more basic proof. In these times of “payola,” rigged television shows, fulsome adverstizing, and “image” politicians, real interest in facts and figures should be welcomed. Evaluation is the opportunity to get the library story “printed on the bottle.”

For the purposes of this paper, “evaluation” is defined as the means of getting reliable and specific answers to the question: “Is state aid doing what we said it would or say it will?” Evaluation must be distinguished from survey.

A survey is a general overview. It is not usually the result of long pre-planning. It is generally a one-shot affair, and very broad in coverage. It often springs from a vague feeling that “something needs to be done.” Evaluation implies a more specific purpose and a more specific answer, in a narrower area. An evaluation suggests a checking of assumptions, premises or hypotheses, and assessment of results. It is not quite of the order of research on a controlled experiment, but it has some of these elements of determination of cause and effect. It should be an expression of both responsibility and desire for a check-up. It is useful as a look backward, but more useful as a gauge to advance. Its primary purpose is good management.

The author is New York State Librarian and Assistant Commissioner of Education for Libraries.
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To be successful an evaluation project needs to have some continuity over a period of time. It should be planned for years in advance. It should have an avowed purpose, and commitments, real or implied, from those in authority to accept and act favorably upon the results. It needs wide involvement by people with confidence. The evaluation may be a modest “self-evaluation,” but more often and more successfully it is done by “outside experts.” A good evaluation has a high degree of specificity, yet is more than just a counting or audit. It is a determination of worth, of success or failure in achieving set objectives, and of extent of acceptance by the clientele. The public relations aspect of this evaluation is exceedingly important. It builds up confidence and acceptance of successful projects; it extends involvement and participation; and if often provides ideas for correction and future improvement.

Evaluation periodically applied has been a powerful tool in New York State, and an important part of a successful program of state aid to local public libraries and local library systems. Its program is believed to be the most extensive among the states, and certainly is the most familiar to the writer. It will be treated fairly fully, and comparisons will be made with other states.

The first big boost to state-aid for local libraries in New York State came a century and a quarter ago as a result of a surplus in the Federal Treasury. From the income of the United States Deposit Fund an annual grant of one hundred dollars a year was paid to approved local libraries, and indeed some 350 libraries are still getting this. If durability be a criterion for evaluation, this system certainly was good. Nevertheless, from time-to-time understandable dissatisfaction was manifest with it.

In the 1890's under Melvil Dewey there was great expansion of state aid in the form of services. Use of the rich resources of the State Library was liberalized. The traveling libraries and library extension services were developed. But through great changes in concepts of library service, the growth of large city systems, and monetary inflation, the grant-in-aid program remained unchanged.

Following a request from the New York Library Association in 1944, the Commissioner of Education and the Regents of the University of the State of New York authorized a full survey of public library service in the state. This included a thorough evaluation of the financing of public library service, and resulted in the conclusion that (1) much was to be gained from consolidation of many operations and from the
pooling of books into larger units of service (2) on the basis of encouragement of consolidation, and on relative income, the state’s share of support should be increased.\(^1\)

A result was a recommendation for a series of regional centers, and one was set up on an experimental basis in Watertown, New York, to serve local libraries in Lewis, Jefferson, and St. Lawrence counties. The word experiment was used advisedly. The Regional Library Service Center in Watertown was not a demonstration—it was an experiment. It was to be watched thoroughly by the Research Division of the Education Department and to receive a full evaluation at the end of a three year period. A series of control communities elsewhere in the state were selected, to be watched on a comparative basis.

Many questions were to be answered as to financing and service in communities served by the Center as compared with similar communities not served. For example, would the availability of state aid in books and services from the Center cause a relaxing of local effort? The answer was no—the presence of larger quantities of new books from the pool stimulated the local communities to improve local library quarters and to extend hours and raise staff salaries at a more rapid rate than in comparable libraries outside the experimental region. This was confirmation of a hypothesis, and evaluation in its highest and best sense.\(^2\)

Acceptance of the experiment and its results were evaluated less rigorously and somewhat informally. It was clear that the North Country liked the Center, and the people there rose valiantly to support its continuation beyond the end of the first experimental period. Acceptance elsewhere in the state was less enthusiastic and occasionally hostile.

Existing large library systems wanted direct grants-in-aid, with few or no strings attached. Hence a committee was established by the Governor, including librarians, trustees and representatives of the State Education Department and Library Extension Division, to review the financial situation and devise a plan for grants-in-aid. The plan developed was for grants-in-aid to county and multi-county systems meeting approval by the Commissioner of Education (through the Library Extension Division). The report concluded with the following recommendation: “After the expiration of five years from such time as its recommendation takes effect, the Committee recommends that library conditions throughout the State again be reviewed, taking into account the extent to which library systems have been established, the
effect of payments of aid, and the need for changes, if any, in the basis of such payments.”

Thus New York State librarians found themselves with two relatively large scale projects side-by-side. One was frankly labeled an experiment. The other was a radical new approach to the problem under an injunction for review at the end of a five-year period. The Regional Center experiment had already survived its initial three-year period. It was a success in meeting objective criteria of service, and in local acceptance. But outside its area of influence it had not attained general acceptance as the best structure for providing the advantages of a wholesale and pooling operation. It was being continued as a somewhat permanent experiment in state aid. It definitely was not a demonstration.

On the other hand the new committee had proposed making the county board of supervisors the vehicle of local option and control for a larger unit of library service. As a means encouraging the formation of such systems, and as a sharing of continued support, a program of “grants-in-aid” was set up. Some of the indications of the success of this program would be the number of counties to be organized, and the extent of coverage. A third element remained—the areas where there was neither the regional center, nor the county systems. These libraries remained under the old hundred-dollar-a-year program, with some aid-in-kind from the traveling libraries and other sections of the State Library.

In the spring of 1956 the New York State Commissioner of Education, J. E. Allen, Jr., appointed a Committee on Public Library Services “to review the present status of public library service in New York State, to analyze and to evaluate the recent progress made and to make recommendations to continue the improvement and extension of library service to the people of the State.” The first third of the 196 page volume is devoted to a summary and recommendations. The latter two-thirds contains reports of detailed comparisons and case studies, such as: “Services and facilities of a sample of system and non-system public libraries” and “Summary of case studies of successful and unsuccessful system movements.”

These studies comprise what the writer believes to be the most detailed and comprehensive evaluation of public library programs ever made on a comparative basis. The resulting conclusions and recommendations took into consideration the good and bad features as they were brought out by the research. The final product was a new legisla-
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tive program. This legislation contained provisions for (1) continuing the regional center with slight modifications, (2) continuing the county and multi-county libraries, again with some modifications, and (3) permitting organization of cooperative systems on the basis of local initiative without a tie to county government.

The third provision was based principally on cognizance of the weakness in the county system and elements of strength in the regional concept, together with an appraisal of the nature of the areas yet to be covered with larger units of service. This legislation as recommended was enacted in 1958, with the exception of the full formula for grants-in-aid. The amount of grants-in-aid provided represented a substantial increase over the 1950 formula. A new element of aid was introduced, viz: state-purchased books for one central reference collection for each system, and for small libraries, outside systems, serving fewer than 5,000 population. This new program resulted in a snowballing of systems. Whereas from 1950 to 1958 only thirteen counties had been organized into systems, in the subsequent two year period the total rose to fifty-two, leaving only ten counties remaining without systems by 1960.

A brief evaluation made in January 1960 showed that the new legal structure was sound, needing only a few technical corrections which have already been passed at the 1960 session of the State Legislature. Nevertheless the financial situation of the systems remained precarious, and it appeared that added incentive was needed to accelerate organization of remaining areas. Bringing grants-in-aid to approved library systems up to the full formula recommended in 1958 has now (March 1960) been approved by the state legislature.

It is not suggested that this continuous process of evaluation has alone been responsible for the success of the program. But evaluation has been an important factor. It has been the foundation upon which quiet but effective legislative campaigns have been based. It has furnished the proof when needed. It will be continued.

The basic purposes of state aid, as conceived in New York are three-fold:

1. To promote efficiency and economy of service.
2. To provide incentive for local effort.
3. To equalize costs and spread the tax burden.

It is generally agreed that larger units of service can be operated more efficiently particularly in respect to acquisition of materials and
technical processes. A large pool of books gives the reader a larger range of choice. On a small population base such a pool is impossible or extremely costly. The 1960 report has a graphic presentation of the effects of systems in providing many more people with much larger collections to draw upon.

Incentive is a subject upon which much can be written. This is no place to examine the psychology of incentive. It is sufficient to say that properly conceived incentives usually work. They must be clear and reasonable. They must have continuity. The *quid pro quo* must be clear and generally desirable. The most common form is matching. This is the basic principle of federal aid, and in book expenditures is an important part of the New York State program.

The present series of incentives are: (1) grants-in-aid to systems for getting started, providing for initial capital expenditures such as bookmobiles; (2) grants-in-aid for expansion of systems by total population and square mileage covered, and by specific grants for number of counties partially or wholly served; and (3) matching book expenditures.

Libraries in New York State have derived their principal support from local real estate taxes, endowments, and gifts. It is generally recognized that real estate taxes are becoming less desirable as a source. There are increasing inequities in the ratios of assessed valuation to the population and areas served. Other taxes are more equitable and have better yields. The principal sources of state funds are income taxes. Hence there are many advantages in use of state funds. Numerous studies on public finance are available and need not be cited here. It is clear that the New York State program has been successful in all three respects. It is predicted that by 1965 the entire state will be organized into systems serving all of the population. Grants-in-aid to the systems will amount to about 50 cents per capita, or between eight and nine million dollars annually.

Because of the growth of systems and as a negative way of further encouraging them, certain other state services have been curtailed or withdrawn. No longer are traveling libraries available to study clubs, or in areas otherwise unserved. This section of the State Library is concentrating on services such as clear-type and foreign language materials which cannot be economically handled in systems. Reference services are now being channeled through the systems and a teletype network has been established to speed up requests and interlibrary loans.
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Of course all these developments will be closely watched and continuously evaluated. In January 1960 a new Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources was established by the Commissioner of Education to deal with problems in this area. The goals are:

1. To identify and broadly evaluate existing major reference and research collections.
2. To study the needs for and use of such material.
3. To propose more effective ways of sharing resources and eliminating unnecessary duplication.
4. To discover gaps and propose means by which they may be filled.

The results will have important implications for state aid in the form of service from the State Library which is itself a major research library, issuing over 350 books and periodicals per day on interlibrary loan.

The writer has reviewed the New York State experience with evaluation in detail because it has been more extensive and because it has been remarkably successful. Extensive correspondence and searching of library literature has failed to produce much that may be used for comparison, with the notable exception of Michigan.

Michigan has had a substantial amount of state aid since 1938-39 when $375,000 was appropriated to encourage establishment of county libraries, to provide an element of equalization to libraries in areas of low assessed valuation, and to aid local public libraries generally. There was no appropriation in 1939-41, but $250,000 was granted in 1942-43, and there have been increasing amounts since then, and occasional changes in the law.

The program was reviewed in 1955 and a brief answer prepared to the question, "What has state aid accomplished?" Among the significant results were: reduction of unserved population from 27 per cent to 13 per cent; only three counties remaining with no local library service; substantial increases in local support, in size of staff and in book purchases.

A new study was begun in 1958 and a preliminary report was prepared in December 1959. The report appears to be directed primarily to adopting the A.L.A. standards for public library service to use in Michigan, and to devising ways and means of raising service to these standards. The advisory committee has had the services of a public administration analyst to assist in evaluation of the state-aid program. The report of this analyst is now available as a "working paper" for the
Michigan State Board of Libraries. Publication of the final report on Michigan is eagerly awaited and expected later this year.

The federal aid program has been the source of funds for surveys in five states—Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Nevada, and Michigan. These have been briefly described by Helen Luce and W. L. Morin. Much attention to recommendation of a state aid program is given in the Pennsylvania report. In a letter to the writer, Ralph Blasingame, Jr., Pennsylvania state librarian, says:

"The Governor's Commission on Public Library Development, the Pennsylvania Library Association and the Pennsylvania State Library will be engaged in reviewing this entire program in preparation for re-entering bills to implement it in the 1961 session. It is my own strong feeling, and I believe shared by all of the people who helped to create this proposal, that the plan should be under constant evaluation. There is no fixed period for review of the entire operation. However, I feel quite sure that, if it goes into effect at some time in the future, it will be under close and constant scrutiny by everyone concerned."

A similar assurance has been received from R. H. McConough of New Jersey. New Jersey now has a state-aid law and an appropriation will soon be available.

An early exception to the general rule is Illinois. Illinois has been a pioneer in state-aid, although in a sense much of the aid was rather in the form of demonstrations. In the survey of the Illinois State Library by H. F. Brigham, F. B. Spaulding, and C. F. Gosnell, published in 1952, some attention was given to the comparative effects of various aspects of that state aid program.

No reference is made here to the impact of federal aid on state programs, or its re-distribution by the states in various forms of aid to the localities. This has been the subject of a great many articles and reports, and does not fall within the present assignment.

For comparative purposes mention may be made of two extensive evaluation projects sponsored by Unesco. These are rather in the realm of grants-in-aid from the national governments to local libraries. One is a thorough analysis of the operation and effects of the Delhi, India, Public Library and the other is the forthcoming report on the Medellín, Colombia, Pilot Library. Both of these reports are directed toward determining the impact of new and outside aid upon the respective communities.
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Joint Responsibility for the Establishment of a State Aid Program

JANET Z. MCKINLAY AND ROGER H. MCDONOUGH

The enactment into law of New Jersey's first state aid program on December 1, 1959, climaxed more than a decade of effort by the New Jersey Library Association and other groups. Although only $400,000 or approximately one-fourth of the amount originally requested was provided for the first years, the important fact is that the program has become a reality. It is hoped that, like Congress with the Library Services Act, the legislature will raise the level of the appropriations to or near the total needed to carry out in full the provisions of the law adopted.

With the enactment of the state aid program, all but one of the recommendations of the Commission to Study Library Services in New Jersey have been realized. The adopted recommendations included mandatory certification programs for municipalities of 10,000 population and above, increased appropriations for the Graduate Library School at Rutgers University and the Public and School Library Services Bureau (extension agency) of the State Library. The commission's recommendation still remaining to be accomplished is the erection of a permanent building to house the extension services. Surveying and studying library conditions provide a necessary basis for sound state aid laws and New Jersey gave careful consideration to this premise.

The movement for a statewide library development program actually began in New Jersey before World War II. In the late 1930's, the Regional Library Committee of the New Jersey Library Association made preliminary investigations of some of the problems confronting county and municipal libraries. This movement, however, lost mo-
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mentum during the war years and gradually came to a halt. In 1949, the Regional Library Committee again became active and subsequently was renamed the Library Development Committee.

At about the same time, a special committee was appointed by the state commissioner of education to study the professional education and training of librarians in New Jersey and to find a means to relieve the shortage of librarians. The resignation at this time of the director of the Library School of the New Jersey College for Women, the women's college of Rutgers University, and the necessity for a decision as to whether the school should be converted from a Type III undergraduate program to a graduate school lent special urgency to the situation. In 1950, this committee undertook a series of studies in the fields of school, public, college, university, and special libraries. Several out-of-state library specialists served as consultants to the committee and were largely responsible for the final editing of the questionnaires used by the committee's survey. The committee's report had two major results. It helped to persuade the state to make a special appropriation of $50,000 to establish the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers University in 1953, and it produced more concrete data about library personnel than had ever been available before. By publicizing the weaknesses existing in the overall library situation, it spurred the movement for a full-scale attack on the problem.

An important step was taken in 1951, when the New Jersey Library Association decided to push forward with its surveys of the public library situation. These surveys were conducted by six regional committees, which were, in effect, subcommittees of the Library Development Committee. Staff members from the State Library were assigned to each regional committee, and library specialists were brought in from New York State to assist in the planning stage. The surveys, which were published and publicized as they appeared in the period 1952-54, had real shock value for the state at large.

To insure that the extension services of the State Library would not be lost sight of, a special committee was appointed to survey the Public and School Library Services Bureau. The report of this survey resulted in a most important action. In 1956, the Appropriations Committee of the state legislature made a special appropriation of $50,000 to this agency for additional staff, books, vehicles, and other equipment. This has been continued annually since that time and is now part of the regular extension services budget.
It is emphasized that these detailed and time-consuming surveys involved more than one hundred working librarians and trustees over a considerable period of time. Numerous local meetings were held to explain the purpose of the questionnaires involved and to solicit the cooperation of librarians, many of whom had never previously submitted annual reports to the State Library. The success of this method is evidenced by the fact that only one public library failed to file a return. It may be noted that in preparing the detailed questionnaires, the previous experience with the survey of library personnel in the state proved extremely valuable.

As the Library Development Committee expanded its operations over the years, it reached out and involved more and more individuals and groups outside the profession. Gradually, support was received from many important state organizations, including, among others, the State Federation of Women’s Clubs, the AFL-CIO, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, the League of Women Voters, the State Grange, the New Jersey Education Association, the State League of Municipalities, the American Association of University Women, and the Associated Board of Chosen Freeholders.

Many members of the New Jersey Library Association, the faculty of the Rutgers Graduate School of Library Service and the professional staff of the State Library rendered inestimable assistance to the Library Development Committee in developing a state aid formula suitable to New Jersey. To attempt to list them all without slighting one would be difficult. It may be stated categorically that the close, continuing cooperation of the New Jersey Library Association, the Library Trustees Association of New Jersey, the Rutgers Library School and the State Library was of paramount importance in moving the entire program forward. The situation might be described as a “family” one in which the members sometimes disagreed on specific points but closed ranks and pushed forward together when major issues were involved.

A 1954 decision which was to have far reaching consequences was to seek the establishment of a joint gubernatorial-legislative commission to study and report on the entire problem. It was believed that, although the studies conducted by the profession itself had produced worth-while factual evidence to support the libraries’ case, they might be regarded as “prejudiced” data. It was recognized that to appoint a commission would delay the entire program for at least two years and would involve the further risk that the commission might not
report favorably on the need for state aid and other benefits. It was concluded, however, that the “facts” of the library situation would speak for themselves and the decision was made to proceed. Accordingly, a joint resolution\(^2\) was introduced on May 10, 1954, to “create a commission to study the administration of library services in the counties and municipalities of New Jersey and prescribing its powers and duties.” The choice of a sponsor of this particular measure proved to be a most fortunate one. Senator T. J. Hillery of Morris County agreed to introduce the resolution, which was unanimously approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor. Subsequently, Senator Hillery served as a member of the study commission and was the principal sponsor of the state aid bill, which was first introduced in 1957, and finally, in amended form, became law in 1959.

The commission included three senators, three assemblymen and five citizens appointed by the Governor. At the organization meeting of the commission on November 17, 1954, Governor R. B. Meyner urged the commission “to make every effort to produce a study that would serve as a basis for a carefully conceived plan leading to the improvement of library services throughout the State.” The commission held three hearings at which a number of individuals and organizations urged support of a state grants-in-aid program to assist public libraries.\(^3\) The commission completed its work in 1955 and made its official report to the Governor and the legislature in January 1956. The report, entitled *Better Libraries for New Jersey*, after pointing out that free public libraries, as a vital part of our whole plan for public education, deserve active state support, listed the following findings and recommendations:

**Present Condition of Libraries in New Jersey**

Definite progress has been made in the libraries of New Jersey. There are, however, a number of obvious weaknesses:

1. More than 200,000 people in New Jersey lack free public library service of any kind.

2. More than one-half of the people in New Jersey have available only inadequate library service supported from public funds at a level lower than $1.50 per capita annually, the standard established by the American Library Association, in 1948 for limited or minimum service.

3. There are not enough books and other library materials available to the people of New Jersey.
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4. Most of our present library units are too small to render adequate service.
5. There is a wide variation in the level of additional support required to bring the present library units up to a minimum level of service.
6. Many libraries in New Jersey are staffed by persons with inadequate professional training and experience.
7. Facilities for training in professional librarianship are now available but low salaries handicap recruitment.
8. Many of our library buildings are outmoded, too small for present populations and inefficient in light of present-day standards.

Recommendations

The present conditions of the free public libraries of New Jersey call for joint vigorous action by the municipalities, counties and the State aimed at achieving minimum library services in all areas of the State through (1) a closely integrated program for the improvement of library services for all our people, (2) increased financial assistance for our county and local libraries, (3) a strengthened State Library extension service, (4) improved standards for professional librarians, and (5) adequate support for the training of professional librarians in our State university.

The importance of having these recommendations included within the covers of an official state report cannot be overemphasized. Since publication, the report has received wide use in providing basic information to local boards of trustees and governing bodies as well as to librarians and other interested individuals.

Space does not permit a detailed description of the state aid program recommended in the report. The formula called for per capita aid to all municipalities supporting public libraries and larger amounts to those meeting certain standards designed to encourage greater local support, larger areas of service and consolidation or federation of libraries. Still higher amounts were provided for those municipalities least able to support municipal services. To receive the higher aid, a municipality would have to expend annually a "local fair share" measured in terms of municipal equalized property valuations for library purposes, have an annual budget of $50,000 or be a member of a federation with a budget of this amount, or be a member of a county library system.

The method or methods by which the study program and legislative campaign were financed in New Jersey may be of interest. The
Joint Responsibility for the Establishment of a State Aid Program

New Jersey Library Association provided the largest portion of the $4,000 to $5,000 that were expended during the period from 1950-59. Annual appropriations were made to the Library Development Committee, and conference receipts from book auctions and exhibitors' fees were dedicated to the purpose of state aid. These monies were used for travel, publications, and for honorariums to various consultants and specialists who were employed. Another source of revenue were the individual contributions solicited by Association members. The Library Trustees Association of New Jersey made two generous gifts, and the State Library contributed services in the form of staff time, supplies, postage, etc. The cost of printing the report, Better Libraries, was borne by the State Library, also. Two pamphlets designed to help sell the state aid program, Of Concern to Everyone Who Reads and Do Not Have and Cannot Borrow, prepared by a professional public relations specialist, were paid for by the New Jersey Library Association. An effective film strip produced by the Library Development Committee, was also paid for by the Association.

The studies made and the recommendations submitted by the legislative commission would have had little effect if they had not been accompanied by an effective legislative campaign. If the task of the Library Development Committee was to produce a good product, i.e., a plan for improving public libraries in New Jersey, the job of the Legislation Committee of the state association was to sell it to the legislature and Governor. A paramount reason for the success of the New Jersey program was the continuing coordination that existed between the two committees.

Immediately after the legislative committee submitted its official report in January 1956, a bill was introduced in the New Jersey Legislature to provide for state grants-in-aid as recommended in the report. It took more than three years after it was first introduced to have the bill passed by both houses and signed into law by Governor Meyner. The detailed history of the legislative campaign would require more space and time to tell than is available. Readers who would like to have a blow-by-blow case history of a similarly successful legislative campaign are referred to R. H. Rohlf's article in the June 1957 issue of Minnesota Libraries. The problems encountered by the Minnesota librarians, the techniques they used and the unflagging energy and zeal with which they went about their legislative task are strongly reminiscent of the New Jersey experience, and, for that matter, of the A.L.A. experience at national level in connection with the Library
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Services Act. These examples suggest strongly that given a good program and effective leadership, a successful legislative program is within the reach and capacity of every state library association.
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