



The Role of ALA and Other Library Associations in the Promotion of Library Legislation

EILEEN D. COOKE

THIS PAPER ATTEMPTS to illustrate how the American Library Association's (ALA) federal legislative program has been implemented over the years, based on an officially adopted legislative policy and a flexible legislative strategy. It also attempts to highlight the organizational components essential to an effective legislative program for libraries, whether at the federal or state level.

The American Library Association's policy on federal legislation is based on the objectives of promoting and improving library service and librarianship. Representing those who use libraries as well as those who operate them, ALA is a source of information on libraries and information services for those concerned with formulating and implementing federal legislation. The statement of federal legislative policy prepared and updated periodically by the ALA Legislation Committee and formally adopted by the ALA Council determines the priorities and relative emphasis of the work of the Washington office and the Legislation Committee and also serves as a guide for the association's participation in various coalition activities.¹

Documents of this kind, which might well be compared to the book selection policy of a library, are exceedingly important. Their preparation and adoption enlightens our membership and strengthens our resolve to persevere. Legislators are keenly interested in the ways organizations adopt their policy positions; they want to know whether the spokesmen they hear are expressing the views of a leadership group or of the entire membership. Legislators also want to be assured that the views presented to them are the position of the association and not simply those of the witness or lobbyist alone.

For these reasons we recommend that allied organizations develop

Eileen D. Cooke is Director of the Washington Office and Associate Executive Director, American Library Association.

and keep current statements of their positions on legislative issues. Furthermore, we consider such policy positions when we appraise the possibility of working in coalition with these organizations. Any major piece of legislation changes, sometimes drastically, as it moves along the tortuous path from proposal to enactment. Therefore, it is prudent to have a written analysis of the views of one's own organization, as well as those of others, for comparison with the bill as it is being reshaped in the legislative process. Comparison with the initial analysis will indicate the extent to which the bill still meets the expressed position of the association, and thus whether it still merits support and effort. Even congressional sponsors have been known to repudiate their own bills as they see them amended beyond their original intent; for example, on June 8, 1972, Rep. Edith Green, Chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Education, voted against the conference report on the higher education legislation which she had originally authored.²

Most federal legislation of benefit to libraries requires corresponding state action before these benefits materialize in local library projects. Programs must be planned and administered at the state level, and federal appropriations must often be matched by state or local funds. Hence, state legislatures and state executive agencies become part of the process. Just as their federal counterparts require continual attention by ALA, elected and appointed officials at the state and local levels require continual attention by state library associations. Development of a national legislative network for libraries as proposed by the ALA Legislation Committee will help to ensure that many opportunities for progress which now are unrealized for lack of time and attention will not be neglected in the future. The Washington office intends to render all possible assistance to encourage and to help develop an active and effective network.

Patience as well as structure is needed if success is to result from the legislative efforts of library and media organizations. It is necessary to shift our view from day-to-day matters and look at this work from an historical perspective. Time is required to reach legislative goals—much time, sometimes too much time. Every legislature is beset with proposals for action. Events alter agendas; bills that should have clear sailing are suddenly becalmed. Persistence is rewarded, nevertheless. The Library Services Act may be cited as an example. It was first discussed at a meeting in Washington in 1944, one and one-half years before the ALA office was opened.³ A bill introduced in 1946 did not come to a vote until 1948, when it was enacted by the Senate. Two years later, the legislation was defeated by three votes in

Role of ALA

the House of Representatives. Finally, it was enacted by both houses and signed into law with an authorization of \$7.5 million in 1956, a full decade after it had been introduced in Congress. Even then, months elapsed before the first appropriation, \$2,050,000, was approved to begin implementation of that first, rural-oriented, public library program.

Now, in the nearly thirty years since the Washington office opened, three basic federal grant programs for public, school and academic libraries have been written into law, and their aggregate appropriations have grown from that initial \$2 million to \$1.8 billion: the Library Services and Construction Act—\$677,858,750, appropriated in fiscal years (FY) 1957-75; Title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act—\$849,234,000, FY 1966-75; and Title II, Parts A, B and C, Higher Education Act—\$273,618,375, FY 1966-75. During those years we learned again and again the critical importance of working with our natural allies—library and education organizations; authors, publishers and equipment dealers; civic leaders and government officials—to build a broad base of support for library programs. Librarians are not numerous in comparison with other groups seeking to influence Congress and other legislatures, so it is only logical that we enlist the support of able allies who share our convictions about the value of library and information services and the need to promote their improvement.

However, our strength does not lie in numbers alone. Librarians are skilled at marshalling facts and in presenting them effectively, and these skills are essential in the legislative process. Moreover, although we are relatively few in number, we are to be found in every Congressional district, and we tend to feel quite strongly that the work we do and the legislative causes we advocate are of extreme and lasting significance in the lives of the people we serve. This is a combination of circumstances that receives the attention, if not the support, of most legislators. They do not have to be reminded that a seat in the U.S. Senate can be won or lost on the basis of as little as two votes, as in New Hampshire's 1974 Senatorial election.

ORGANIZATION

Organization is indispensable to legislative advocacy. Legislators do not ignore individuals, but they pay more attention to organizations.⁴ The validity and credibility of a viewpoint is enhanced when it is espoused by an organization, especially if the organization's members

are particularly qualified by training and experience to express the viewpoint and defend it in debate and discussion. For this reason, organizations are well advised to confine their advocacy to issues about which they may be presumed to have some special expertise or concern. For example, ALA takes a position with respect to the depository library program of the Superintendent of Documents but not with respect to the general operation of the Government Printing Office; it maintains an interest in the National Library of Medicine but not in all of the specialized agencies of the National Institutes of Health. As individual citizens, we hold and may express opinions on a great variety of public issues. We join other organizations, however, to espouse these views, since library associations quite properly and reasonably limit their advocacy to matters within their professional purview.

There are other strengths in organization. Formal associations are more or less permanent; they have a corporate memory, while individuals forget or come and go. Legislators are well aware of this fact. They know that the irate citizen who writes an indignant letter today may well be exercised about something else tomorrow. Organizations, on the other hand, keep everlastingly at it. The fact that the ALA is almost one hundred years old wins a certain measure of respect for its statements. Legislators know it will not disband once a certain bill becomes law. They recognize that it represents a permanent group in our society, a viewpoint that will always be expressed and therefore must be reckoned with in every legislative session.

Organizations provide communication channels between legislators and their members. *The ALA Washington Newsletter* goes to fewer than 2,000 individuals and institutions, but it is excerpted or republished in the newsletters and bulletins of many other associations and thus reaches a much wider audience. Often the flow of information is in the other direction, as when state library associations, library schools, state or local library agencies or individual libraries respond to questionnaires and other requests for information to be forwarded to the ALA Washington Office for compilation, analysis and presentation to Congress. Authoritative, current and objective information collected in this way is invaluable and indisputable evidence that cannot be ignored or denied by even the most determined opponent. It could not be obtained so quickly and comprehensively without the machinery and traditions of ALA.

Obviously, organizations such as ALA and other library associations make possible the provision of specialized personnel to conduct their

Role of ALA

legislative activities. The resources of an organization permit the hiring of a law firm to take a case to the Supreme Court, as well as the maintenance of an office for legislative advocacy in Washington or in a state capital. The library associations also expedite the identification and recruitment of the most appropriate witnesses to testify about a pending legislative measure at a committee hearing or to discuss its merits privately with legislators. Naturally, such a witness or purposeful visitor to Washington must be particularly knowledgeable about the business at hand.

Organizations facilitate the careful matching or dovetailing of the advocate's expertise with the legislator's need for information.

COALITIONS

Coalitions are a very useful legislative technique. They may be temporary and informal, as when the education organizations agreed, early in the Kennedy administration, that higher education legislation would be deferred in one legislative session until measures benefiting the schools had been considered by Congress. Or, coalitions can be as formal and lasting as the Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, which has its own staff and in five years helped to secure \$561.8 million more in appropriations for library programs than had been requested in the President's annual budgets. The Full Funding Committee, whose membership includes some seventy organizations, worked closely in its early years with another coalition formed to focus the supportive activities of the book publishing industry.⁵ That coalition included the American Book Publishers Council, the American Textbook Publishers Institute (which later merged to become the Association of American Publishers), and the Book Manufacturers Institute Joint Committee on Federal Education and Library Programs.

Coalitions not only concentrate effort and assure that like-minded organizations do not work at cross purposes, they also increase the strength—or clout, if you will—of each organization that joins the common effort. To a few members of the coalition, the issue it addresses will be of primary importance; to the other member organizations the issue is of lesser importance. The combined membership of the organizations in the coalition bulks more impressively to the legislators, and thus the smaller but more vitally concerned groups are able to amplify their impact and influence on the legislative process. Implicit in this strategy of coalition is the readiness of the coalition's member organizations to lend strength and support to

the causes advocated by other members when these are on the legislative agenda and require special effort.

To illustrate these principles, ALA works most closely and continuously with over one hundred other library organizations, e.g., the Association of Research Libraries and the Medical Library Association, as well as with the various state library and school media associations. Here there is an identity of interest. ALA also works with the other education organizations whose primary interests are in the statutes that authorize aid for libraries as part of the school systems, colleges, universities, and graduate schools. Here there is a community of interests. Librarians rejoice in the enactment of sound legislation for higher education, even though its library provisions are relatively minor and the greater part of the assistance it authorizes is for student aid, because the library is part of every college and university and whatever strengthens the whole institution ultimately benefits the library.

ALA has common interests, too—e.g., postal rates and the Florence and Beirut Agreements (international agreements to facilitate the duty-free flow of printed matter and audiovisual materials and equipment for educational and cultural purposes)—with many of the trade and industry groups that represent publishers and suppliers. These groups have other legislative objectives which do not concern ALA, for the attainment of which they form coalitions with other business groups, and they may at times seek ends that ALA considers contrary to its own, as exemplified by the pending Williams & Wilkins case, the lawsuit of medical publishers Williams & Wilkins against the National Institutes of Health and the National Library of Medicine for alleged copyright infringement. Nevertheless, ALA finds it possible and rewarding to work together with them to persuade Congress to enact the legislation on which they can agree, given the necessarily differing policies and principles of the respective organizations.

What must be understood is that legislation is not created in a vacuum. It is considered the art of the possible; the legislative process is based on compromise. That is what democracy is all about. Neither side gets everything they propose, but with common sense and diligence some progress is usually made which benefits both sides. Some periods are more productive than others, such as 1965-69, when categorical, federal aid to education measures hit an all time high.

TIMING

Timing is of the essence in the legislative process, and education

Role of ALA

indeed seemed, for that brief period, to be an idea whose time had come. Current events often have a significant role to play in the legislative process. There is no doubt but that the assassination of President Kennedy helped to expedite action on many of the "Great Society" programs. Kennedy's omnibus education proposal of 1963 subsequently blossomed, during President Johnson's so-called honeymoon period, into the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act and the Medical Library Assistance Act, all of which authorized substantial library programs.

Unfortunately, the inauguration of President Nixon brought an immediate reversal. His administration proposed drastic cutbacks, called for education reform and urged a halt to "throwing dollars at problems." However, foreseeing a period of uncertainty ahead after the November 1968 election, when it was known that the majority of the 91st Congress would be of one party and the incoming President of another, ALA began developing a new dimension to its legislative program. Unlike previous proposals, it was not aimed at obtaining federal grants-in-aid from the U.S. Office of Education, but was instead directed at long-range planning and oversight by an independent government agency and at establishment of a national library policy. The impetus for this came from the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries (NACL) submitted to President Johnson on October 15, 1968,⁶ which called for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing federal planning agency.

The fundamental recommendation of the National Advisory Commission, on which all their other recommendations were based, was: "that it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with state and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services."⁷

Following up on the release of the NACL recommendations, ALA moved quickly to disseminate its report widely and to muster support for legislation to implement its initial recommendations. Bills were subsequently introduced in the House with thirty-one sponsors and in the Senate with twenty sponsors. The legislation which was endorsed in hearings by a wide-ranging group of well over 100 library and education representatives and organizations⁸ was passed by the Senate

on May 23, 1969, but took nearly another year, after being reported out of committee, to be passed by the House (April 20, 1970). Then another three months elapsed before President Nixon on July 20 signed into law the final version—Public Law 91-345—which called for an independent commission rather than one subject to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).

In addition to establishing the permanent, independent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Congress set forth the following statement of policy in the new law: "The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services."⁹

Still another year elapsed before the President named the members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) and requested \$200,000 in July 1971 to carry out their initial work. ALA filed a supporting statement with the Senate Appropriations Committee urging more adequate funding in view of the fact that the fiscal year was just beginning. But with all other library and education programs under continual fire by the administration, library allies were too busy defending their own flanks to rally additional support for the fledgling NCLIS. For the next two fiscal years, 1972 and 1973, the commission was kept on a short leash with a budget of \$200,000, which allowed for a staff of five and for periodic meetings and limited field hearings by the members of the commission.

It was obvious that the Nixon administration intended to systematically terminate all categorical library and education programs through a series of proposals designed to decentralize government activities throughout ten HEW regional offices and to "return power to the people" through revenue sharing. The President proposed to do this by establishing various revenue-sharing programs. General revenue sharing, or the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act as it later came to be called, was the trial balloon and, unfortunately for the majority of libraries and many other governmental agencies, it has proved to be very elusive and full of hot air. The first comprehensive review of general revenue sharing published by the Treasury Department revealed that public libraries, which are listed as one of eight priorities, had received only about \$18 million, or about one percent of the funds allocated. In the period since the survey, it

Role of ALA

appears that more libraries are now getting revenue sharing dollars, but this time they are supplanting the local tax money they used to get. So local governments are not paying out more to libraries, they are merely switching pockets.

NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE NETWORK FOR LIBRARIES

By mid-1972, the ALA Legislation Committee began to make plans to develop support within the association for a legislative workshop and a Congressional luncheon to be held during the 1973 midwinter meeting in Washington, D.C. The aim was to take advantage of the meeting location in the nation's capital by giving ALA members an opportunity to get acquainted with their Congressional delegations, and to discuss and develop some basic legislative techniques which ALA members could take home for future application at federal, state and local levels.

Part of the impetus for the legislative workshop grew from the previous cooperative efforts of the Legislation Committee in connection with a study conducted under the auspices of the Department of Government and the School of Library Science at Florida State University. The report on this research, *State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts*,¹⁰ documents that library development at the state level had been uneven, but that areas of achievement showed little or no correlation with population wealth or other socio-economic factors in a state. The Legislation Committee recognized that library programs generally have a favorable public service image among legislators at all levels, but it takes more than good will to win their necessary financial support. The public at large must be made more aware of the library and information resources available to them, and they have to be informed on a continuing basis of the changing needs which must be met in order to preserve, expand, and provide equal access to these resources for all citizens. To accomplish this, a more aggressive library leadership must be developed through various ALA activities of a continuing educational nature. Compilation of information about federal library programs and backup statistical data is, of course, basic to any campaign designed to increase public awareness of libraries on a national scale.

Having received ALA Executive Board approval and the budget backing of the Committee on Program Evaluation and Support (COPEs), the Legislation Committee moved ahead with its plans for a legislative workshop. In an effort to develop a profile of legislative operations within each state, a three-page questionnaire was mailed in

the fall of 1972 to the president of every state library association and school media association. Fifty-four completed questionnaires were returned, representing thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia. They came from thirty-six state library associations and eighteen school media associations. As expected, the replies showed a wide range in the stages of development of the associations and their legislative programs.

Workshop participants, selected by the state associations, were sent copies of a draft prepared by the Legislation Committee of a proposal for a National Legislative Network for Libraries, and at the workshop, held February 1, 1973, they discussed it and analyzed it throughout the day and evening. Revisions were later made in the draft as a result of the comments and suggestions of panelists and participants, and the plan was issued by the committee in May 1973.¹¹ The plan has subsequently been widely distributed throughout the states and used by many in connection with follow-up workshops held under the guidance of a legislative consultant provided by the ALA Legislation Committee, and subsidized by funds from a J. Morris Jones-World Book Encyclopedia-ALA Goals Award.

The overall goal of the National Legislative Network for Libraries is to bring maximum constituent effort to bear upon Congress, the several state legislatures, national and state administrations, and appropriate regulatory agencies, in support of library programs and the ideals of the library profession. To carry out this goal effectively, the following five objectives are specified in the plan:

1. To inform as many individuals as possible of the functions and importance of libraries, and of federal and state library programs, in order to enlist citizens, local and national officials and library employees alike in joint legislative efforts.
2. To establish and maintain a timely flow of information on current library legislative proposals to all interested or potentially interested persons.
3. To assign specific responsibility for liaison with each member of the Congress and the state legislatures in order to insure his receipt of appropriate information and to provide feedback on his position.
4. To maximize the effectiveness of the ALA Washington Office and its counterparts in those states where they exist or may be established.
5. To avoid duplication of effort on the part of library organizations—national, state and local.

Role of ALA

It was also during the 1973 ALA midwinter meeting in Washington, D.C., that the Nixon administration unleashed its block-buster budget for federal library programs. The FY 1974 budget, sent to Congress January 29, proposed the termination of ESEA II, LSCA and HEA II by recommending no funds in the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973.

ALA members who came to that midwinter conference planning to talk about the legislative process got an unprecedented crash course in practical politics and an immediate opportunity to apply their learning. Many rushed to Capitol Hill, armed with budget figures hot off the press to inform their lawmakers from "both sides of the aisle" about the latest plot perpetrated by the administration to wipe out categorical library aid.

ALA members were the talk of the town and the envy of the Committee for Full Funding for weeks to come. "Those librarians" had stolen the march on everyone in the education community. Naturally, they were quick to proclaim that having up-to-date information available when needed is what libraries are all about and why it is essential that they be maintained by adequate funding.

With its members, ALA was quick to point out that timing is of the essence in the legislative process and also that periodic meetings in Washington are useful when it comes to nurturing national legislation. But at any level, accurate and timely information about a proposal is essential if an individual or an organization is to take effective action. The fact that the public is aware of actions being considered by officials insures a greater degree of responsiveness to public opinion.

The fast follow-up and continuing work of members throughout the spring months, coupled with the comprehensive public relations effort directed by ALA headquarters in Chicago—"Dimming the Lights on the Public's Right to Know"—combined to greatly increase general public awareness, and eventually it yielded unprecedented mass media coverage about the plight of libraries and succeeded in convincing Congress to reject the zero budget proposal and appropriate \$151.2 million for the library programs threatened with extinction.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

Mindful of the strong leadership role played for years in ALA by the American Library Trustee Association (ALTA), the Legislation Committee and the Washington office had been waiting for months for an opportunity to advance a long-time proposal of the trustees as well as to focus greater attention on the work of NCLIS. For more than

twelve years, ALTA had seen the need and potential value of a White House Conference on libraries. But it was not until January 1972 that the proposal in the form of a resolution was seen as an idea whose time had come, and it was adopted by the ALA Council. During the fall of that year, in the midst of planning for the Washington midwinter meeting, Sen. Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, demonstrated an interest in the measure by announcing to his colleagues on October 13 that he was preparing a bill calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

The Senator said that the legislation would authorize the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, the centennial of the American Library Association as well as the bi-centennial of the United States. He referred to the work of NCLIS, which was established by his first bill as chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, and stated his belief that the various studies and recommendations of NCLIS should receive the attention of the thousands of public-spirited citizens and professional librarians who are primarily responsible for the support and guidance of American libraries. He said: "I am confident that a White House Conference on Library and Information Services will promote greater appreciation and support for libraries. It will forcefully acquaint legislators, public officials, the news media, and the public with the abiding concerns of librarians, educators, library trustees, and the governing boards of school systems and institutions of higher education. A White House Conference can review the accomplishments, the unmet needs, and, above all, the magnificent potentialities of our libraries, and I am sure that, once they are made aware of the facts, the American people will see the wisdom of enlarging their support for their libraries."¹²

On January 26, 1973, Senator Pell introduced Senate Joint Resolution 40 (S.J. Res. 40), a bill calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976. He said that it might be asked why such a conference was needed when there were already laws providing for library services and construction as well as for the NCLIS, and added: "What is now needed is a public forum to bring together a body of interested citizens to consider the recommendations of the Commission and the proposals of other organizations and institutions, public and private. A White House Conference would provide an efficient way of arriving at a truly national consensus regarding the further development of our libraries and information services, and their coordination through greater cooperation and

Role of ALA

interconnection, making use of the technological resources we now have."¹³

Since S.J. Res. 40 proposed that the White House Conference be administered by NCLIS and that it be chaired by NCLIS's chairman, Frederick Burkhardt, it was necessary that Burkhardt be a star witness at hearings on the measure. So, when it was learned that he was out of the country during the spring months, Senator Pell postponed consideration of the resolution until July 24. At that time three organizations in addition to NCLIS presented testimony in support of the legislation—the ALA, the Association of Research Libraries, and the Independent Research Libraries Association. The Librarian of Congress also submitted a statement for the record in support of the proposal. The Nixon administration submitted one in opposition.

Apparently expecting a negative attitude on the part of the administration, during the hearing Senator Pell said, "I do make a point that while I am willing to take whatever leadership I can in this matter, I cannot do it alone. If the administration is actually negative on it, then it is going to take a very real persuasion job across the length and breadth of our country to restore the priorities of libraries, to restore the budget for libraries. We in the Senate cannot do it alone, because it will take a lot more help than that . . . we will do our best to report a bill out of the subcommittee and see where it goes from there. How far it goes depends in great part on the energies of those in this field."¹⁴ As it turned out, the energies and enthusiasm in the field proved to be boundless. Equally important, however, was patience and persistence as the legislation fitfully advanced, sometimes as though on square wheels.

On September 19, then House Minority Leader Gerald Ford introduced House Joint Resolution 734 (H.J. Res. 734), a bill identical to S.J. Res. 40. Previously, the same bill had been introduced by Rep. Ken Hechler (D-W.Va.) and on October 11, a similar bill, H.J. Res. 766, was introduced by Rep. John Brademas, Chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education.¹⁵ On November 16, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported out S.J. Res. 40 (Senate Report 93-521), and four days later the bill was brought up in the Senate and passed by a voice vote, without debate. On November 29, Chairman Brademas held a hearing in his select subcommittee with eight witnesses testifying in support of the legislation, representing NCLIS, ALA, the Association of American Publishers, the American Library Society, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Book Committee, the Library of Congress, and the National

Archives. Twenty other organizations submitted statements for the hearing record: American Association of University Professors, Coalition of Adult Education Organizations, Association of Research Libraries, Urban Library Trustees Council, New York City Board of Correction, Medical Library Association, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Theater Library Association, Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Authors League of America, International Federation of Library Associations, Special Libraries Association, American Council on Education, Joint Council on Educational Telecommunications, National Audiovisual Association, Michigan Library Association, Music Library Association, American Foundation for the Blind, American Society for Information Science, and International Reading Association. In addition, Rep. William Ford (D-Mich.) also submitted a supporting statement. The Nixon administration continued to oppose the proposal.

After that relative rush of activity in the closing months of the first session of the 93d Congress, not much happened in the second session until mid-May 1974 when the House Education and Labor Committee voted to report out their version of Senate Joint Resolution 40, changing the date of the national conference from 1976 to 1977. The report was issued May 22—House Report 93-1056. Then, on June 4, in an attempt to expedite action before the principals became involved in the marathon conference sessions resolving the differences in the omnibus ESEA extension bill, the measure was brought to the House “under suspension of the rules” which requires a two-third majority to pass a bill. The vote, 223 for and 147 against, was less than the necessary two-thirds, and the bill failed to pass.¹⁶

So, action was stalled again until October 2 when House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Carl Perkins (D-Ky.) and Rep. Brademas took S.J. Resolution 40 to the Rules Committee for approval so it could be brought up again in routine fashion, with only a simple majority vote needed for passage. An open rule with one hour of debate was granted (H.Res. 1410, House Report 93-1417), and on December 12, the House amended the bill and passed it by a vote of 259 to 81. The next day the Senate took up the bill again and changed the date of the conference to 1978, and on December 16 they reconsidered the measure again and passed it after adding three unrelated riders, merely using Resolution 40 as a convenient vehicle—a strategy frequently employed in the closing days of a Congress.

On December 17, House and Senate conferees reached a

Role of ALA

compromise agreement on their differing versions of the bill and reported it out of conference (H.Rept. 93-1619). The next day, the Senate filed an identical report (S.Rept. 93-1409), and on December 19, both House and Senate finally approved the conference report, and Resolution 40 as amended was cleared for the President's signature. And on December 31, 1974, nearly two years after being introduced, the legislation authorizing a White House Conference on Library and Information Services was signed into law (PL 93-568) by one of the sponsors of the proposal, President Gerald Ford.

Now that there is an *authorization* for a White House Conference, ALA and the other library associations have their work cut out for them in the months ahead; the battle is only half over. Now they must work for an *appropriation* to finance this major national assessment.

ACTION NEEDED: WHAT YOU CAN DO NOW

In the months ahead, much work remains to be done if the White House Conference and the preliminary conferences in the states are to successfully achieve the results intended by Congress. What can you do? The first step is to inform yourself thoroughly about the proposed conferences. You must understand what Congress intended when it enacted S.J. Res. 40. The more you know about it, the more you can enlighten your friends and colleagues, especially nonlibrarians. Remember these are conferences for library users, not for professional librarians. The Additional References following this article suggest some readings on the White House Conference.

References

1. American Library Association. Legislation Committee. *Federal Legislative Policy of the American Library Association*. Chicago, ALA, 1973.
2. Summerfield, Harry L. *Power and Process*. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan, 1974, p. 108.
3. Daniel, Hawthorne. *Public Libraries for Everyone*. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1961, p. 39.
4. Redman, Eric. *The Dance of Legislation*. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1973, Chapter 6.
5. Frase, Robert W. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds," *Publishers Weekly*, 205:64-67, Jan. 21, 1974.
6. *ALA Washington Newsletter*, 20:1, Oct. 28, 1968.
7. Knight, Douglas M., and Nourse, E. Shepley, eds. *Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and the National Interest*. New York, Bowker, 1969, p. 521.
8. U.S. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Select Subcommittee on Education. *Hearings to Establish a National Commission on Libraries and*

Information Science, and Other Purposes, 91st Congress, 1st Session, on H.R. 8839 and H.R. 908, April 15 and 17, 1969. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1969; and U.S. Senate. Committee on Education and Labor. Select Subcommittee on Education. *Hearings to Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and Other Purposes, 91st Congress, 1st Session, on S. 1519, April 24, 1969.* Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1969.

9. *U.S. Statutes at Large.* Public Law 91-345. 91 Cong., 2 Sess. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1971, p. 440.

10. St. Angelo, Douglas, *et al. State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts.* Chicago, ALA, 1971.

11. American Library Association. "The National Legislative Network for Libraries: A Master Plan." Chicago, ALA, 1973, pp. 1-15.

12. U.S. Senate. *Congressional Record.* 92 Cong., 2 Sess., Oct. 13, 1972, p. 35723.

13. ————. *Congressional Record.* 93 Cong., 1 Sess., Jan. 26, 1973, p. 2261.

14. U.S. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education. *Proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. 93d Congress, 1st Session, on S.J. Res. 40, July 24, 1973.* Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973, pp. 96, 99.

15. U.S. House. *Congressional Record.* 93 Cong., 1 Sess., Oct. 11, 1973, pp. H8923-26.

16. ————. *Congressional Record.* 93 Cong., 2 Sess., June 4, 1974, pp. H4672-79.

Additional References

Brademas, John. *Congressional Record.* 93 Cong., 2 Sess., Dec. 12, 1974, pp. H11775-76 (daily edition). See particularly section on state conferences, which will be "designated to insure that the recommendations of the public become a central concern of the White House Conference. Two-thirds of those attending each State conference, therefore, will be citizens not associated with libraries, and one-third of those attending will be from the professional library and information science community." Brademas also discusses the depository library system and the role of new technology, among other subjects. A good source for information on the legislative intent behind enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Burkhardt, Frederick. "Prepared Statement of Frederick Burkhardt, Chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science," *White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.* Hearing held Nov. 29, 1973, before Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 93 Cong., 1 Sess., on H.J. Res. 734 and H.J. Res 766. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1974, pp. 15-19. Provides a detailed breakdown of the work that must be done to achieve a carefully planned national conference preceded by state conferences.

Lowrie, Jean E. "Supplementary Statement Submitted by Jean E. Lowrie, President, American Library Association," *White House Conference on Library*

Role of ALA

and Information Services in 1976, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-59. Possible agenda items for state conferences as well as the White House Conference are suggested, including statistical and economic data, the depository library program, systems of library financing, federal library and information resources, inventory of library needs, population analyses, concerns of special groups, library education and manpower needs, and interrelationship of libraries and other social agencies.

Mumford, L. Quincy. Letter from the Librarian of Congress to Sen. Claiborne Pell. In *Proposed White House Conference on Library and Information Services*. Hearing held before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 93 Cong., 1 Sess., on S.J. Res. 40. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973, pp. 7-21. Presents LC's views with respect to its participation in a proposed White House Conference. Also suggests a number of topics to which the conference might address itself, including centralized cataloging, machine-readable cataloging, national serials service, bibliographic control of state and local government publications, library of last resort, surplus publications pool, support of regional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped, the preservation of library materials, and standardization in library automation.

Pittenger, John C. "Testimony of John C. Pittenger, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," *White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, op. cit.*, pp. 6-14. Strong statement in support of White House Conference from a nonlibrarian. Note particularly the exchange between Pittenger and Rep. Orval Hansen (R-Idaho) about the role of the states.

"S.J. Res. 40," *ALA Washington Newsletter*, April 10, 1974. A five-page attachment to the newsletter. Note particularly "White House Conference on Library and Information Services: Purpose and General Organization," which outlines the provisions of the legislation; "What Might be Accomplished if Planning Begins Now," which suggests agenda items for the state conferences and the White House Conference; and "Preceding Conferences in the States," which summarizes ideas of what might be accomplished at the state conferences. Although this material was written before final enactment of the legislation, the only major change is the amount of money authorized: not \$10 million, but \$3.5 million, is authorized by the legislation as enacted.

"Statement of the Authors League of America," *White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, op. cit.*, pp. 84-85. This statement urges that authors "who create the books, journals, articles and monographs which libraries ultimately help to distribute" should be represented at the White House Conference, as well as spokesmen for such organizations as the American Chemical Society, American Institute of Physics, and American Society of Testing and Materials.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of the Secretary. Letter from Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary, to Carl D. Perkins, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, *White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, op. cit.*, pp. 83-84. Presents the objection of the Nixon administration to the proposed White House Conference: "would be too narrowly focused."

To be released in November:

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN LIBRARIES

Allerton Park Institute, number 20

proceedings of a conference

edited by Frederick A. Schlipf

published by the University of Illinois

Graduate School of Library Science

\$8.00/available from:

University of Illinois

Graduate School of Library Science

Publications Office/249 Armory Bldg.

Champaign, Illinois 61820

Special Issue:

Library Trends, vol. 25, no. 1
July 1976

Howard W. Winger, editor

American Library History **1876-1976**

A limited number of hardcover volumes will be available for \$8.00 each. Individual paperbound copies may also be purchased for \$5.00. Individual orders must be prepaid.
Order from:

- University of Illinois Press
- Urbana, Illinois 61801