

# Administration of State and Federal Funds for Library Development

---

GENEVIEVE M. CASEY

THIS ARTICLE WILL ATTEMPT to trace how state library development agencies were affected by state and federal funds for libraries, and how those agencies in turn determined the pattern, volume and utilization of these funds. It will explore relationships which state and federal funding brought about between state library agencies and local and federal libraries and governments. The review will focus on the period from the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956 through 1977.

## LSA/LSCA

The passage of the Library Services Act (LSA) and its successor, the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), federal legislation for the improvement and extension of public library service, has probably produced a more profound impact on state library development agencies than any other single factor. The other library legislation of the 1960s — the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (administered by a very few state libraries), the Higher Education Act and the Medical Library Assistance Act — have had much less impact on state library development agencies and thus are not discussed in this article. In all states, however, LSA/LSCA has had a profound influence on state library agencies. Because of the importance to the topic of this issue, a brief chronology of LSA/LSCA follows. It is based on data up to 1973 gathered by James Fry for an earlier issue of *Library Trends*,<sup>1</sup> and on later data published in the

---

Genevieve M. Casey is Professor, Division of Library Science, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

*ALA Washington Newsletter* and in recent editions of the *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*.

## CHRONOLOGY

*1944:* A group of librarians, headed by Ralph Shaw, director of the Department of Agriculture Library; Paul Howard, the first director of the ALA Washington Office; and Carl Milam, ALA Executive Secretary, conceived the idea of a bill to provide federal aid to public libraries. At that time, adequate public library service was available to less than one-half of the American people. One county in five had no public library whatever.

*1946:* Senator Lister Hill (D., Alabama) introduced the bill conceived in 1944. A decade of legislative setbacks and disappointments followed.

*1956:* Representative Edith Green (D., Oregon) and Senator Lister Hill, with bipartisan sponsorship of twenty-seven representatives and sixteen senators, introduced legislation which was destined to become the Library Services Act. In addition to strong support from ALA, the legislation was endorsed by twenty national organizations, including the National Education Association, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Farmers' Union, Federation of Women's Clubs, and several library associations.

In June 1956, President Eisenhower signed into law the Library Services Act, Public Law 597 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, described by Edmon Low as the father of modern library legislation.

In effect until June 30, 1961, the Library Services Act authorized annual appropriations of up to \$7.5 million to be distributed to the states according to a formula based on their relative rural populations and fiscal capacity. With the objective of extending and improving public library service, the act provided that:

1. funds be channeled through a state library agency designated by each state's attorney general as responsible for fostering statewide public library service;
2. funds be used only for the establishment and/or improvement of public library service in communities of 10,000 or less;
3. funds be expended according to a state plan for public library service reached by the state library agency with the advice of a broadly representative advisory board;
4. funds be matched with state/local funds, and that these state/local appropriations not fall below the level of the previous year;

*Administration of State and Federal Funds*

5. funds be used for personnel, materials, communication, travel, equipment, rental of space, but not construction.

Table 1 charts the authorization and appropriations for LSA from 1957 to 1961.

*January 1960:* Senate Bill 2830 to extend LSA for five more years was introduced by Senator Lister Hill and cosponsored by fifty-one senators. In justifying the need for an extension of what had been conceived as a temporary measure, Senator Hill argued: "By the end of fiscal 1961, when this program will expire. . . it is estimated that only half of the job will be done, that at least 40 million rural residents will still have no public library service, or inadequate service, and that 150 rural counties will still have no public library service within their borders."<sup>2</sup>

*May 26, 1960:* The Senate passed S. 2830 unanimously.

*August 22, 1960:* The House passed S. 2830 (190-29) after forty minutes of debate which centered on the question of whether the federal government had any responsibility for local public library service.

*August 31, 1960:* President Eisenhower signed into law the extension of the Library Services Act until June 30, 1966 (P.L. 86-679). The extension continued authorization of up to \$7.5 million annually for the establishment and improvement of rural public library service.

*January 29, 1963:* President Kennedy sent to Congress a special education message which included a recommendation to enact "legislation to amend the Library Services Act by authorizing a 3-year program of grants for urban as well as rural libraries and for construction as well as operation." In justification for this new initiative, President Kennedy's message cited that:

The public library is also an important resource for continuing education. But 18 million people in this nation still have no access

TABLE 1. LSA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1957-61  
(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Authorization</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>
1957	\$7.50	\$2.05
1958	7.50	5.00
1959	7.50	6.00
1960	7.50	6.00
1961	7.50	7.50
1962	7.50	7.50
1963	7.50	7.50

to any local public library service and over 110 million more have only inadequate service.

Advanced age, lack of space, and lack of modern equipment characterize American public library buildings in 1963. Their rate of replacement is barely noticeable: two per cent in a decade. There are now no Carnegie funds available for libraries — nor have there been for 40 years.

The public library building is usually one of the oldest governmental structures in use in any community. In one prosperous mid-western State, for example, 30 per cent of all public library buildings were built before [the] year 1910, and 85 percent were erected before 1920. Many other States are in a similar situation.<sup>3</sup>

*October 29, 1963:* Senator Wayne Morse (D., Oregon) introduced S. 2265, embodying President Kennedy's recommendations.

*November 26, 1963:* The Senate, as its first order of business after the assassination of President Kennedy, passed S. 2265 (P.L. 88-7), a resounding bipartisan victory.

*January 21, 1964:* The House passed its version of S. 2265 by a vote of 254-107. Opposition in the debate centered on the dangers of federal intervention in local public libraries, and the likelihood that this "temporary" support would become permanent.

*February 11, 1964:* President Johnson signed into law the Library Services and Construction Act (P.L. 88-269). The principal differences between LSCA and LSA were:

1. The population limitation was removed beginning July 1, 1964. Coverage was extended to all areas of the country regardless of size.
2. A new construction title was added which authorized \$20 million for FY 1964 and such sums as the Congress may determine for FY 1965 and 1966. The act provided minimum allotments of \$80,000 to each state.
3. The matching grant authorization for public library services was increased from \$7.5 million a year to \$25 million for FY 1964 and such sums that Congress may determine for FY 1965 and 1966.
4. Construction was defined to include construction of new buildings; expansion, remodeling and alteration of existing buildings; initial equipment; and architects' fees and land acquisition costs.
5. The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico were included in the definition of a state.<sup>4</sup>

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

For state libraries, LSCA had momentous effects: (1) it forced them into relationships with large city libraries and away from the exclusive concentration on rural problems which had characterized many of them, (2) it provided them with greatly increased funds and power to implement plans for public library service, and (3) it catapulted them into the enormously political and competitive world of library construction. Table 2 traces the authorization and appropriations for LSCA in 1964-66.

*March 1965:* Senator Lister Hill and Congressman Roman Pucinski (D., Illinois) introduced similar bills to amend and extend LSCA for four years. The new bills proposed four principal titles with the following provisions:

Title I — Public Library Services: as in the 1964 act, matching-grant funds to be used for books and other library materials, library equipment, salaries and other operating expenses.

Title II — Public Library Construction.

Title III — Interlibrary Cooperation: funds for the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, state or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

Title IV — Specialized State Library Services: funds to assist states in providing greatly needed specialized library services to state institutions and to the physically handicapped.

In defending the bill, Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana) cited the following accomplishments of LSCA:

More than 375 bookmobiles were added to existing library resources to reach rural readers. An estimated 14 million books and other informational materials were added to library collections. In the construction phase of the Library Services and Construction Act program, 53 States or territories reported that they had approved

TABLE 2. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1964-66  
(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Title I</i>		<i>Title II</i>	
	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>
1964	\$25.0	\$ 7.5	\$25.0	—
1965	“such sums as Congress may determine”	25.0	“such sums as Congress may determine”	\$30.0
1966	“such sums as Congress may determine”	25.0	“such sums as Congress may determine”	30.0

363 local public library construction projects. . . . Of the 363 projects, 233 were for the construction of new buildings; 58 were for additions to existing library buildings; and 72 were for remodeling or alteration. An estimated 23.3 million people will be served by this new construction.<sup>5</sup>

*July 19, 1966:* President Johnson signed into law the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-511), effective through June 30, 1971. Table 3 graphs the authorizations and appropriations for each title, 1967-71.

*April 1969:* Library, education and related interests formed a coalition, the "Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Educational Programs." The demands of the Vietnam war and inflation were beginning to jeopardize the priorities of the "Great Society."

*January 1970:* The Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, containing funds for LSCA for FY 1971, was vetoed by President Nixon.

*March 5, 1970:* President Nixon signed a revised appropriations bill for FY 1971, providing appropriations for LSCA of over \$51 million.

*July 1970:* The Education Appropriations Bill for FY 1972, appropriating funds for LSCA, passed and was then vetoed by President Nixon.

*August 1970:* Congress overrode the president's veto of the 1972 appropriations bill.<sup>6</sup>

*September-December 1970:* Bills were introduced in the Senate by Senators Clairborne Pell (D., Rhode Island) and Ralph Yarborough (D., Texas), and in the House by Congressman Brademas (D., Indiana), for the extension of LSCA until June 30, 1976. The bills consolidated Title IV (services for institutionalized and handicapped persons) with Title I and identified three federal priorities: library service to the disadvantaged,

TABLE 3. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1967-71  
(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Title I</i>		<i>Title II</i>		<i>Title III</i>		<i>Title IV-A</i>		<i>Title IV-B</i>	
	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>
1967	\$35	\$25.0	\$40	\$40.00	\$ 5.0	\$3.75	\$ 5.0	\$0.4	\$3	\$0.3
1968	45	35.0	"such sums as Congress may de- termine"	18.20	7.5	2.37	7.5	0.2	4	1.3
1969	55	35.0		9.20	10.0	2.28	10.0	2.1	5	1.3
1970	65	17.5		7.80	15.0	2.28	12.5	2.1	6	1.3
1971	97	38.4		7.09	15.0	2.28	15.0	2.1	7	1.3

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

strengthening of state library administrative agencies, and strengthening of metropolitan libraries.<sup>7</sup> Both bills passed unanimously.

*December 30, 1970:* President Nixon signed P.L. 91-600, the extension of LSCA until June 30, 1976. Table 4 charts the authorizations and appropriations for LSCA, 1972-76.

*January 1972:* President Nixon, in his budget for FY 1973, eliminated all funds for LSCA, along with funds for other library legislation.

*August 1972:* The Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, providing funds for LSCA, passed and was vetoed by President Nixon.

*October 1972:* A second Labor/HEW bill providing dollars for LSCA passed and was vetoed by President Nixon. A continuing resolution permitted the administration to spend at the presidential budget figures or at the appropriation level of FY 1972; this meant zero funding for LSCA. President Nixon signed into law the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act, conceived as an alternative to categorical federal aid. The act authorized over \$6 billion for each calendar year, 1972-76, to be distributed to states and municipalities on the basis of income, population, urbanization and tax revenues. Priority expenditures were for public safety, environmental protection, transportation, health, recreation services for the poor and aged, financial administration and libraries.

*January 29, 1973:* President Nixon's 1974 budget again proposed to terminate federal funds for public libraries on July 1, 1973. In the words of Richard Nathan, undersecretary of HEW: "Libraries simply are not a national government responsibility. . . . This program is a good case of a federal program that should be turned back to the States and localities."<sup>8</sup> This position was resisted by ALA and several congressmen. Ralph Nader urged librarians to launch a campaign to educate the public and legislators about the importance of libraries to the American people.<sup>9</sup> The Nixon administration advocated revenue-sharing as an alternative to the direct,

TABLE 4. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1972-76  
(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Title I</i>		<i>Title II</i>		<i>Title III</i>	
	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>	<i>Auth.</i>	<i>Appr.</i>
1972	\$112.0	\$46.5	\$80.0	\$9.5	\$15.0	\$2.6
1973	117.6	62.0	84.0	—	15.7	4.7
1974	123.5	44.2	88.0	—	16.5	2.6
1975	129.6	49.1	92.5	—	17.3	2.6
1976	137.1	51.7	97.0	—	18.2	2.6

categorical aid provided by LSCA. In response to this proposal, Joseph Shubert, then State Librarian of Ohio, reflected the skepticism of the library profession:

You have two problems [with revenue-sharing]. One is that the money in some cases has already been allocated and the other is that the general attitude toward revenue sharing is [not to] make long term commitments. You can't put together systems or regional co-operative operations out of bits and pieces of revenue sharing where you have to get maybe 35 different local governments each to contribute a little money to run a \$40,000 bookmobile in three rural counties. And yet not one of those three rural counties can afford to run a bookmobile program by itself.<sup>10</sup>

Shubert's reservation about federal revenue-sharing as a substitute for LSCA was borne out in an intensive study in 1976 of the effect of revenue-sharing on public libraries, sponsored by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Data gathered in this study led to the conclusion that "general revenue sharing . . . is not an effective substitute for . . . progressive development of public library services for all citizens."<sup>11</sup> In 1973-74, only 1.8 percent (\$76 million) of all general revenue-sharing funds to local governments was allocated for public library capital and operating expenses, and no more than one-third to one-half of this \$76 million represented new money. The remainder simply replaced local tax dollars.

*March 1973:* A final continuing resolution for the period January-June 1973 was signed by President Nixon, requiring the administration to spend for LSCA at the lowest of the House or Senate figures authorized in the first Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill for FY 1973. The administration continued, however, to spend only at the level of the president's budget (\$30 million for LSCA Title I, compared to the \$62 million authorized; zero for Title II, compared to the \$15 million authorized).

*May 1973:* A new Title IV, "Older Readers Services," was added to LSCA, authorizing funds for a variety of services to the aging, including employment of older people in libraries. This title has never been funded.

*June 26, 1973:* The House of Representatives passed H.R. 8877, a Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill for FY 1974, which included \$58.7 million for LSCA (rejecting the Nixon zero budget recommendation).

*June 30, 1973:* The U.S. District Court of Oklahoma ruled on a suit brought by Oklahoma, Michigan and New Mexico that the administra-

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

tion's impounding of LSCA funds for FY 1973 was "unconstitutional and unlawful."

*July 1, 1973:* President Nixon signed a continuing resolution which funded LSCA through September 30, 1973 at the \$58 million-level.

*December 18, 1973:* President Nixon signed the 1974 Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill into law. Compromising with the administration, Congress allowed the president to cut 5 percent from each program exceeding his budget request. This included LSCA.

*December 19, 1973:* The administration announced the release of all LSCA 1973 impounded funds. In the crisis of the 1970s, state libraries assumed a new prominence in the fight for federal as well as state funding. In every state, the impoundment of federal funds threatened to destroy library programs. The release of impounded funds six months into the fiscal year created new challenges for their wise expenditure.

*August 1974:* LSCA was again amended, as part of the Education Amendments of 1974, to ensure that priority be given to programs and services for persons of limited English-speaking ability.

*February 5, 1975:* Congressman Harold Johnson (D., California) introduced H.R. 2893 to extend LSCA through September 30, 1978.

*July 1975:* The Education Appropriations Bill for FY 1976 (H.R. 5901), which contained funds for LSCA, passed and was vetoed by President Ford.

*September 1975:* Congress overrode the president's veto and the Education Appropriations Bill became P.L. 94-94. It provided \$51.7 million for LSCA.

*September 1975:* The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science adopted a resolution, recommending to the Congress and the president:

That the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) be revised and extended for three years on the following basis:

- (a) Revise the act to ensure that federal funds not be substituted for state funds nor used as a substitute for adequate state support for the function of the state library agency. Provide a limitation on expenditures by state library agencies of 10 percent for administrative purposes.
- (b) Match LSCA, Title I, funds by state appropriations only.
- (c) Implement statutory time limitation on the use of LSCA funds for the state administration of LSCA, ensuring that more LSCA funds are distributed to eligible libraries.

- (d) Assure an equitable distribution of LSCA, Title I, funds to strengthen urban public libraries.
- (e) Structure administrative and fiscal provisions of LSCA to strengthen, stimulate, and require state and local support.
- (f) Merge Title III of LSCA and the multitype Library Partnership Act providing for the establishment of a local-state-federal partnership program for the purpose of encouraging and sustaining an adequate system of libraries and for the further development of networks that extend and expand the use of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers.
- (g) Revise LSCA to include provisions for forward funding to help resolve the recurring problems of uncertainty, late allocations, and other administrative problems that interfere with effective planning at the national, state, and local levels.

The resolution further recommends that the funding level for fiscal year 1977 for LSCA, Title I, be at a level not less than the FY 1976 appropriation; Title II at a minimum level of \$9 million; Title III, including the Library Partnership Act, at a minimum level of \$15 million; Title IV, Older American Services, at a minimum level of \$2 million.<sup>12</sup>

Table 5 charts appropriations for 1977 and 1978.

*February 1976:* A 5-year extension of LSCA (H.R. 11233) passed the House by a vote of 378-7, but was not considered by the Senate Education Committee. LSCA operated in FY 1977 under a 1-year extension authorized through the Education Amendments of 1974. LSCA was scheduled to expire September 20, 1977.

*September 8, 1977:* House and Senate reached final agreement on a 5-year extension of LSCA. Table 6 charts funds authorized in the bill.

The Senate's provision for a Title V, providing discretionary grants to urban libraries, was dropped by the conferees in favor of a provision earmarking all appropriations for Title I in excess of \$60 million for supporting and expanding library services of major urban resource libraries.

TABLE 5. LSCA: APPROPRIATIONS, 1977-78 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Title I</i>	<i>Title II</i>	<i>Title III</i>	<i>Title IV</i>
1977	\$56.9	—	\$3.3	—
1978	56.9	—	3.3	—

*Administration of State and Federal Funds*

TABLE 6. FUNDING AUTHORIZED UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES  
AND CONSTRUCTION ACT, 1978-82 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Title I</i>	<i>Title II</i>	<i>Title III</i>	<i>Title IV (Older Readers)</i>
1978	\$110	“such	\$15	
1979	140	sums as	20	“such
1980	150	necessary”	20	sums as
1981	150		20	necessary”
1982	150	\$97	20	

*October 7, 1977:* President Carter signed into law P.L. 95-123 which extends LSCA through 1982.

*December 9, 1977:* President Carter signed a continuing resolution providing LSCA funding for FY 1978. This resolution superseded the Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, which had been delayed in a lengthy controversy over federal funding for abortion.

#### IMPACT OF LSA/LSCA

What have state libraries accomplished with the federal funds entrusted to them over the last twenty-two years, and what has been the impact of these federal funds upon the state library agencies themselves?

The answer to the first part of this question could fill many books. To answer it in detail would be beyond the scope of this article. In general, as Rodney Lane pointed out in *Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries*, “much has been accomplished to stimulate and sustain the public library as a vital community-based informational and educational institution.”<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the most impressive result of the federal-state-local partnership has been the widespread — indeed, almost universal — establishment of public library systems and multitype library networks designed to augment and supplement local library services. These cooperatives have resulted in some level of library service to most American citizens, in improved service for many, but not in equality of access.

The movement toward regional and statewide library networks began early, under LSA, and was further stimulated after 1966 by LSCA Title III. Elizabeth Hughey, summarizing the activities undertaken by the states during the first ten years of Title III, lists the following: “(1) identification and location of library resources available in a state or region; (2) establishment or expansion of interlibrary loan and reference networks to include all types of libraries and information centers . . . ; (3) ex-

pansion or establishment of preprocessing centers . . . ; (4) coordination of the acquisition of materials among types of libraries; and (5) . . . the establishment of regional area library councils" engaged in assessing needs, joint planning, and evaluation.<sup>14</sup> Looking to the future, Hughey states that, "multistate regional networks are currently grappling with the as yet unanswered problems of interface and their role in what might become a 'national' network."<sup>15</sup>

Funds for construction were last appropriated in 1973, and were available for obligation through FY 1975. During its 12-year period, a total of \$174.5 million of LSCA funds were allocated and matched by local funds. The result has been the erection and remodeling of over 2000 public library buildings.<sup>16</sup>

Although no one could claim that public library service to the disadvantaged, the aging, the institutionalized, the handicapped, to minorities, or to persons of limited English-speaking ability are adequate, the record of achievement under LSA/LSCA is impressive. A sampling of these achievements is provided in *Library Programs Worth Knowing About*, a descriptive, annotated guide to exemplary programs initiated under LSCA in thirty-four states, jointly prepared by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources of the U.S. Office of Education (the federal agency which administers LSCA) and COSLA, the association of Chief Officers of State Library Agencies.<sup>17</sup>

For each program described, information is included on users or target group, facilities and materials utilized, budget, staffing and training requirements, evaluation, and "replication services" available, i.e., reports, forms, audio or video materials, opportunities for site visits, etc. In general, most of the programs are aimed at groups and individuals ordinarily not reached by conventional public library services.

Six projects are focused on the aging. These range from home delivery of library materials by volunteers in Muscatine, Iowa, to oral history projects — one in Grand Rapids, Michigan, aimed at capturing the reminiscences of elders among Chippewa, Ottawa and Potawatomi Indian tribes, and another in New Mexico which recorded the rapidly disappearing rural way of life in Spanish-speaking villages.

Eleven of the projects focus on people for whom English is a second language — Asians in Oakland, California; Spanish-speaking migrant workers in New Jersey; preschool children of non-English-speaking families in Massachusetts. "Project CHIPS" (Consumer Health Information Program and Services) offered health information and referral services

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

in Spanish and English to a multiethnic population of over 2 million people in Los Angeles County.

Eight of the projects were targeted at functionally illiterate adults, many of them involving the recruiting and training of community volunteers to tutor the illiterate, thus providing a link between two divergent groups in the community — the literate, educated middle class and the undereducated poor. Commonly, these programs encouraged close cooperation between the library and other community agencies working in adult basic education.

Many of the projects demonstrated nontraditional ways to deliver library services, such as books by mail, information broadcast by radio and television, computerized information/referral centers, and innovative use of bookmobiles.

At least eleven of the projects detailed were in the area of networking and interlibrary cooperation. Among the most original of these was the development of a mathematical model of the Illinois Interlibrary Loan Network. Seven projects were aimed specifically at school/public library cooperation.

The projects highlighted in *Library Programs Worth Knowing About* reflect the response of state library agencies to national priorities written into LSCA — priorities of: (1) extending library services to the poor, minority groups, the illiterate, the disadvantaged — all people outside the middle-class mainstream who are traditional library users, and (2) utilizing technology to link together resources in all types of libraries. The compilation also reflects congressional and executive concern for accountability, with emphasis on clear objectives, realistic evaluation and deliberate planning to share insights and replicate programs.

Another accomplishment linked at least indirectly to LSCA, and to the planning, experiments and demonstrations it enabled, has been a wider range of state aid and grants to local public libraries. State aid to local public libraries will be discussed in a later section of this article.

On the negative side, in analyzing the effects of LSA/LSCA, it must be admitted that:

1. Equality of library opportunity has not yet been reached. In the mid-1970s, per capita expenditures for library service ranged from less than \$1.00 to \$15.00, against a median of \$3.28.<sup>18</sup> In 1976, the chief state library officers estimated that there were over 9 million Americans (4.4 percent) with no library service, 175 million (83.3 percent) with inadequate service and only 26 million (12.3 percent) with what they defined as adequate service.

2. State support of local public libraries, although it has increased in dollar amounts, has actually decreased relatively. The library's share of all state aid to local government has declined, from .33 percent in 1967 to .21 percent in 1974. Between 1972-74 state aid to libraries increased by 4.7 percent, whereas all state payments increased by 11.8 percent. Breakthroughs in the state aid programs in California and Michigan during the last few months have somewhat altered the picture at least in these two states.
3. LSA/LSCA has not achieved a balanced intergovernmental funding system between local, state and federal levels, as is generally perceived as necessary. The overwhelming portion of the cost of public library service continues to fall on local government.

Because the level of LSA/LSCA funding has never been in accord with its stated goals and objectives, and because its funding has been unstable, fluctuating widely from year to year (especially during the 1970s), LSCA has been less than totally effective in assuring adequate public library services throughout the nation, despite its truly impressive achievements.

What has been the impact of federal funds on state library agencies themselves? In the first place, state library extension/development agencies in some states, such as Arizona and Utah, were actually brought into being to enable the state to qualify for the federal funds. In every state, library development agencies have been enormously strengthened in order to meet the demands placed on them by LSA/LSCA. In fact, a 1974 report compiled by the General Accounting Office criticized state libraries for channeling too many LSCA dollars into "administration services and statewide programs" at the state level, thus unduly reducing the funds available to provide new or improved library service at the local library level, for which LSCA was intended.<sup>19</sup>

LSA/LSCA strengthened state libraries, not only because it afforded them discretionary funds for administration, but also because it:

1. required planning, leading to long- and short-range programs for public library development;
2. it provided them over the years with substantial amounts of new money for the improvement of public library services, for construction of public libraries, for the development of library services for the institutionalized and for the handicapped — all of these forcing more sophisticated systems of accounting, budgeting, planning, evaluating, and technical consulting;

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

3. gave leadership responsibility for statewide multitype library networks, thus causing state library development agencies to widen their scope from public libraries alone to all types of libraries within a state; and
4. caused state libraries to move from an almost exclusive concentration on small rural public libraries to consideration of the more sophisticated demands of large urban public libraries and public library systems.

There can be no doubt that the state library development agency of 1978 is a vastly more sophisticated agency, better staffed, better equipped and more respected than it was in 1956, and that much of this growth is a result of LSA/LSCA. It also cannot be questioned that a strong state library is critical to an effective local-state-federal partnership for the improvement of public library services.

One evidence of the growing maturity of state libraries since LSA was enacted is the establishment of two professional organizations: the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA), a unit of ALA founded in 1956, and COSLA (mentioned earlier), an independent organization founded in 1973 of individuals who head state agencies responsible for library development. The scope and focus of these associations reflects the growing importance of state libraries as intermediaries between the federal government and local libraries.

Within the American Library Association, ASLA has responsibility for:

planning of programs of study and policy for the development of total library service on a statewide basis, emphasizing the coordination and interdependence of all types of libraries . . . ; establishment, evaluation and promotion of standards for state library agencies; [and] . . . the development of policies, studies, and activities relating to (a) state library legislation, (b) state grants-in-aid and appropriations, and (c) relationship of state to federal and local government.<sup>20</sup>

Multitype library cooperation has dominated the attention of ASLA since Title III (Interlibrary Cooperation) of LSCA was enacted in 1966. In December 1976, the ASLA Board of Directors adopted a position statement which asserts that ASLA is "the unit within the American Library Association best able to promote and represent the interests and activities of libraries involved in statewide coordination, interlibrary cooperation and networking."<sup>21</sup> In 1976, ASLA was one of only three ALA divisions which increased its membership, a trend which continued in 1977. In 1977, ASLA merged with the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division of ALA. The fact that these two divisions share a major concern

for service to the handicapped and institutionalized can be directly attributed to responsibilities engendered by LSCA Title IV-A and IV-B in the amendments of 1966.

COSLA has as its purpose "to interact with the federal officials with whom they [the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies] work and with each other on issues of mutual concern."<sup>22</sup>

Present concerns include (1) effective statewide planning and action to ensure library services adequate to meet the needs of all communities; (2) the strengthening of state library agencies, library systems, and effective networks; (3) federal legislation and federal appropriations for library services; (4) state-federal partnership implications of the proposed National Program for Library and Information Services; (5) state library services; (6) availability of state and federal documents; (7) improved library statistics programs; (8) continuing library education programs; and (9) state-federal responsibilities for talking book service to blind and physically handicapped.<sup>23</sup>

The range of concerns of both ASLA and COSLA is evidence of the priority which state library development agencies place on legislation and long-range national planning for library development. No one who has observed the Washington scene during the last twenty-two years could deny the close ties which have existed between USOE officials responsible for administering LSA/LSCA and state library administrators, or the leadership role played by the state libraries in influencing the Congress in its generally favorable attitude toward the legislation.

#### STATE AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

No picture of state library development agencies would be complete without a discussion of state aid to public libraries and, more recently, to multitype library systems.

In all states, both state and federal funds for public libraries are channeled through state libraries. Commonly, state and federal funds are jointly used in the implementation of long-range plans for statewide library development. According to Alex Ladenson, "the rationale for state aid [to public libraries] is founded on the principle that education is a primary function of state government, and since public libraries are part of the education system, it follows that the state has a direct responsibility for their financial support."<sup>24</sup> Following this rationale, a report to the Urban Library Council on *Improving State Aid to Public Libraries*<sup>25</sup> recommends that state aid to public libraries be based on a percentage of the

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

state aid to local school districts. The fact that, as of January 1977, 38 percent (nineteen) of state library development agencies are now administered under state departments of education would seem to suggest the practical feasibility of this approach. It cannot be denied that, despite Ladenson's rationale, state aid to libraries in all states is miniscule (less than 2 percent of the dollars appropriated for state school aid), and that no state has chosen as yet to tie together in one formula aid to both schools and public libraries.

A survey of fifty large metropolitan libraries conducted annually since 1973 by the Montgomery County (Maryland) Department of Public Libraries revealed a range in state aid received in 1976 of from \$1235 (by the New Orleans Public Library), to \$3,478,000 (by the New York Public Library). Of the forty-three libraries responding to the survey, five (11 percent) received less than \$100,000, four (9 percent) received over \$1 million, and sixteen of the respondents (37 percent) received no state aid. Overall in the nation, state aid accounted for only 11.7 percent of the total expended by public libraries (with 80.9 percent local and 7.4 percent federal). By the mid-1970s, fifteen states had made no provision for state aid to local public libraries and library systems.<sup>26</sup> However, between 1962 and 1972, the number of states granting aid to local libraries jumped from twenty-one to thirty-three. State aid to public libraries is commonly distributed in three broad patterns:

1. *State aid to cooperative library systems* — This pattern is found in New York, Illinois, California, Michigan and Ohio. State aid is viewed as an effort to equalize library service throughout a region, and throughout a state, by offering incentive to local libraries to enter into cooperatives offering improved interlibrary loan and reference service, joint acquisition and technical processing, reciprocal in-person borrowing, staff development, and other services to strengthen the local member libraries.
2. *State aid to district library centers* — Aid is given to resource libraries capable of and willing to supply resources and services to local public libraries. The pattern is used in Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Jersey.
3. *Direct state aid to local public libraries* — Assistance helps individual public libraries to achieve prescribed minimum standards, as in Maryland. Michigan continues to provide state aid to local libraries — indeed, has substantially increased the per capita grants to local libraries — while also supporting regional public library systems.<sup>27</sup>

Frequently, as in Ohio, state funds for public libraries are used to supplement federal funds in the implementation of a plan for statewide library improvement, developed by the state library as part of the requirement for LSCA.

In summary, the record of state library administration of state and federal funds between 1956 and 1977 documents that these funds have resulted in greatly strengthened state library agencies and that the maturing state libraries have contributed significantly to the amount and effectiveness of the funding programs.

### References

1. Fry, James W. "LSA and LSCA, 1956-1973: A Legislative History," *Library Trends* 24:7-26, July 1975.
2. U.S. Congress, Senate. *Congressional Record*, 86th Cong., 2d Sess., 1960, 106, pt. 1:547.
3. "Excerpts from President Kennedy's Special Education Message," *ALA Washington Newsletter* 15:6, Feb. 7, 1963.
4. U.S. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. "Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, Compilation of Materials Relevant to Public Law 88-269, Prepared for Subcommittee on Education." Committee Print, 88th Cong., 2d Sess., 1964, pp. 11-12.
5. U.S. Congress, Senate. *Congressional Record*, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., 1966, 112, pt. 11:13901.
6. These events of 1970 are detailed in Robert W. Frase. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds," *Publishers' Weekly* 205:64, Jan. 21, 1974.
7. U.S. Congress, Senate. *Congressional Record*, 91st Cong., 2d Sess., 1970, 116, pt. 24:32650.
8. Pierson, John. "Do Libraries Need Federal Aid? White House Says No, but Librarians Say They'll Suffer," *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 27, 1973, p. 42, cols. 1-3.
9. Nader, Ralph. "A Strategy for Librarians," *American Libraries* 4:275, May 1973.
10. "Libraries: Administration Plans to End Funding," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 31:781, 1973.
11. Government Studies and Systems. *Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries*. Washington, D.C., NCLIS, 1976, p. 114.
12. Trezza, Alphonse F. "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science." In Madeline Miele, et al., eds. and comps. *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 21st ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1976, pp. 16-17.
13. Government Studies and Systems, op. cit., p. 109.
14. Hughey, Elizabeth H. "Library Services and Construction Act." In Nada B. Glick and Sarah L. Prakken, eds. and comps. *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 22d ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1977, p. 181.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 182.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
17. Erteschik, Ann. *Library Programs Worth Knowing About*. Washington, D.C., Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, USOE, 1977.
18. Government Studies and Systems, op. cit., p. 111.

### *Administration of State and Federal Funds*

19. U.S. General Accounting Office. *Federal Library Support Programs: Progress and Problems* (MWD 75-4). Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, Dec. 30, 1974, p. ii.

20. Power, Mary R. "Association of State Library Agencies." In Glick and Prakken, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

21. Ibid., p. 79.

22. Shubert, Joseph F. "Chief Officers of State Library Agencies." In Glick and Prakken, op. cit., p. 71.

23. Ibid.

24. Ladenson, Alex. "Library Legislation: Some General Considerations," *Library Trends* 19:180, Oct. 1970.

25. Government Studies and Systems. *Improving State Aid to Public Libraries*. Washington, D.C., NCLIS, 1977.

26. Green, Joseph. "Urban and Suburban Public Library Statistics." In Glick and Prakken, op. cit., pp. 270-71.

27. Ladenson, op. cit., p. 180-81.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank