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A reading of the Senate and House subcommittee hearings on the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title II-A, College Library Resources) shows that special purpose grants were aimed at encouraging (1) interlibrary cooperation in the acquisition of quality library resources, and (2) use of the new technology for processing, storing, and distributing information. The latter was in direct response to pressure from scientists to modernize methods of library organization, with emphasis on the efficient and speedy provision of information.
From the federal appropriation, the act specifies that 15 per cent must be used for special purpose grants. The institutions, in turn, must match one-third of the grant allotted.
The appropriation for fiscal year 1967 was

$\$ 25$ million, so $\$ 3,750,000$ was available for special purpose awards, Types A, B, and C. Applications for all categories of grants totaling $\$ 60$ million were submitted. The basic grants of up to $\$ 5,000$ for each qualifying institution had to be considered first. They totaled $\$ 9,622,865$ for 1,989 institutions, out of the 2,117 that applied.

Next, 15 per cent of the appropriation for special purpose grants was distributed among the three types. Of the 1,083 applications, there were 666 for Type A, 172 for Type B, and 245 for Type C. The 55 institutions rating 10 to 12 points on the criteria stated in the manual received grants as requested under Type A, except that $\$ 100,000$ was established as a ceiling so that the number of grants would not be limited to a few large projects.

Only seven institutions were awarded Type B grants, which totaled $\$ 253,420$. The recipients scored 24 points, the highest rating received among the Type B applicants. The 71 Type C grants awarded totaled $\$ 1,575,050$, again with a ceiling of $\$ 100,000$ on any one grant.

The applicants who failed to qualify for grants should not think their effort was wasted. The information assembled here gives some idea of the present need for academic library resources and will be useful in estimating future needs. For the next round of applications this experience in the process of "grantsmanship" will certainly be helpful.

## ANNUAL REMINDER FROM CHICAGO?

Belonging to ALA continues to be one of the best ways a librarian can keep informed about new developments in the profession. It also is a vehicle which permits librarians to make a contribution outside of their daily work to the future of the profession. Those who are not yet members are reminded that applications are available from Peter Gellatly, Acquisition Division. This annual reminder from Chicago always brings to mind the Washington Library Association Bulletin of April, 1906.

The Council of the A.L.A. recently voted
to change the fee for joining the Association
to $\$ 3.00$, the change to take effect June 1st.
The old fee of $\$ 2.00$ holds till that date;
hence, it behooves us to see the Treasurer before that date.
Oh, for the good old days-but, ALA, good as it should be and on target, looks like a better bargain quality-wise today!-Washington Library Letter (University of Washington Libraries, VIII, No. 19, 2-3).

