Forty-seven responses were usable. Among the respondents were 12 collections (25%) in medical school libraries, 24 received 8 responses, an astonishing (to me) rate of 69.5%! A search of the literature for the last ten years or so turned up little on sales of library materials, except articles with suggestions for organizing and holding on-site sales. With one exception they focused on public libraries (4-6).

A more cooperative group would be hard to find--I received 8 responses, an astonishing (to me) rate of 69.5%! Forty-seven responses were usable. Among the respondents were 12 collections (25%) in medical school libraries, 24 (50%) in health science or medical center libraries, and eleven (22.9%) other libraries--dental, society, museum, or government libraries. They ranged in size from those whose general collections were under 10,000 volumes, to one over several million. The greatest number of responses came from rare collections under 5,000 volumes (14 libraries, 29%), followed by those with 5-10,000 (nine libraries, 18.75%), 11-15,000 (six libraries, 10%), 15-30,000 (six libraries, 12.5%), three libraries over 30,000 (6.25%), and one over 100,000.

One librarian found that a lack of a significant amount of rare book materials had made it unprofitable in the past. Several others commented that they had neither the space to store materials prior to selling them, nor the time or the staff to prepare and carry out such activities, particularly for a "Minimal return." One respondent noted that the collection was not cataloged, so presumably they cannot identify their duplicates. In another library, the "collection focus is unique," and they are currently in the market to buy, not sell, duplicates. Finally, one librarian stated that their duplicates are in "bad shape" and would not be

TO SELL OR NOT TO SELL: BOOK SALES IN HISTORY OF HEALTH SCIENCE COLLECTIONS

by Nancy Whitten Zinn

INTRODUCTION

Sale of library materials presents a very real quandary for many librarians. The persistent pressures of increasing book prices (of both secondary and rare materials), decreasing budgets in private and public institutions everywhere, the weakening dollar in foreign currency--all of these factors add up to the need for most of us to seek additional avenues of financial support. If programs are to be supported adequately, and collections for research and teaching are to be maintained by a reasonable growth rate, funds must be found to supplement budgets.

Even a reasonable growth rate can be a matter for concern. As libraries age, and their collections continue to expand, space does not. The need to find extra room for newly acquired materials often sends librarians to their stacks to measure and re-measure their inflexible space allotments, in hopes of squeezing in just a few more volumes.

Short of finding a magic wishing pebble or winning the lottery, librarians may find that possibilities for ameliorating both problems exist within their own collections. Leaving aside the thorny questions of defining duplicate materials (a strongly debated subject addressed in a workshop at Brown University in 1981), (1-3) sale of duplicates weeded from the library's general and rare book collections may be a ready source of additional funds.

Presuming that the donors are aware of policies which give the library the right of disposal, gifts which turn out to duplicate materials already held in the collections, and which are not needed as second copies, are potential sale material as well.

A search of the literature for the last ten years or so turned up little on sales of library materials, except articles with suggestions for organizing and holding on-site sales. With one exception they focused on public libraries (4-6).

METHOD

As well as revenue, library book sales raise a number of interesting questions. To learn which history of health science librarians are selling materials to raise funds, and how they are going about it, in June 1988 I sent out a survey to 69 members of ALHHS. A more cooperative group would be hard to find--I received 8 responses, an astonishing (to me) rate of 69.5%! Forty-seven responses were usable. Among the respondents were 12 collections (25%) in medical school libraries, 24 (50%) in

RESULTS

Of the 48 respondents, 27 (56.25%) routinely sell materials; 20 (41.66%) do not (although several are "about to" and one is "thinking about it"). Of the 20, an equal number of medical school and health science libraries (seven each) currently do not sell materials. The other six are society or museum libraries, and the National Library of Medicine.

Institutional or governmental regulations which forbid the process were the primary reasons given by six librarians for not selling duplicate library materials. Respondents commented that they were "not allowed to," that being part of the state university "poses problems of disposing of state property," or that it was "against state law." One response stated that although regulations forbade sale of state property, gifts (i.e., materials received but not added to the collections) could be sold. However, it was also noted that some gifts carried restrictions which prevented their sale. Several respondents said that they had no trouble discarding or giving away such materials to other libraries, and that accumulations of such materials were sent to the MLA (Medical Library Association) Exchange.

One librarian found that a lack of a significant amount of rare book materials had made it unprofitable in the past. Several others commented that they had neither the space to store materials prior to selling them, nor the time or the staff to prepare and carry out such activities, particularly for a "Minimal return." One respondent noted that the collection was not cataloged, so presumably they cannot identify their duplicates. In another library, the "collection focus is unique," and they are currently in the market to buy, not sell, duplicates. Finally, one librarian stated that their duplicates are in "bad shape" and would not be
attractive to a prospective purchaser. In several cases however, these negative respondents left the door open for future sales, indicating that they were considering it, and examining the implications for their libraries.

Among the 27 affirmative responses, most mentioned making money, increasing rare book purchasing funds, as the main reason for selling books and materials. Need for creating more space was the second most frequent response. Several librarians found the process helped generate good will toward the library, both inside and beyond the institution. Others saw it as a means of making the library more visible, and increasing community awareness of the library's needs and services.

Not surprisingly, librarians, whose goal after all is to collect and preserve, find it difficult to simply throw away books and other printed materials. Consequently, preventing the destruction of worthwhile materials, and redistributing works which they cannot use, also rated high as reasons for selling unwanted duplicates. Additionally, sales can offer, as one librarian noted frankly, a means of "recouping purchasing errors," whether of duplicate or out-of-scope materials.

How, then, do most librarians sell their duplicate materials? and what do they hope to sell? All 27 respondents sell books (no differentiation was made between rare and secondary materials); 17 sell journals as well. One sells only journals, and the sale is handled by the serials staff, not the history staff. Only one librarian sells artifacts, but another is contemplating doing so. The primary source of sale books was gifts to the library (27 responses), and duplicates withdrawn from the collection (19 responses); no surprises here.

Occasionally libraries are given or purchase entire collections which frequently contain duplicates, particularly collections purchased by lot at auction. The practice of purchasing another copy of an already held title to obtain a better copy, while perhaps not widespread, also creates duplicates for possible sale.

The most popular sale methods are on-site sales, and sales direct to dealers, each of which received 15 responses (55%). Sales by catalogue or list are only slightly less common, with 12 responses (44%). One respondent allowed that on-site sales had brought little income; another has an on-going sale with a shelf of rare books available to be purchased by anyone who drops in. Still another sells duplicates at meetings of society members. For one librarian non-medical rare materials are a primary item for sale to dealers. Two (7.5%) sell books on consignment to dealers, and two others trade with out-of-print dealers.

Sales by catalogue or list are a very time-consuming, labor-intensive practice. The description and pricing of items and typing of catalogues have to be done when staff are available, and when not pressed by other business. Comprehensive and accurate description of items saves the buyer time and trouble, and the seller the problem of returned items. Of the twelve individuals who sell in this fashion, nine (75%) do the description of the items themselves; in three cases, it is done by library assistants. The descriptions ranged from "rudimentary" to "very complete." Even so, all (40.7%) but one gave complete title transcriptions, and all gave complete publishing information. Only eight (29%) give complete collations—the lack of which is a pet peeve of my own, particularly where the item is part of another publication or is a reprint. Six respondents routinely give information on condition of items as well, particularly important for those looking for fine, as opposed to working copies.

Pricing items for sale can pose major problems. While librarians routinely read dealers' catalogues, they lack the experience that results from a singular focus and handling large numbers of books in a constantly changing market. Consequently, they use a combination of experience and reference tools to arrive at a price they feel is equitable to the institution yet will not discourage a sale. Two respondents who sell to dealers ask the latter to bid on their items, which saves them the effort of pricing; they indicated no dissatisfaction with this method. Judith Overmier's article in a recent Watermark (7) indicated those dealers who routinely do this. Nine librarians who distribute catalogues and lists do their own pricing; one supervises an experienced library assistant who prices items; one institution also avails itself of the help of knowledgeable volunteers. Their own experience and dealers' catalogues are the primary sources for nine librarians; seven also use reference works such as Bookman's Price Index, and auction records.

The survey also asked how the catalogues were produced: five respondents type their lists on a typewriter; seven are using a word processor—another sign of the times. No one is currently using a desktop publishing program, however, nor are they having their catalogues printed. Certainly the ability to type your description into the word processor, edit and print it out eliminates one time-consuming chore, that of retyping after proofing, and allows the insertion of added items at the last minute.

Catalogues are distributed to history of health sciences collections by ten respondents, and to general health sciences libraries by five. Sixteen respondents distribute catalogues or lists to dealers, and three send them to collectors as well. Only one sends the list to general libraries, and one sends it to members of their society. Ten librarians distribute their lists to everyone at the same time; one mails the list first to dealers, one sends it to other librarians first.

When asked about the frequency of catalogue distribution, no one suggested they had a regular schedule. Everyone replied that they were compiled and sent out when enough materials had accumulated and there was sufficient time for preparation. The numbers of catalogues distributed varied widely, from a low of "fewer than 10", "6 to 8", to "10 to 20", "25-30" and three who sent out 100 or over. The number of items also varied, from a low of "30-40" to a high of 250.

There were only six responses to the questions asking for estimates of the amounts of time spent on compiling and producing lists. The questions were not asked in a manner to elicit times comparing effort with the number of items, but respondents guesses ranged from 2-4 to 100 hours pricing items, from 2-3 to over 50 hours on description, and from five to 20 hours typing lists. One librarian noted that "mailing and taking orders" took approximately 30 hours.

Most dealers charge customers postage and handling fees, and one might expect that librarians would also, since prices they ask for their books are generally far below those asked by dealers. However, only two charge handling fees, ten do not. However, nine respondents charge for postage, and five charge a flat fee for it.

12
On-site sales call for space, staff and publicity. Books sold in this fashion may or may not be individually priced. Some give the run-of-the mill books a single price ($1.00/volume) and price rare items separately. Books may be categorized by subject, and perhaps by rarity. We have noted above one continuing sale. Most, however, also depend on a critical mass of books available simultaneously with a place to sell them, and a staff to carry out the sale. Nine librarians have sold books this way. Six publicize the sales in internal publications, two in outside publications. Seven librarians distribute flyers internally, and five outside the institution, to library associates, or members of local history groups. In these budget-conscious days the term "cost-benefit analysis" has become a buzz word of administrators anxious to impress their staffs with the need to make their units more cost effective. However, only one of the survey respondents has done such an analysis of book sale efforts. As another commented, "my hunch is that the benefits are less than the staff time it takes," which is possibly the reason most have avoided the process. Perhaps librarians don't really want to know just what we are paying for the profits we are making.

The estimates given for the costs to the library of such sales followed no pattern. One respondent said that it cost $1000, but that "it brings over $3000 in sales," another that the catalogue cost $20-30 plus postage, without figuring in the librarian's time. Others estimated sale costs ranging from $5. to $75. On the other hand, in one library, on-site sales brought in $500 to $1000 per year; and another makes $50 to $100 per volume selling to dealers.

Of course, the hard question is profit versus costs. In answering question 19. about the costs of sales being equal to the gains, fourteen respondents answered -yes- (54%), two answered -no- (8%), and nine (35%) answered -perhaps-. One respondent couldn't decide between -no- and -perhaps-. Still, no one said that they would discontinue sale of materials. Seventeen who answered the question said they would continue; two were unsure. The satisfaction derived from putting books in the hands of those who need and want them, and gaining money in hand from the process, makes this doubly rewarding, and most seductive. The associated benefits mentioned--raising the visibility of the library, providing a service to students faculty, opening up space for shelving of new materials--are all other additional reasons for deciding to sell unwanted books.

Although only three librarians send their lists/catalogues to collectors, many of the latter are reached by on-site sales, and in this way good will is generated for the collection, and perhaps, future donations. It is clear that many librarians are building good relations also by selling to and trading with dealers; and the arguments for keeping books in circulation speak strongly against destruction. The increasing totals in special funds available for purchase of materials which could not otherwise be afforded exert a powerful appeal, when compared with the costs to libraries in staff time, which are less visible.

Possibly we have to consider the other factors--public relations, visibility, preservation and passing on worthwhile books--as benefits equal with the financial gains in evaluating the total picture of book sales; perhaps then we will find the justification we would like to have for continuing the processes some of us seem to carry out in any case!

PRESERVATION MICROFILMING AT THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
by Margaret M. Byrnes

Microfilming and conservation work have been conducted at the National Library of Medicine for many years. It was not, however, until the Library conducted an exhaustive preservation self-study and issued its report, "Preservation of the Biomedical Literature: A Plan for the National Library of Medicine" in 1985 that a formal Preservation Section was established. The primary responsibilities of the NLM Preservation Section include staff and patron preservation education, disaster prevention and recovery, and management of contracts for binding preparation, binding, and preservation microfilming. The Section also provides assistance to other NLM staff who are responsible for related activities such as the conservation of History of Medicine Division materials, research into electronic imaging as an alternative means of preserving the content of deteriorated materials, and NLM's campaign to increase the use of alkaline paper by medical and scientific publishers.

During the first few years of the Preservation Section's existence, attention has been focused on the microfilming of brittle volumes. Surveys of the collection conducted in 1984 and 1986 showed that approximately 158,000 serials volumes and monographs (11.8% of the collection) have become brittle. This figure includes materials that have already been filmed but do not reflect the many brittle theses, pamphlets and government documents in the collection. In response to this finding, the Library launched a major microfilming effort in September, 1986, by initiating a contract for the filming of 35 million pages or approximately 50,000 volumes over a four to five year period. It is the Library's intent by the time the project is completed to have an archival film copy of all brittle monographs and serials in the collection that are in core medical subjects and have not been filmed by other sources. The general order in which brittle serials and monographs are being filmed is as follows:

1) serials indexed in Index Medicus.
2) serials in NLM core subjects and currently indexed in NLM data bases.
3) serials in NLM core subjects currently indexed in other major abstracting and indexing services (e.g., Excerpta Medica, BIOSIS, Chemical Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts.
4) serials which, according to SERHOLD, are unique to NLM.
5) NLM's remaining serials in core subjects.
6) monographs published in the United States between 1801 and 1900 in WZ 270 of the National Library of Medicine classification schedule.
7) all other monographs in core subjects published between 1801 and 1914.
8) monographs in core subject published between 1914 and 1950 in classification numbers W through WZ.
9) monographs in preclinical sciences in classification number QS through QZ published between 1914 and 1950.
10) monographs in Library of Congress classification numbers which were published between 1914 and 1950 and are regarded, currently or historically, as important to core medicine.

After a somewhat slow startup period that is typical of a project of such ambitious size, microfilming is now proceeding smoothly. By the end of December, 1988, 12.7 million pages had been collated, and 15,400 serials volumes had been filmed. To avoid future duplication of effort by other biomedical libraries, records for all serials filmed by NLM are being input into SERLINE. Records for filmed monographs will be input into CATLINE. The Library is working toward making bibliographic data about its preservation microfilms available for loading into the other bibliographic utilities.

Since it is assumed that any microfilm produced by the National Library of Medicine will become the archival copy for the country, an effort is being made to film the brittle portion of serials in complete runs. For this reason, the Library began a program in 1987 to borrow from other libraries volumes that are missing from its collection and needed for filming. Cooperation from the libraries identified as owners of needed materials has been excellent. By the end of December, 1988, 2,729 volumes had been requested from fifteen libraries and 1,275 had been received. Since approximately 200 additional titles have been found to be incomplete and the volumes needed for filming cannot be located in the United States, a program of borrowing from foreign libraries has recently been initiated. The response to date from European libraries has been very positive. By January, 1989, the Library had begun filming materials borrowed from Finland, Denmark, and Yugoslavia.

The Preservation Section is in the process of arranging for remote storage under archival conditions of all master negative microfilms in the collection. Storing the masters under recommended temperature, humidity, and air quality conditions and physically separating them from printing master copies of the film so that only one set would be damaged in the event of fire or flood should help to guarantee the future availability of the information that NLM has preserved. In addition, a project will
be begun this year to inspect for the technical quality and bibliographic completeness of all of the NLM film that was produced prior to September 1986 and all of the commercially produced film that NLM has purchased. If any of the film is found to be of poor quality or incomplete, the originals will be refilmed. Inspection of the commercially produced film will be especially important since many of the titles filmed by micropublishers are major American biomedical serials which must be preserved in their entirety.

As part of the Library’s National Preservation Program for the Biomedical Literature, NLM’s filming effort will soon begin to be supplemented by microfilming projects conducted by other U.S. health science libraries. On a cost-sharing basis, contracts will be made available to qualified institutions so that they will be able to microfilm or provide conservation treatment for important biomedical materials that are not held by the National Library of Medicine. The program will begin on a small scale by providing funding for up to three microfilming and three conservation projects during the first year. These pilot projects are scheduled to begin in October, 1989. Subject to the availability of funds, the Library plans to expand the program in 1990. The combination of NLM’s filming efforts and projects conducted by other libraries as part of the National Preservation Program for the Biomedical Literature should help to ensure that most of the important publications that are currently at risk of loss from embrittlement will be saved for future generations of researchers in the health sciences.

---

**EX LIBRIS**  **EX LIBRIS**  **EX LIBRIS**

by Katharine E.S. Donahue

**NEW ACQUISITIONS**

The Twenty Second California International Antiquarian Bookfair was held February tenth, eleventh, and twelfth, 1989 at the Crystal Court, San Francisco. The Book Fair was the largest ever held in the United States and probably Europe. There were 185 dealers from the United States, Canada, the Netherlands, England, France, Germany, Argentina, and Australia. Needless to say, there were thousands of books on display and many wonderful titles to delight the eye and deplete the pocketbook.

**AS REPORTED IN THE NEWS**

The University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, purchased the Andrew A. Sandor Ophthalmology collection with special funds. The collection includes 389 titles published between the late 1400s and the early 1900s.

The University of Rochester’s Edward G. Miner Library (History of Medicine Section), Rochester, New York completed the processing of the papers of Wallace Osgood Fenn (1893-1971). He was the chairman of the Department of Physiology at Rochester’s School of Medicine and Dentistry from 1924 until 1959. The Fenn papers include series of correspondence, reports, manuscripts, lecture notes, and laboratory notebooks chronicling Fenn’s research activity from 1915 to 1971.

**ANALYTICS**

Margaret Jerrido and Judith Overmier were invited speakers on a five person panel discussing “Research Opportunities for Literary Scholarship in Medical Historical Libraries” on December 28, 1988 at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in New Orleans.

With funding from a Library Resource Project Grant of the National Library of Medicine, Dr. Ynez O’Neill, principal investigator, and Dr. Mark Infusino, project coordinator, are undertaking to describe and index the contents of all medieval manuscript images with medical components presently held in North American collections. The goal of the project is to provide a new tool for those who seek to study the graphic legacy of the medieval medical mind, by producing a comprehensive database of medieval medical iconography. They are also issuing a newsletter which will detail their progress. Anyone wishing to receive “The Index of Medieval Medical Images in North America, Newsletter” may write to Ynez Viole O’Neill, Medical History Division, Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, UCLA School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, 90024-1763. Volume 1, number 1 of the newsletter has just been issued. The researchers would be happy to be notified of the existence of American owned medical manuscripts written up to the year 1500 that may not yet be recorded in standard reference sources.

The Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, ALA, is holding its annual meeting in Cambridge England, September 5-8, 1989. The subject of the meeting is the history and present state of the international trade in antiquarian materials. Anyone interested, who is not already a member of RBMS, may write to William Joyce, Rare Books and Special Collections, P.O. Box 190, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. 08544.
CALENDAR
30 March--Robert J. Joynt, M.D., Ph.D., Dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry. History of the Health Sciences Lecture Series, Claude Moore Health Sciences Library, University of Virginia. "Low Intellect in High Places." 5:00 P.M., Wilhelm Moll Rare Book and Medical History Room.
3 April--Michael Osborne, Ph.D., Lecturer, Department of History, University of California, Santa Barbara. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "French Military Epidemiology and the Limits of the Laboratory: the Case of Louis-Felix-Achile Kelsch." 12:00 P.M., 555 Diehl Hall.
10 April--Robert J. Richards, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Departments of History, Philosophy and Psychology, University of Chicago. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "Ernst Haeckel and the Battle Over Evolution in Germany: An Argument for Scientific and Narrative Realism in the History of Science." 12:00 P.M., 555 Diehl Hall.
17 April--Penelope Krosch, Assistant Professor, University Archives, University of Minnesota. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "Thomas Sadler Roberts: Father of Minnesota Ornithology." 12:00 P.M., 555 Diehl Hall.
1 May--Ted Greenfield, Ph.D., Research Associate, School of Dentistry, University of Minnesota. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "After Darwin, Before Mendel: August Weismann and 19th Century Theories of Heredity." 12:00 P.M., 555 Diehl Hall.
8 May--Chris Lewis, Doctoral Student, American Studies, University of Minnesota. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "Historical Roots of Ecological Apocalyptic: A Dialogue About Progress." 12:00 P.M., 555 Diehl Hall.
15 May--Lynn K. Nyhart, Assistant Professor, History of Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison. History of the Life Sciences Lecture Series, Owen H. Wangensteen Historical Library of Biology and Medicine, University of Minnesota. "The Problem of the Organic Individual in Mid-19th Century Germany."

CONSERVATION NOTE
The Document Conservation Branch of the National Archives and Records Administration tested two brands of removable self-stick notes (3M Post-it, and ABM Attention) and found that when removed the adhesive stays behind and that the colors tend to run when wet. NARA recommends that no removable self-stick notes be used on any paper that has permanent value.

DESIDERATA
I am looking for publications from the American Committee for the Control of Rheumatism. Specific titles are:
What is Rheumatism? (1928)
Rheumatism Primer (1932)
Primer on Rheumatism (1934).

My address to use for anyone having copies of these is:
Elizabeth White
Historical Research Center
HAM-TMC Library
1133 M.D. Anderson Blvd
Houston, Texas 77030
713-797-1230

MISCELLANEOUS
WANTED: BOOK REVIEWERS of advance copies of health and medical books for Library Journal. Reviews run about 150-200 words; audience is the large public library and academic library. Payment is final bound copy of review book, name credit in Library Journal, and additional bonus books when possible. For more information, contact: Judy Quinn, Associate Editor, The Book Review, Library Journal, 249 W. 17th Street, New York, NY 10011; 212-463-6805.

The list of standardized citations to bibliographic works in the history of health sciences prepared by the ALHHS Ad Hoc Committee was sent to Paul Winkler at the Library of Congress in June. He responded in August, indicating he was very grateful for our contributions, and urging us to send in the future any title we deem useful. He did not say when the next revised list would be out, nor if our contributions would all be accepted as sent. Keep posted!

Election Results
Elizabeth Borst White - Secretary/Treasurer
Barbara A. Paulson - Steering Committee Member (two years)
Philip M. Teigen - Steering Committee Member/President Elect

Program in Birmingham
Wednesday, April 26
6:00 p.m. Dinner at Rossis

Thursday, April 27
9:00 a.m. Reynolds Library (Coffee and pastries will served.)
9:30 a.m. Tour and slide presentation of the Reynolds Library
10:30 a.m. Speaker: James T. Goodrich, M.D.
"A new view on the illustrations of Vesalius’ De Humani Corporis Fabrica (enlarged)"
11:30 a.m. Stroll to University Inn, Faculty Reception Center
12:00 p.m. Luncheon and Business meeting

Friday, April 28
Patient Records and Historical Research:
Prospects and Problems
A major issue involved in documenting twentieth-century medicine is the use of patient records in historical research. This lunch session will attempt to address the various issues relating to the access to and use of these records by historians. A panel consisting of two historians and two archivists will address this most important issue from two different viewpoints. Each panelist will deliver an informal paper (limited to 12 minutes) and then the floor will be opened up for discussion. The historians on the panel will be expected to speak on the value of patient records to their own research and what role these records will play in future studies of twentieth-century medicine. The archivists will speak about the records under their care and the problems involved in making these records accessible to historians, such as legal and donor restrictions and confidentiality. This session should be of interest to both the historian and the librarian, because the issues involved with the access of these records will grow in importance as research in the history of twentieth-century medicine expands.

Panelists: Terry A. Bragg, Archivist, McLean Hospital, Massachusetts; Joel Howell, M.D., Ph.D., University of Michigan Medical Center; Nancy McCall, Archivist, The Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, MD; Jack D. Pressman, Ph.D., Professor, University of California, San Francisco, and organizer & Moderator: Thomas A. Horrocks, M.A., M.S.L.S., Associate Librarian for Historical Collections, College of Physicians of Philadelphia.

Delta/Group Travel Directors/Lanita Smith is willing to extend the 5% discount on a super-saver ticket offered to the American Osler Society to ALHHS, AAHM and MeMA. To make these arrangements call 1-800-222-7907, ask for Lanita Smith or "Carolyn" and mention that you are attending meetings in conjunction with the American Osler Society (all their information is computerized under AOS).