

17/3/10



WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER



MAR 11 1980

LIBRARY

BOX 54, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002 • TEL. 202-547-4440
TWX 710-822-1976 ISSN: 0001-1746

Vol. 32

March 5, 1980

No. 2

: All or any part of the ALA Washington Newsletter :
: may be reprinted for distribution :

CONTENTS

Appropriations, FY 1981, ACTION NEEDED p. 1	Copyright. p. 5
HEA Extension. p. 2	Title 44 Revision. p. 6
National Periodical Center p. 3	Paperwork Reduction. p. 6
Arts and Humanities. p. 4	Federal Register Items p. 6

Attachments: National Archives and Records Service
House and Senate Appropriations Committees
House and Senate Budget Committees

Appropriations, FY 1981

U.S. Office of Education officials, testifying February 20 at a Congressional hearing on the FY 1981 budget for library programs, indicated that the increases requested for interlibrary cooperation and research libraries and level funding for other programs "signal a shift in the Federal investment, from that of expanding access to libraries to that of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of our Nation's libraries through the encouragement of resource sharing among all libraries and support for demonstration activities."

Eileen Cooke of ALA's Washington Office will testify before the Senate Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee on March 12, and before the House subcommittee in April. The ALA recommendations for major federal library programs are shown below, compared with the budget request and last year's figures:

	FY 1980 Appropriation	Carter FY '81 Budget	ALA FY '81 Recommendation
<u>Elementary & Secondary Educ. Act</u>			
Title IV-B, School libraries	\$171,000,000*	\$171,000,000*	\$205,000,000*
<u>Higher Education Act</u>			
Title II-A, College libraries	4,988,000	4,988,000	15,000,000
II-B, Training	667,000	500,000	4,000,000
II-B, Demonstrations	333,000	500,000	2,000,000
II-C, Research libraries	6,000,000	7,000,000	10,000,000
<u>Library Services & Construction Act</u>			
Title I, Library services	62,500,000	62,500,000	100,000,000
II, Construction	-0-	-0-	50,000,000
III, Interlibrary coop.	5,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000

*Advance funded program

Although the administration's budget for libraries is better (thanks to efforts of White House Conference delegates) than in the past few years, President Carter, concerned about continued high inflation, has asked all federal agencies to recommend cuts in the budget. Thus changes in the budget may be in the offing. The

reaction of members of Congress will depend, in this election year, on what they hear from their constituents.

ACTION NEEDED: Appropriations subcommittees are now holding hearings and will begin to make their own funding recommendations next month. This is the time to write letters in support of adequate funding for federal library programs. The key members of Congress for funding purposes are those on House and Senate Appropriations Committees (especially Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittees) and House and Senate Budget Committees (see lists attached to this newsletter). If your own members of Congress are not on these key committees, ask them to pass your message along to their colleagues on the Labor-HEW Appropriations subcommittees. One sympathetic subcommittee member noted that he needed pressure from his fellow legislators in order to feel comfortable asking for increases in education programs.

Several resolutions from the White House Conference on Library and Information Services called for better funding for existing programs. Pass the word to your state's WHCLIS delegates, alternates, and those involved in the state pre-conference. This is the most opportune time for them to show their support. Programs which do not receive a large outpouring of support in the next month will be vulnerable to budget cutting. There will be no bill numbers for some time; simply refer to the FY 1981 Labor-HEW appropriations. Send the ALA Washington Office blind copies of your letters.

Higher Education Act Extension

The Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities has begun markup of S. 1839, a five-year extension of the Higher Education Act. On February 28, the subcommittee approved a simple extension of the college library, library training and demonstration, and research library programs (HEA II-A, B, and C), plus a compromise proposal for a national periodical system developed by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY). Rather than setting up a National Periodical Center as in the House-passed bill (HR 5192), the Senate subcommittee's HEA II-D would establish a National Periodical System Corporation to design a system. The design would require Congressional approval before it could be implemented (see following article on National Periodical Center).

The subcommittee had recently requested from the administration a proposal for need-based criteria for the II-A College Library Resources grants. The proposal was received just a few days before markup, and subcommittee chair Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) explained that members had insufficient time to make a judgment on it. Need-based criteria will be considered for II-A at the full committee level, however. Although full details are not yet available, the administration's proposal as outlined in a letter from Secretary of Education Shirley Hufstедler to Sen. Pell, would provide grants for approximately 675 institutions in three categories (two-year, four-year and universities) based on the number of titles in the library and the percentage of institutional expenditures on library collections.

The subcommittee also approved on February 28 a revised HEA title I which would include establishment of a Commission on National Development in Post-secondary Education, state planning and continuing education (including at least \$50,000 per state for educational and occupational information and counseling programs replacing the current Educational Information Centers program), institutional adaptation and innovation pilot programs, women's worksite development demonstration, and postsecondary education and youth unemployment transition demonstration programs.

The institutional planning and adaptation pilot programs, for which \$13 million per year would be authorized, would provide assistance to schools of library and information sciences or "other schools and areas of study experiencing difficulties and economic change which adversely affect the quality of the delivery of educational services." The pilot programs are to help develop methods of delivering cost-effective, high quality educational services to unserved or underserved populations and to help higher education institutions adapt to the pressures of demographic and economic change.

On February 27 the subcommittee approved a new HEA title VI, International Education Programs, which would reauthorize the current National Defense Education Act foreign language and area study programs, add a new part B for business and international education, and transfer NDEA section 603 which has emphasized teacher training and elementary and secondary level programs to ESEA. Title VI was developed by Sen. Robert Stafford (R-VT) who introduced it as a separate bill (S. 2306) with bipartisan cosponsorship on February 20.

Title VI is based partly on the recommendations of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. (Its report, Strength Through Wisdom; A Critique of U.S. Capability, November 1979, is available for \$4.75 from GPO, Washington, D.C. 20402, Stock No. 017-080-02065-3. There is an accompanying Background Papers and Studies, \$7.00, Stock No. 017-080-02070-0.) The report takes note of library problems and recommends expanding Library of Congress international activities and establishing a \$4 million per year Education Department grant program to provide \$50,000 grants for library collections to the national international studies centers plus \$300 mini-grants to allow scholars from other institutions to visit and use the center collections.

The Senate subcommittee will meet again on March 14 to continue markup of HEA title IV student assistance provisions.

National Periodical Center

Sen. Jacob Javits (R-NY), saying he had "rarely run into a buzz saw like this one," proposed a compromise on the National Periodical Center which was accepted by the Senate Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee February 28. The subcommittee version of HEA II-D would establish a National Periodical System (not Center) Corporation to "assess the feasibility and advisability of a national system and, if feasible and advisable, design such a system to provide reliable and timely document delivery from a comprehensive collection of periodical literature." The design must be submitted to Congress by December 31, 1981, and may not be implemented until approved by further Congressional action.

Apparently referring to intense lobbying against the House-passed provision by the information industry, the publishers (who earlier supported the NPC but now want to delay it), and some representatives of scholarly society publishers, Sen. Javits said he had "great fear that we are compromising the sources of American excellence should we establish such a system." Setting up a board to design a system would give everyone "a little time to think this over...to cool off." Subcommittee chair Claiborne Pell (D-RI) called the compromise "a good approach and a proper Senatorial one."

\$750,000 for each of fiscal years 1980, 1981 and 1982 would be authorized, plus such additional sums as necessary through FY 1985 to implement a congressionally approved design. The Corporation's Board of Directors would consist of 14 members

appointed by the President (for two-year terms) and confirmed by the Senate, plus the director. Members are to be "equitably representative of the needs and interests of the Government, academic and research communities, libraries, publishers, the information community, authors, and the public."

The design for a national periodical system is to include provisions for the system to:

- 1) acquire current and retrospective periodicals, and to preserve and maintain a dedicated collection of such documents;
- 2) provide information on periodicals to which the system can ensure access, including those circulated from private sector sources, and cooperate in efforts to improve bibliographic and physical access to periodicals;
- 3) make such periodicals available, through libraries by loan or by photo-reproduction or other means;
- 4) cooperate with and participate in international borrowing and lending activities as may be appropriate for such purposes;
- 5) ensure that copyright owners of periodicals who do not wish to participate in such system are not required to participate;
- 6) ensure that fees are fixed by the copyright owners for any reproduction or dissemination of a document delivered through the system;
- 7) complement and not duplicate activities in the private sector to provide access to periodical literature;
- 8) ensure, to the maximum extent feasible, that such system not adversely affect the publication and distribution of current periodicals, particularly scholarly periodicals of small circulation; and
- 9) ensure coordination with existing programs to distribute periodical literature, including programs of regional libraries and programs of interlibrary loan and library networks.

In January, separate briefing sessions were held for Senate staff by opponents and proponents of a National Periodical Center. Opponents included the Information Industry Association, the Association of American Publishers, and representatives of some scholarly societies which publish journals. Proponents included the Association of Research Libraries, Special Libraries Association, Association of American Universities, the Board of Governors of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication, and ALA, represented by President Thomas Galvin.

The Senate subcommittee expects to complete markup of Higher Education Act extension in mid-March, after which the bill would be sent to the full Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Arts and Humanities

The Senate passed by voice vote on February 7 a five-year extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The bill, S. 1386, would increase the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts from \$175 million in 1981 to \$306 million in 1985, and for the National Endowment for the Humanities from \$170 million to \$299 million over the same period. The authorization for Arts Endowment challenge grant funds would increase from \$27 million to \$52.3 million, and Humanities challenge grant funds from \$30 million to \$53 million. Challenge grants, which have aided a number of libraries, require raising \$3 for every \$1 of federal funds.

In its report (S. Rept. 96-557), the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee said of the Humanities Endowment:

The Committee is pleased to note the increased attention that the Endowment is paying to the needs of our country's libraries. The establishment of a separate Library Program in 1978 has allowed the humanistic resources of these institutions to be more fully utilized by the public. Wider use of humanities collections and increased local participation and financial support are viewed by the Committee as positive results of this new program. The support made available to local public libraries to raise the profile of their humanities collections is particularly welcome to members of the Committee.

On February 7 the Senate also passed an extension (S. 1429) of the Institute of Museum Services. The Institute is located in HEW and will become part of the new Education Department, but Senate Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee Chair Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) said the "committee decided to extend the Institute's authorization for only two years, rather than the usual five, so that it could re-examine the question of the Institute's location within the Federal Government at the end of that period." Other locations mentioned include the Smithsonian Institution and an independent status like the Arts and Humanities Endowments.

In the House, the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Bill Ford (D-MI), has held hearings on extension of the Arts and Humanities Endowments and the Institute of Museum Services, but legislation has not yet been introduced.

Copyright

Public hearing on 5-year review. The second regional hearing leading up to the first five-year review required by section 108(i) of the Copyright Act of 1976 will be held by the Copyright Office March 26 in Houston in connection with the annual meeting of the American Chemical Society. The hearing will be held at 9:30 a.m. in Room 218 of the Albert Thomas Convention and Exhibit Center, 612 Smith Street. Requests to testify and ten copies of written statements should be sent by March 19 to: Office of General Counsel, U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Caller No. 2999, Arlington, VA 22202 (703/557-8731). Supplemental statements will be accepted until April 26.

The announcement of the hearing in the February 20 Federal Register (pp. 11279-81) includes the specific questions on which the Copyright Office is particularly interested in receiving comments. These questions were enumerated in the December 31, 1979 ALA Washington Newsletter preceding the January 19 Chicago hearing, but two new questions have since been added by the Copyright Office: "Would the creation of a National Periodical Center affect your operations?" and "How should foreign copyrighted works and requests from foreign libraries be treated under section 108 and, in practice, how are they treated now?"

Register of Copyrights search. The Register of Copyrights, Barbara A. Ringer, who was instrumental in the development of the major revision of copyright law passed by Congress in 1976 (PL 94-553), will be retiring this spring. A search committee to consider candidates for a new Register has been established by the Library of Congress. The committee is chaired by Alan Latman, executive director of the Copyright Society of the U.S.A., and includes Robert Wedgeworth, ALA executive director.

The Register of Copyrights is appointed by the Librarian of Congress, serves as the principal U.S. public official in the field of copyright, is responsible for carrying out the provisions of U.S. copyright law, and serves as head of the Copyright Office, one of the principal departments of the Library of Congress with approximately 600 employees. The search committee is to forward its nominations to the Library by March 14, and the Librarian of Congress plans to announce his selection in mid-May. Nominations should be sent to Alan Latman, New York University Law School, 40 Washington Square South, New York, NY 10012.

Title 44 Revision

The House Administration Committee has not yet issued its report on HR 5424, the National Publications Act of 1980. Preparation of the report has been delayed because the Congressional Budget Office has not yet sent the committee a cost estimate for the bill. The difficulty seems to be that cost figures for the current system of government documents printing and distribution are not available in a form that can be compared with the cost of doing things under the proposed legislation.

Paperwork Reduction

After two days of hearings the House Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security approved HR 6410, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, on February 26. One week later, on March 4, the Government Operations Committee approved the bill, recommending passage by the full House. Rep. Jack Brooks (D-TX) is Chair of both the Subcommittee and the full Committee, as well as the sponsor of the legislation which was originally introduced on February 5.

The stated purpose of the bill is to achieve coordinated and integrated federal government information policies and practices. An Office of Federal Information Policy would be established within the OMB in order to provide "overall direction in the development and implementation of Federal information policies, principles, standards, and guidelines, including review and approval of information collection requests, the reduction of paperwork burden placed on the public, Federal statistical activities, records management activities, privacy of records pertaining to individuals, interagency sharing of information, and acquisition and use of automatic data processing and other technology for managing information resources."

A Federal Information Locator System would be established to keep track of government information and each agency head would designate a senior official to oversee all agency information activities. The authority of any agency to prescribe policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and forms for federal information activities would be subject to the authority of the Director of the Office of Federal Information Policy.

Federal Register Items

Public Telecommunications Facilities Program. Application deadline extended to March 21. Contact NTIA, Dept. of Commerce, 202/724-3307. Feb. 5 FR, p. 7780.

U.S. Patent Data Files available on magnetic tape from National Technical Information Service. Contact NTIS, 703/557-4806. Feb. 6 FR, p. 8083.

National Archives & Records Service. Revised regs on issuance and use of researcher ID cards and researcher use of lockers. Feb. 8 FR, p. 8603.

Metric Education Program. Deadline extended to 45 days after publication of final regs (regs & new deadline date will appear in a future FR). Contact USOE at 202/653-5920. Feb. 11 FR, p. 9113.

Public Telecommunication Services Program. April 7 deadline for proposals for Public Telecommunications Services (PTS) needed by and affordable to public service organizations and government agencies. PTS is any offering of operational facilities, program/service acquisition and delivery, and other management services necessary to provide telecommunications that will meet agency requirements. \$1.2 million is available; at least two awards will be made. Contact NTIA, Commerce Dept., 202/724-3464. Feb. 12 FR, pp. 9310-14.

Community Education Program. Deadline extended until after final regs are published. Contact USOE, 202/245-0691. Feb. 19 FR, p. 10902.

Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Application deadline May 9. Contact USOE, 202/245-2181. Feb. 26 FR, pp. 12499-500.

Consumers' Education Program. Deadline extended to May 12. Contact USOE, 202/653-5983. Feb. 26 FR, pp. 12501-2.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1980

No. 21

House of Representatives

U.S. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE (NARS)

NARS is news lately. Congressional oversight hearings, criticism of NARS' preservation efforts, the Archivists' retirement and the search for a successor, and a controversial proposal by the GSA Administrator to decentralize archival records—all have brought NARS into the unaccustomed glare of media attention. Several of these events are covered in the Congressional Record item below. For further detail, see the February 1980 Extra edition of the SAA Newsletter (Society of American Archivists).

ARCHIVES DECENTRALIZATION OF RECORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, a number of questions have been raised recently concerning the announced plan to move certain records currently held by the National Archives and Records Service in Washington to regional records centers across the country.

The proposal was discussed last November 8 at a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, which I chair. The subcommittee has legislative and oversight responsibility for the National Archives, and has been examining the management of the Archives for more than a year. The subcommittee was told by the Acting Archivist in November that the planned transfer of records to the regions involved small amounts of materials; that the National Archives Advisory Council and independent scholars supported the transfer; and that the plan, which the Administrator of General Services had ordered be accelerated, was originally developed by Archives officials in the late sixties.

A number of respected historians and archivists have questioned the announced move, however, and are concerned that this would involve a mass dispersal of materials currently available in Washington. Since many researchers have to use the manuscript collections and materials at the Library of Congress, the trip to Washington becomes inevitable in much scholarly research. The concern is that additional trips to other parts of the country may be necessitated by movement of documents, breaking up current subject matter holdings.

The crux is the criteria used to segregate the materials, what user interest there is in the records, and whether movement will facilitate or hinder research. Splitting up Works Progress Administration records, for example, based on the part of the country a WPA project took place, might make an overall history of WPA politics and administration difficult, but be of some interest to local or regional historians.

A decentralization of historical holdings would be a dramatic shift in Archives policy. It is a change which would require considerable consultation with Congress and the affected scholarly communities and an adequate cost-benefit study.

To clarify the scope of the proposal and to reassure interested parties, I asked the Administrator of General Services to place a temporary hold on any further movement of documents pending further study of the issue. Happily, he has agreed to this freeze.

My letter to the Administrator and his reply follow. Also included below is a statement issued by the Administrator on January 24, 1980, outlining his general views of the Archives and this issue. I hope that my colleagues who have received inquiries concerning the movement of archival holdings will find useful the following materials:

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1980.

HON. ROWLAND G. FREEMAN III,
Administrator, General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I am writing to request that you place a "hold" on the further transfer of archival documents from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area to National Archives and Records Service (NARS) regional facilities until such time as the impact of such transfers has been fully considered by this subcommittee.

At the subcommittee's November 8 hearing you announced that the holdings of the eleven regional NARS centers would be significantly increased by transferring to these centers, records of interest to the particular regions. You emphasized that none of the records constituting the core of the National Archives' holdings would be involved in this action. The program was described by both you and the Acting Archivist as involving a simple acceleration of plans NARS had developed in the late 1960's. Dr. O'Neill stated that the proposed dispersal of records had been discussed with members of the National Archives Advisory Council and with independent scholars, most of whom were supportive of the plan.

Recently, however, considerable confusion appears to have developed concerning the scope and impact of the program to transfer materials to regional centers. Concern has been expressed by a number of mid-level employees of the National Archives and members of the academic community about both the possible short-term dislocation resulting from the plan and its long-term effect on the Archives.

I agree that we should seek ways to increase the availability to citizens throughout the country of our rich documentary history. But I am unclear as to the dimension of the transfer of documents contemplated and the criteria to be used in selecting these documents.

Given these concerns, I believe a more careful examination of the decentralization proposal is warranted. A slight delay should enable you to dispel any unwarranted fears and provide an opportunity to clarify researcher use and interest in the records slated to be moved. This review of a possible increase in the archival holdings of the regions may further be in order with the plan to join into a single regional commissioner's position, NARS and ADTS (automated data and telecommunications systems) responsibilities.

Cordially,

RICHARDSON PREYER,
Chairman.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1980.
Congressman RICHARDSON PREYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PREYER: Thank you for your letter of 21 January 1980. I regret that what appeared to be a rather simple request for dispersal of some records in Washington, D.C., to the regions has both been misinterpreted, badly managed and has created confusion.

It is quite apparent we failed to discuss with the users of these records anticipated moves. In my concurrence with the material that was to be moved, I made the erroneous assumption the proper staff work had been completed. I have requested the Acting Archivist of the United States to hold further transfer until such time as we have selected an Archivist and have had the opportunity to review the plan with him/hor as well as discussing potential candidates for transfer to the regions with the user communities.

I will keep you informed of our progress in this matter.

Sincerely,

R. G. FREEMAN III,
Administrator.

JANUARY 24, 1980.

ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES
(By Rowland G. Freeman III)

Scholars, historians, genealogists and other researchers need not be fearful that the destruction of the National Archives is near, as some have reported and others have proclaimed.

There is no proposal under consideration at the General Services Administration, nor has there been nor is it anticipated that there will be, for a "decentralization of the National Archives" that would disperse the core holdings of the institution in a destructive way.

A program of transferring selected regionally oriented records to archival centers around the country—began more than 10 years ago—will continue in a sensible, orderly manner that has already proven so successful. No changes will be made that would have a detrimental impact on this program. In addition to making the documents of our rich heritage available to more people, it hopefully will relieve to some degree the critical problem we have of archival storage space in the national capital area.

A storm of controversy and concern has developed around this program in recent weeks, mainly because my interest in the program has been poorly communicated, perhaps deliberately. Part of that controversy was a meeting during the past few days of some 200 midlevel managers and employees of GSA's National Archives and Records Service (NARS), a group calling themselves the National Archives Concerned Professionals. The organization approved a resolution to be transmitted to the President of the United States. It called for a delay in the regionalization program, and that a commission be formed to study the feasibility of re-establishing an independent National Archives.

The proponents of this resolution may be surprised to learn that I have no basic disagreement with them. I had already directed

a temporary halt to the transfer of records to regional centers until I perceive my views on the matter are properly understood and until we can confer at some length with the user community to ensure agreement as to how the records may be kept. When I asked several months ago for a plan to make parts of this rich heritage available in regional centers, I was delighted that such a program to regionalize archival holdings had been underway since 1969 under what I consider to be sensible guidelines. The 11 archives branches now hold original records, principally of regional research interest—such as field activities of Federal agencies—as well as microfilm copies of some of the most important or frequently used holdings in the National Archives. Well used by researchers, these branch holdings have been augmented from time to time by similar records of regional interest and are now fixtures in the federal archival system.

This program will continue. But users may be assured that there will be no fragmentation of the records that constitute the core of the National Archives. Recommendations of records to be transferred to regional centers would come from the Archivist of the United States after consultation with the user community.

Further means to be used to preserve and increase accessibility to the documents that trace our nation's history surely include duplication of records in microfilm or microfiche. Plans are being explored to develop a National Archives and Manuscript Information System in cooperation with other major archival and Library institutions. Such a computerized indexing system would be valuable to researchers, and the public as well, in determining the full extent of the holdings of these institutions and facilities access through inter-library loans.

I have set no goals or deadlines for this program in the way of dates, or volumes of records, nor have I personally decided that any particular records are to be dispersed. I reiterate that these decisions will be made by archivists. Any examples I have used were based on recommendations made by archivists.

The shortage of space in the Washington area is of concern to me and the expense of further construction is a problem in a time of budget constraints and taxpayer concern.

As to the question of separating the National Archives from GSA: I have no preconceived view of the disposition of this issue. This question has not been seriously considered since 1967, and it may be appropriate to do so now.

A final matter of utmost importance is the selection of a person of considerable stature for the position of Archivist of the United States (vacated in August by the retirement of Dr. James B. Rhoads). My position all along has been that we will select a person experienced as an archivist, historian or scholar. I have added another criteria, that the person be a capable manager, competent to administer the \$80 million budget of NARS, its 4,200 employees here and in the 11 regional centers and six presidential libraries. There is no incompatibility in these requirements. Recent studies by the General Accounting Office and GSA's Inspector General indicate disarray in the management of NARS, a problem I am committed to solve. ●

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Appropriations

96th Congress, 2nd Session

Jamie L. Whitten (D-MS), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts
William H. Natcher, Kentucky
Tom Steed, Oklahoma
John M. Slack, West Virginia
Neal Smith, Iowa
Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut
Joseph P. Addabbo, New York
Edward J. Patten, New Jersey
Clarence D. Long, Maryland
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois
David R. Obey, Wisconsin
Edward R. Roybal, California
Louis Stokes, Ohio
Gunn McKay, Utah
Tom Bevill, Alabama
Bill Chappell, Jr., Florida
Bill D. Burlison, Missouri
Bill Alexander, Arkansas
John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania
Bob Traxler, Michigan
Robert B. Duncan, Oregon
Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts
Charles Wilson, Texas
Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, Louisiana
Adam Benjamin, Jr., Indiana
Norman D. Dicks, Washington
Matthew F. McHugh, New York
Bo Ginn, Georgia
William Lehman, Florida
Jack Hightower, Texas
John W. Jenrette, Jr., South Carolina
Martin Olav Sabo, Minnesota
Julian C. Dixon, California
Bennett M. Stewart, Illinois
Vic Fazio, California

REPUBLICANS

Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts
Robert H. Michel, Illinois
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania
Mark Andrews, North Dakota
Jack Edwards, Alabama
Robert C. McEwen, New York
John T. Myers, Indiana
J. Kenneth Robinson, Virginia
Clarence E. Miller, Ohio
Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania
C. W. Bill Young, Florida
Jack F. Kemp, New York
Ralph S. Regula, Ohio
Clair W. Burgener, California
George M. O'Brien, Illinois
Virginia Smith, Nebraska
Eldon Rudd, Arizona
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan

American Library Association
Washington Office
February 1980

(See over for Appropriations
Subcommittees on Labor-HEW,
Legislative, and Treasury-
Postal Service-General Govern-
ment.)

Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee

William H. Natcher (D-KY), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Neal Smith, Iowa
Edward J. Patten, New Jersey
David R. Obey, Wisconsin
Edward R. Roybal, California
Louis Stokes, Ohio
Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts

REPUBLICANS

Robert H. Michel, Illinois
Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts
George M. O'Brien, Illinois
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan

To be appointed

Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee

Adam Benjamin, Jr., (D-IN), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

John M. Slack, West Virginia
Neal Smith, Iowa
Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois

REPUBLICANS

Robert H. Michel, Illinois
Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts
Eldon Rudd, Arizona

Treasury - Postal Service - General Government Appropriations Subcommittee

Tom Steed (D-OK), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Joseph P. Addabbo, New York
Edward R. Roybal, California
Edward J. Patten, New Jersey
Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut

REPUBLICANS

Clarence E. Miller, Ohio
Robert C. McEwen, New York

February 1980

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Appropriations

96th Congress, 2nd Session

Warren G. Magnuson (D-WA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

John C. Stennis, Mississippi
Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia
William Proxmire, Wisconsin
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina
Birch Bayh, Indiana
Thomas F. Eagleton, Missouri
Lawton Chiles, Florida
J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana
Walter D. Huddleston, Kentucky
Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota
Patrick J. Leahy, Vermont
James R. Sasser, Tennessee
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona
Dale Bumpers, Arkansas
John A. Durkin, New Hampshire

REPUBLICANS

Milton R. Young, North Dakota
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Ted Stevens, Alaska
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland
Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania
Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma
Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut
James A. McClure, Idaho
Paul Laxalt, Nevada
Jake Garn, Utah
Harrison H. Schmitt, New Mexico

American Library Association
Washington Office
February 1980

(See over for Appropriations
Subcommittees on Labor-HEW,
Legislative, and Treasury-
Postal Service-General
Government.)

Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee

Warren G. Magnuson (D-WA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia
William Proxmire, Wisconsin
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina
Thomas F. Eagleton, Missouri
Birch Bayh, Indiana
Lawton Chiles, Florida
Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii

REPUBLICANS

Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut
Harrison H. Schmitt, New Mexico

Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee

James R. Sasser (D-TN), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Dale Bumpers, Arkansas
John A. Durkin, New Hampshire

REPUBLICANS

Ted Stevens, Alaska
Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania

Treasury - Postal Service - General Government Subcommittee

Lawton Chiles (D-FL), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Dennis DeConcini, Arizona
Dale Bumpers, Arkansas

REPUBLICANS

Paul Laxalt, Nevada
Harrison H. Schmitt, New Mexico

February 1980

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Budget

96th Congress, 2nd Session

Robert N. Giaimo, (D-CT), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Jim Wright, Texas
Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio
Louis Stokes, Ohio
Elizabeth Holtzman, New York
David R. Obey, Wisconsin
Paul Simon, Illinois
Norman Y. Mineta, California
Jim Mattox, Texas
James R. Jones, Oklahoma
Stephen J. Solarz, New York
William M. Brodhead, Michigan
Timothy E. Wirth, Colorado
Leon E. Panetta, California
Richard A. Gephardt, Missouri
Bill Nelson, Florida
William H. Gray III, Pennsylvania

REPUBLICANS

Delbert L. Latta, Ohio
James T. Broyhill, North Carolina
Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York
Marjorie S. Holt, Maryland
Ralph S. Regula, Ohio
Bud Shuster, Pennsylvania
Bill Frenzel, Minnesota
Eldon Rudd, Arizona

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Budget

96th Congress, 2nd Session

Edmund S. Muskie, (D-ME), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Warren G. Magnuson, Washington
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina
Lawton Chiles, Florida
Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Delaware
J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana
Jim Sasser, Tennessee
Gary W. Hart, Colorado
Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan
Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York
J. James Exon, Nebraska

REPUBLICANS

Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma
Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico
Bob Packwood, Oregon
William L. Armstrong, Colorado
Nancy L. Kassebaum, Kansas
Rudy Boschwitz, Minnesota
Orrin G. Hatch, Utah
Larry Pressler, South Dakota

American Library Association
Washington Office
February 1980