Congressional Budget

House-Senate conferees on S.Con.Res. 32, the congressional budget resolution for FY 1986, are expected to try again this week to resolve their differences and come up with a joint budget. Whether they will succeed before the recess is problematical.

Appropriations, FY 1985

On June 20, the Senate passed HR 2577, the FY 1985 general supplemental funding bill, including the $5 million authorized for the new Library Services and Construction Act title VI Library Literacy Programs. The House-passed version has no LSCA funds. Conferees were to begin meeting July 22.

Appropriations, FY 1986

Library Programs. The House L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee met on July 10, but did not take action, and recessed until after the supplemental is completed.

ACTION NEEDED: This delay will allow library supporters to contact House and Senate L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittees (see 3/19 newsletter for lists) to urge at least current levels of funding for Library Services and Construction Act and
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Library Programs. The House L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee met on July 10, but did not take action, and recessed until after the supplemental is completed.

ACTION NEEDED: This delay will allow library supporters to contact House and Senate L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittees (see 3/19 newsletter for lists) to urge at least current levels of funding for Library Services and Construction Act and
Higher Education Act title II programs, plus funding for the new LSCA V Foreign Language Materials Acquisition ($1 million is authorized) and LSCA VI Library Literacy Programs ($5 million is authorized).

"Playboy" in Braille Prohibited. The House on July 18 reduced the Library of Congress budget by $103,000 in order to prohibit LC from reproducing and distributing Playboy in braille. The amendment was offered to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for FY 1986, HR 2942, by Rep. Chalmers Wylie (R-OH) and passed by a vote of 216-193. See the July 18 Congressional Record, pp H5932-35 for the vote and remarks.

Librarian of Congress Daniel Boorstin in a statement expressed "profound regret" at the House action "censoring material made available to the blind community through our Library of Congress service. The next step might be to deny funds to the Library of Congress for purchase of books which the House deemed inappropriate, subversive, or unacceptable to the majority of the House. Censorship has no place in a free society."

LC's National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS) is authorized by law to provide reading materials to those who cannot read ordinary print. It has a selection policy based on the premise that its users should have access to the same books and information made available to the non-handicapped through public libraries. However, the cost of reproducing materials in braille and in recorded format means NLS must be selective in what it produces. It receives guidance from advisory groups which include readers and librarians. Only 36 magazines are available in braille; Playboy is one of the more popular items. Playboy in braille includes only selected print material, no pictorial material or captions, and has been produced since 1970.

In 1981, Rep. Wylie intended to offer a similar amendment, but the legislative appropriations for FY 1982 were included with a continuing resolution and the amendment was not in order. With this issue in mind, ALA Council on July 1, 1981 passed a Resolution on the Reaffirmation of Access for the Physically Handicapped, reaffirming "the principles of intellectual freedom as basic building policies for all libraries, including the Library of Congress, which, through its National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, makes a significant contribution to free access through the provision of library materials for use by physically handicapped people...".

ACTION NEEDED: For Congress to monitor and pass judgment, by title, on the materials provided by NLS amounts to censorship of the worst sort, aimed at a segment of the population whose access to materials is already restricted, compared to that enjoyed by the sighted. The Wylie amendment if allowed to stand would set a very unfortunate precedent for the federal government.

Thank those who voted against the amendment. Thank especially House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Vic Fazio (D-CA) and ranking minority member Jerry Lewis (R-CA), who spoke up on the floor against the amendment, as did Reps. Dante Fascell (D-FL) and Parren Mitchell (D-MD). Immediately alert Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee members (see 3/19 newsletter for list) to the implications of the Wylie amendment and urge them to omit it when they mark up HR 2942, probably the week of July 29.

LC Budget Cut. The House went on to pass HR 2942 (H.Rept. 99-194) by 263-136. As brought to the House floor by the Appropriations Committee, the bill would cut the Library of Congress budget by 8.9 percent, leaving LC below the FY 1985 level.
LC requested $253,129,000, only a 5.7 percent increase, for FY 1986. Areas particularly hard hit by the reduction would be preservation (including preservation microfilming and preparation for use of the DEZ facility), purchase of books, automation, and books for the blind. No new positions would be allowed; approximately 174 positions would have to remain unfilled.

Govt. Docs. Budget Cut. The Government Printing Office's Superintendent of Documents budget would also be cut about 9 percent by HR 2942 from its request of $28,868,000. Also, the Joint Committee on Printing would be required to abolish the publication specialist position provided in FY '85 to help get government documents into the depository library system.

ACTION NEEDED. The next step for the LC and GPO budgets will be Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee markup, probably the week of July 29. Constituents of subcommittee members (see 3/19 newsletter for list) should urge them to reverse the actions noted above. The LC, GPO and JCP budget requests were modest, reasonable and responsible; the House cuts would do major damage to programs essential to libraries in all states.

Postal Revenue Forgone. The House Appropriations Committee issued its recommendations July 18 on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Bill for FY '86 (HR 3036, H. Rept. 99-210). The committee would provide $922 million for postal revenue foregone for free mail for the blind and preferred postal rates. The difference between this amount and the $981 million U.S. Postal Service estimate is accounted for by two recommendations: (1) The 2nd class in-county rate would be limited to publications of 10,000 circulation or less where 50 percent or more of the mailing is done in the county of publication, for a savings of $13 million. The intent is to prohibit large commercial publications such as Time or Playboy from using a postal rate designed for small local newspapers. (2, added at the full committee level) On the phased rate schedule, Step 15 would take effect January 1, 1986 instead of July '86 for a savings of about $47 million. A 2-lb. 4th class library rate book package would go up 11 percent from the current 54¢ to 60¢.

Whether the $922 million in HR 3036 has any chance of being enacted may depend on the outcome of House-Senate budget deliberations. The House-passed budget assumes $871 million; the Senate-passed version assumes only $100 million and passage of an Administration legislative proposal for cross-subsidization among postal rates. As House Post Office and Civil Service Committee Deputy General Counsel James Cregan told an audience at the ALA Annual Conference in Chicago July 6, for the first time in 200 years the postal subsidy is in real danger of being eliminated. Although there have been some cuts, there has been nothing like the President's '86 budget which would eliminate all postal appropriations. On July 10, the ALA Council passed a resolution urging Congress to provide the full postal revenue foregone appropriation and opposing the Administration's legislative proposal. A copy is attached to this newsletter.

ACTION NEEDED: There is still time to urge Senate conferees Domenici, Armstrong, Kassebaum, Boschwitz, Gorton, Chiles, Hollings, Johnston and Sasser to accept House-passed postal revenue foregone figure of about $871 million.

NARA & NHPRC. HR 3036, the Treasury, postal funding bill, includes $103,513,000 for the newly independent National Archives and Records Administration, $4,150,000 over the amount requested for FY '86 and $4,588,000 over '85. This amount includes $4 million of the $5 million authorized for FY '86 for the grant programs of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.
NEH. House Appropriations Committee recommendations for the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill for FY '86 were issued July 16 (HR 3011, H. Rept. 99-205). For the National Endowment for the Humanities, there would be $150 million, $10.5 million over '85, but equal to the funding in FY 1980. This amount includes $5 million for the new Office of Preservation, and $3,033,000 for Humanities Projects in Libraries. The latter figure compares with $2,940,000 in FY '85 and $1,200,000 requested for FY '86. "The Committee was concerned to learn that the Endowment in 1985 took money away from the library program," according to the committee report. Letters of thanks would be appropriate to Chairman Sidney Yates (D-IL) and the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

Department of Education

William J. Bennett, Secretary of Education since his confirmation February 6 to replace T. H. Bell who resigned late last year, has made some changes affecting federal library program administration. The new Secretary requested the resignation of Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement Donald Senese, and designated Chester E. Finn, Jr. of Vanderbilt University as his replacement. Finn was confirmed July 18.

On July 2 Secretary Bennett announced plans to reorganize the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The new structure would abolish the National Institute of Education, whose presidentially-appointed director often bypassed the Assistant Secretary for OERI, through whom the NIE director was technically supposed to report.

The new OERI would have five major operating units, each to be headed by a director: (1) Office of Research, including most of the research supported by NIE; (2) Center for Statistics, including most of the work of the National Center for Education Statistics, plus the National Assessment of Educational Progress; (3) Program for the Improvement of Practice, including the Regional Education Laboratories, the National Diffusion Network, and several of the Secretary’s discretionary programs; (4) Information Service, including public information, publications, the ERIC system, and "an improved Education Department library"; and (5) Library Programs, described very briefly as the unit which would continue the library categorical grants. ED officials did admit in briefings that the library unit administers the largest amount of funds ($125 million in FY 1985) of any of the new OERI units. Education technology programs, now combined with libraries, would be placed elsewhere.

The new OERI would have two secretarially-appointed deputies, one primarily responsible for operations and management, the other for policy coordination and planning. The purview of the presidentially-appointed National Council on Educational Research would be expanded to encompass all OERI activities, but its authority to establish policies would be removed. The Advisory Council on Education Statistics would continue.

The effect of the reorganization on libraries would be to remove a layer of bureaucracy between the head of the library unit and the Assistant Secretary, and to remove allied educational technology programs, thus both elevating and isolating the library unit. The real effect may depend on the leadership; it is unknown at this time who would be named to head the library unit.

The Secretary has the power to reorganize OERI under the Department of Education Organization Act (PL 96-88), but the changes cannot go into effect until 90 days after ED notifies the congressional education committees. Congress is not expected to object to the reorganization, which should take effect in October.
This spring, the Secretary informally solicited comments in connection with a review of OERI's management structure. ALA Washington Office Director Eileen Cooke wrote to Secretary Bennett on May 24, and enclosed a position paper on library programs within the U. S. Department of Education which provided history and background on the library unit and made several recommendations. The paper noted that the combining of library programs with other complementary and cross-cutting educational support services such as education technology, research, and statistics has worked well and makes sense in a department divided mainly according to levels of education or service to special constituencies.

ALA recommended that the federal library programs be kept together, and that within the OERI successor organization, the library unit be provided with permanent professionally-qualified leadership at a level comparable to that of ED's research or statistical activities. ALA also recommended that any reorganization strengthen and more fully support National Center for Education Statistics activities, particularly the library surveys.

WHCLIS II

On June 19, Rep. Bill Ford (D-MI) inserted in that day's Congressional Record (pp. H4526-27), his introductory speech, "America's Libraries in Crisis," to accompany H.J.Res. 244, legislation introduced April 18 calling for a 1989 White House Conference on Library and Information Services. Ford's remarks, plus those of Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI), who introduced a similar measure, S.J.Res 112 on April 16, are reprinted as an attachment to this newsletter.

During the Annual Conference in Chicago, the ALA Council passed July 10 a resolution thanking Sen. Pell and Rep. Ford for their leadership, and urging other legislators to cosponsor the WHCLIS II measures. A copy of the resolution is also attached to this newsletter.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has created a Preliminary Conference Design Group with federal (NCLIS), state (the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies - COSLA), and local (the White House Conference on Library and Information Services Task Force - WHCLIST) representatives. Design Group Chair Bill Asp continues to welcome input on the composition of a new White House Conference Advisory Committee, the scope and focus of the Conference, alternatives for financing, and the nature of preliminary events. Contact Bill Asp, Director, Library Development & Services, 440 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101. The Design Group is to present its final report to NCLIS on December 2, 1985.

Florence Agreement - Nairobi Protocol

Administration-backed legislation has been introduced to reauthorize the President to implement the Nairobi Protocol to the Florence Agreement, which provides for duty-free trade in certain educational, cultural, and scientific materials, and articles for the blind and physically handicapped. The Nairobi Protocol provides for the removal of import duties among adhering countries on audio, visual and microform materials and materials for the blind and physically handicapped not included in the original agreement. The measures, S. 1274 and HR 2885, were introduced on June 11 by Sen. Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-KS) and on June 26 by House Trade Subcommittee Chairman Sam Gibbons (D-FL).
The new bills would replace the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1982 (PL 97-446, Sections 161-167), which authorized a 30-month trial period (expiring August 14) designed to encourage other countries to adhere to the Protocol and its more liberal option, Annex CI, relating to audio, visual, and microform materials. By using CI, a country drops all import barriers to U. S. and other instructional materials.

For the past two and one-half years, the U. S. has applied the protocol without restrictions. However, Sen. Dole, in his June 11 Congressional Record (pp. S7933-36, daily edition) statement accompanying the text of the bill, noted that the 17 other signatory nations, including members of the European Economic Community, applied the more restrictive annex under which audio, visual, and microform materials must be certified to be of an educational, scientific or cultural nature and imported by designated nonprofit institutions. Because of this experience during the trial period, S. 1274 would, at the request of the Administration, require the U. S. to revert to implementing the more restrictive annex, but would authorize the President to apply the less restrictive annex if other nations do so in the future.

The ALA Council adopted a resolution July 10 endorsing S. 1274 and HR 2885 with one major modification. ALA recommended that the bills be modified to extend unqualified duty-free entry into the U. S. as does the expiring temporary legislation, but with power given to the President to adopt the more restrictive treatment of these materials if in the future, damage to U. S. producers could be demonstrated. In technical terms, the U. S. would then be adopting the Nairobi Protocol option Annex C-1 rather than C-2. This would avoid the cumbersome certification requirements which would make it impossible for U. S. dealers to import and stock these materials duty free for later sale to all consumers as they do for books and other publications.

Higher Education Act Reauthorization

ALA and the Association of Research Libraries submitted joint recommendations for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee on April 29. The ALA and ARL recommendations are summarized in an attachment to this newsletter.

Chairman William Ford (D-MI) and ranking minority member Thomas Coleman (R-MO) had requested organizations with an interest in HEA, including ALA and ARL, to submit recommendations in draft legislative language with justifications by April 30. The House Education and Labor Committee published all the recommendations as a comparative committee print.

Meanwhile, the House subcommittee began a long series of HEA reauthorization hearings June 4, although a few regional hearings had been held earlier by both the House subcommittee and the Senate education subcommittee. A House hearing on HEA II Library programs is expected in early September. The Senate education subcommittee will also hold HEA hearings in September.
WHEREAS, The 1979 White House Conference on Library and Information Services served as a focal point for planning library and information services for the succeeding decade; and

WHEREAS, There is an urgent need now to consider future directions for library and information services; and

WHEREAS, The American Library Association has supported legislation for a 1989 White House Conference on Library and Information Services; and

WHEREAS, Senator Claiborne Pell and Representative William Ford have introduced legislation for a 1989 White House Conference on Library and Information Services; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association express deep appreciation to Senator Pell and to Congressman Ford for their leadership in introducing S. J. Res 112 and H. J. Res. 224; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association urge other Senators and Representatives to join as co-sponsors of this legislation.

Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association
Chicago, Illinois
July 10, 1985
(Council Document #47.5)
RESOLUTION ON POSTAL SUBSIDIES

WHEREAS, For the first time in U.S. history, the Administration has proposed that Congress provide no appropriation in fiscal 1986 for postal subsidies; and

WHEREAS, This Administration budget proposal would eliminate all revenue forgone funding for free mail for the blind and physically handicapped, severely curtailing the provision of talking books and other special materials to those eligible for such free mail, and forcing many regional libraries for the blind to go out of business for lack of resources to pay full commercial rates; and

WHEREAS, The Administration's budget would eliminate all subsidy for the fourth class library postal rate, resulting in a 74 percent increase on top of a 15 percent increase implemented in February 1985, causing purchase of fewer materials by libraries, cutbacks in books-by-mail programs to isolated and rural users, and increased interlibrary loan costs; and

WHEREAS, The Administration's budget would eliminate all subsidy for other 2nd, 3rd, and 4th class preferred postal rates used heavily by libraries, schools and colleges, charitable organizations, and other preferred mailers; and

WHEREAS, The Administration has developed a legislative proposal which would maintain some but not all subsidies by raising first class and other nonsubsidized postal rates to make up the difference; and

WHEREAS, Such a cross-subsidization proposal is currently illegal, lacks fairness, and would drive large mailers from use of the U.S. Postal Service, thus causing a vicious circle of increases for nonsubsidized postal rates; and

WHEREAS, In the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 (PL 91-375), Congress enacted a permanent subsidy for free mail for the blind and physically handicapped and for preferred 2nd, 3rd, and 4th class postal rates, and directed that the setting of postal rates reflect the educational, cultural, and scientific value to the recipient of mailed material; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association reaffirm its long-standing support of the revenue forgone appropriation to the U.S. Postal Service; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the American Library Association recommend that Congress provide the full amount of appropriation needed to maintain current levels of revenue forgone funding for free mail for the blind and physically handicapped and for preferred 2nd, 3rd, and 4th class postal rates in the fiscal 1986 congressional budget and appropriations processes; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Library Association express to Congress and to the Administration ALA's opposition to the Administration's legislative proposal for cross subsidization among postal rates.

Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association
Chicago, Illinois
July 10, 1985
(Council Document #47.1)
By Mr. PELL:
S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be held not later than 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during this 28th annual observance of National Library Week (April 14-20), it seems altogether fitting and proper that I take this opportunity to introduce legislation calling for the second White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be held in 1989. My intentions to do this last August 3rd when I placed in the RECORD the Declaration of Education’s publication “Alliance for Excellence: Librarians Respond to a Nation at Risk.” There was much food for thought in that document, highlighting the role of our Nation’s libraries in helping to foster excellence in education and in providing adequate, up-to-date resources for a learning society.

Now, during National Library Week, we are all particularly conscious of the budgetary dilemma that beset us, with a $200 billion deficit confronting us. We note that libraries, too, at every level are beleaguered by budgetary problems. As a matter of fact, they suffered from double-digit inflation long before the rest of the country, in terms of trying to keep pace with rising book and periodical subscription costs and gasoline shortages, they too felt the pinch in their pocketbooks when the prices soared for petrochemical-based products, such as films, microfilm, and audio tapes. More recently, libraries have been turning to automated circulation systems, computerized resources, sharing networks, and other high tech devices to modernize their services and to increase productivity in order to keep up with increasingly sophisticated user demands.

Accordingly, it appears none too soon for library users, civic leaders, and lawmakers at all levels to join forces in working with librarians and suppliers of library and information service products to consider what new directions we expect our libraries to take in the future. Because so much information becomes available only online and for a fee-per-use, the library role in guiding users to the most appropriate source in whatever format and to providing access to those who could not otherwise afford needed information, will be crucial.

Although I do not for 1 minute believe that books are going to disappear, I do envision libraries widely utilizing satellite receivers and optical discs and microwave devices to help resolve storage and preservation problems as well as to facilitate delivery of services to their patrons in remote areas and those precluded from using the library because of age or handicap.

It is important to keep in mind that a significant aspect of the White House Conference process is the preceding series of local town hall meetings, speakouts, and Governors’ conferences held in each of the States to help our citizens assess and better use the resources we have on a nationwide basis.

I would eagerly invite those of you who share my interest and concern, that all our citizens have access to quality library and information services to join me in cosponsoring this legislation calling for a second White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1989.

June 19, 1985

(Rep. Ford continued)

The president of the American Library Association, E.J. Josey, of the New York State Library, has stated the issue succinctly:

‘Nobody would deny the utility of many of these services provided by the private sector, but (they) are not available to all of the American people; their purpose is to yield a profit, and they are designed only for those who can pay for them. Nor do they have any obligation to provide access to all or any information; only that information which suppliers deem profitable or potentially so. Only the preservation of public services, publicly supported, can assure that each individual has equal and ready access to information, whether provision of that information to that individual is economic (i.e. profitable in private sector terms) or not.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 244 calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1989 is simple: To build public awareness of the precarious state of American library service today and to facilitate informed, grassroots, policymaking concerning the future of all types of libraries. Postal policies, Federal information guidelines, Federal funding for libraries, the future of the library as a publicly funded institution providing public service to all—these are vitally important issues affecting all Americans.

And there are other issues affecting libraries that I could mention—the contracting out of Federal libraries as commercial activities, and the increase in library telecommunications costs as a result of access and divestiture related tariffs, for instance. They are not isolated subjects but interrelated issues. Grassroots involvement of the American public, made possible through the White House Conference format, is urgently needed to examine, to protect, and to nurture the many types of libraries throughout the Nation, which together in all their diversity comprise the impressive collections and array of services that make American libraries a national treasure, a storehouse of information freely accessible to all, and the envy of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

For this reason, I have sponsored House Joint Resolution 244 calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services, and I invite any colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.”
Rep. William Ford (D-MI), House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee Chairman, introduced April 18 H.J.Res.244, calling for a 2nd White House Conference on Library and Information Services no later than 1989. His introductory statement of June 19 is reprinted here. The companion bill, S.J.Res.112, was introduced April 16 by Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI). His introductory speech is reprinted on the reverse of this sheet.

AMERICA'S LIBRARIES IN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1985, I introduced legislation calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services (H.J. Res. 244). Because events of the last few months have demonstrated that the need for such a conference is urgent, I would like to take this opportunity to state the case for this legislation. In brief, library service, as we have come to know it in America, is gravely endangered. The ominous cloud above the library is not a spectacular one causing massive public outcry; instead, it is barely visible, gathering momentum almost undetected by the public at large. If not soon recognized, understood, and remedied, the problems besetting the Nation's libraries will cause irreparable harm before many people realize what has happened.

This administration's repeated efforts to eliminate Federal funding for library programs have been widely reported in the media and understood by the general public. We have all heard from our constituents that Federal support for library programs is in the public interest, and we have continued to authorize and appropriate funds for elementary and secondary school libraries, academic, and public libraries. (Although Federal funds for school libraries have been consolidated in a block grant, I, for one, intend to monitor the effects of the block grant approach on school library service.)

The threat of curtailed Federal funding for school, academic and public library programs is not the only danger confronting libraries: indeed, if it were, a White House Conference would not be so urgent. The White House Conference is needed to enable the American public to examine the impact on libraries of many Government policies including some which are seemingly tangential to libraries but which in fact may jeopardize American libraries to the core.

For example, as chairman of the House Postsecondary Civil Service Committee, I have had an opportunity to learn firsthand how postal policies can affect library service. The mailing of newspapers, magazines, books, and classroom publications has been subsidized for many years through the setting of postal rates. The primary purpose of the subsidy has been to promote the dissemination of information throughout the Nation by means of the postal system—a tradition that dates back to the 18th century. Since 1904, postal policy has allowed the mailing of library materials to the blind and physically handicapped at no cost, again using the postal system to promote the dissemination of information to those without access. Historically, the Federal Government, from general tax revenues, has helped certain people pay their postal bills, not as a special favor, but in furtherance of the national good. Low rates for small newspapers facilitate the flow of necessary information to all parts of the country, especially rural areas. Subsidized rates for schools, libraries, and suppliers of classroom materials help advance the education of our young people. And low rates for mailings by charitable organizations may make some small contribution toward helping the truly needy.

This year, however, the President proposed that no money be appropriated to continue such traditionally preferred postal rates. While libraries are not the chief beneficiary of postal subsidies, library service to the public is severely impacted by the proposed termination, because library postage bills would increase dramatically. Neither the libraries themselves, usually on fixed annual or 2-year budgets, nor their users, especially the elderly, the handicapped, and those in rural or isolated locations who depend on library books-by-mail services, can absorb the massive postal increases. It is a truism that every extra dollar libraries must spend on postage is a dollar less for the purchase of library resources and provision of services. Equally obvious is the fact that if libraries are forced to pass on increased costs to their users, libraries will begin to serve only those who can afford to pay for the service.

Thus the relationship between postal policy and library service is of crucial importance. In fact, the setting of postal policy can alter drastically the role of the library in our society. The library of today—a publicly supported institution providing a public service to all—could become an institution charging fees for its services, thus limiting its clientele to the affluent.

Another example of Federal policy promulgation with serious impact on libraries is embodied in the recent Office of Management and Budget draft circular purporting to provide a general policy framework for management of Federal Information Resources. (Management of Federal Information Resources, DraftOMB Circular, 50 FR 10734 (March 15, 1985).) The guidelines set forth in this circular, if implemented, would sharply reduce the Government's collection of information and its dissemination to the public, while escalating the so-called privatization of Government information. I have reviewed a statement on this subject by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., of the Detroit Public Library, who cites several instances of the relationship between such privatization and curtailed public access to Government information.

For example, the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) announced in the March 4, 1985, Federal Register that it will no longer publish the full text of its decisions in bound volumes, referring users to four private sector sources instead. The volumes in the past have been provided at no charge to 472 depository libraries across the country, including 37 Federal libraries. In addition, copies were available for purchase through the Government Printing Office at a cost of approximately $55 per year. The private publishers cited offer the decisions in various formats (bound volumes, loose-leaf services, and microfiche), not all of which include complete texts, at prices ranging from $250 to $498 per year. Few depository libraries or citizens will be able to subscribe to the MSPB decisions at these prices. The discontinuation of Government publication removes the item from the Depository Library Program, the Government Printing Office sales program, and inhibits public access to the information involved.
A White House Conference on Small Business will be held no later than September 1, 1986, as required by PL 98-276, signed by President Reagan May 8, 1984. On June 19 the sites and dates of the state conference were announced, as shown below. State conferences will focus on such issues as capital formation, tax policy, education and training, procurement, international trade, regulatory policy, finance, and economic policy.

The approximately 1,800 delegates to the National Conference must have attended their home state conference, must be an owner, partner, or corporate officer of a small business, must employ under 500 people, and will pay their own travel and living expenses. Some national delegates will be appointed by the President, Senators, Representatives, Governors and other public officials; others will be elected by state delegates.

Library opportunities: (1) alerting potential delegates knowledgeable about the importance to small business of library and information services, and of a literate workforce; (2) providing library and information services to state conference delegates.

Further information is available from White House Conference on Small Business, Suite 1101, 1801 K St. NW, Washington, DC 20006, 202/653-9550.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>8/20/85</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>5/06/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>5/16/86</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>10/28/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>5/01/86</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>4/25/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>4/18/86</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>11/22/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1/07/86</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>3/11/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1/10/86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>10/08/85</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>2/10/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>10/11/85</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>1/28/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>8/15/85</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>11/01/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>3/07/86</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12/05/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>2/05/86</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>4/22/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>8/23/85</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5/09/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>1/14/86</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Hershey</td>
<td>12/11/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>5/13/86</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>1/24/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>9/13/85</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>10/16/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>4/01/86</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1/31/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>4/11/86</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>11/06/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>4/15/86</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>2/28/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>2/25/86</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>3/18/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>2/21/86</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>10/04/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>11/19/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>12/19/85</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Montpelier</td>
<td>11/15/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>11/26/85</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>8/09/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>9/20/85</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1/17/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>9/17/85</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>12/17/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2/19/86</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>9/05/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>4/08/86</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>10/01/85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Additional State Conference Sites**

The White House Conference on Small Business has announced additional sites to update the original list on the other side of this sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>1/07/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>2/14/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>10/24/85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**American Library Association**

Washington Office

202/547-4440

July 1985
ALa & ARl RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HEA REAUTHORIZATION

The American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries on April 29, 1985 made joint recommendations for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee. The recommendations were submitted in draft legislative language with justifications as requested by the subcommittee, and are summarized below:

HEA II College & Research Library Assistance, & Library Training & Research

Authorization Levels. The recommendations follow levels in HR 5210, introduced by House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee Chairman Ford and ranking minority member Coleman in 1984.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEA II-A</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
<td>$13,750,000</td>
<td>$15,125,000</td>
<td>$16,637,500</td>
<td>$18,301,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA II-B</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>6,655,000</td>
<td>7,320,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA II-C</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
<td>13,750,000</td>
<td>15,125,000</td>
<td>16,637,500</td>
<td>18,301,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA II-D</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>6,050,000</td>
<td>6,655,000</td>
<td>7,320,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II-A College Library Resources. By analyzing earlier congressional proposals and suggestions from the library community against NCES academic library statistics, ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries developed criteria to target II-A grants to the neediest academic libraries.

Funding would be available to those libraries which rank below the norm when scored for both "materials expenditures/FTE student" and "volumes held/FTE student". Libraries would be compared to like institutions according to the classifications designated by NCES.

Maintenance of effort in relation to materials expenditures must be assured as in current law. A graduated amount between $2,000 and $10,000 would be awarded to needy libraries annually, based on an institution's FTE enrollment range. Insufficient appropriations would result in fewer grants, not smaller grants.

Libraries would be expected to designate how they plan to use the funds on the grant application forms and to report on their use after the grant period in conjunction with their final financial reports. Definitions would be based whenever possible on those already in use by NCES. An evaluation would be conducted after two years to determine the effectiveness of the program.

II-B Library Training, Research, & Development. No major changes are recommended for the Library Career Training or Research and Demonstration sections. The unfunded Section 224 would be deleted since a revised and technologically-oriented version of Special Purpose Grants is proposed as a new part D.

II-C Strengthening Research Library Resources. No major changes are recommended.

II-D College Library Technology & Cooperation Grants. The current part D, National Periodical System, has never been funded. It would be deleted, and in its place would be a new part D for College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants. Competitive grants of at least $15,000 for up to three years would have a one-third matching requirement, and would be made to:
(1) Institutions of higher education which demonstrate a need for special assistance for the planning, development, acquisition, installation, maintenance, or replacement of technological equipment (including computer hardware and software) necessary to participate in networks for sharing of library resources.

(2) Combinations of higher education institutions which demonstrate a need for special assistance in establishing and strengthening joint-use library facilities, resources, or equipment.

(3) Other public and private nonprofit organizations which provide library and information services to higher education institutions on a formal, cooperative basis for the purpose of establishing, developing, or expanding programs or projects that improve their services to higher education institutions.

(4) Institutions of higher education conducting research or demonstration projects to meet special national or regional needs in utilizing technology to enhance library or information sciences.

The recommendation recognizes that capitalization costs have posed a significant barrier to the full utilization of technological developments by academic libraries. The goal of a nationwide network of information resources in support of scholarship would be strengthened by such a program.

The recommendation for a new II-D follows the part D College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants as proposed in HR 5210 by Reps. Ford and Coleman in 1984. HR 5210's II-D was based on a recommendation of an American Council on Education task force on HEA II. The ACE recommendation, in turn, was an updating of the currently unfunded Special Purpose Grants under II-B.

HEA VI International Education Programs

Foreign Periodicals. A new section, "Periodicals Published Outside the United States," is recommended for grants to established institutions of higher education or public or nonprofit private library institutions or consortia of such institutions for the following purposes:

(1) To acquire periodicals published outside the U.S. not commonly held by American academic libraries and of scholarly or research importance.

(2) To maintain current bibliographic information on periodicals thus acquired in machine-readable form and to enter such information into one or more of the widely available bibliographic data bases.

(3) To preserve such periodicals.

(4) To make such periodicals available to researchers and scholars.

Grant recipients should demonstrate relevant collection strengths and a commitment to share the resources of the collection. Nothing in the section would be considered to affect the copyright law. Authorization levels would be $1,000,000 for FY 1987, $1,100,000 for FY '88, $1,200,000 for FY '89, $1,300,000 for FY '90, and $1,400,000 for FY '91.

American Library Association Washington Office 202/547-4440 June 1985