



# ALA Washington Newsletter

**Contents:**

March 17, 1986, Volume 38, Number 3

Library Hearing April 7 . . . . .	p. 1	Approp., FY 1986 - Rescissions . . .	p. 4
Postal Issues . . . . .	p. 1	ACTION NEEDED . . . . .	p. 5
Preferred Rate Increase . . . . .	p. 1	"What Works" - ED Report . . . . .	p. 5
PRC Hearings - ACTION NEEDED . . . . .	p. 2	WHCLIS II - ACTION NEEDED . . . . .	p. 6
Balanced Budget & Deficit Control . . . . .	p. 2	Japanese Tech. Lit.; NTIS & GPO . . . . .	p. 6
LC Budget - ACTION NEEDED . . . . .	p. 3	GPO SuDocs Budget	
Approp., FY 1987 . . . . .	p. 3	Congr. Docs. Rms. to Close? . . . . .	p. 7

**Attachments:** (1) March 4 Congressional Record reprint of Librarian of Congress budget testimony, (2) Committee lists - House & Senate Appropriations and Budget Committees

CORRECTION: In shaded area of Congr. Rec. reprint on LC, first column heading of funding table should read "FY '85 Funding."

Library Hearing Precedes Legislative Day

At the request of Rep. Major Owens (D-NY), the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee chaired by Rep. Bill Ford (D-MI) has scheduled a library hearing for 2:00 p.m. Monday, April 7, the day before Legislative Day. The hearing will focus on the impact on all types of libraries of the Administration's budget proposals, policies, and the rising costs and changing nature of library materials. The hearing promises to be lively and wide-ranging. Plan to attend if you will be in the Washington, D.C./Baltimore area for any of a number of events planned for that week. To participate in the April 8 National Library Week Legislative Day of organized congressional office visits, contact your state library association federal relations coordinator to register with your state's group and with the ALA Washington Office. If you cannot make it to D.C., contact your legislators during the Spring recess beginning about March 26. They'll be back in the Capitol April 7.

Postal Issues

Preferred Rate Increase. The U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors announced March 4 that preferred 2nd, 3rd and 4th class postal rates used by local newspapers, charities, schools, colleges and libraries would go up March 9. The increase is due to a shortfall of \$104 million in revenue forgone funding resulting from insufficient congressional appropriations (the President vetoed a more adequate level), and the cut mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget legislation.

The full schedule of new rates was published in the March 7 Federal Register, p. 8059. These rates are now above Step 16, the last step of a 16-year phased rate schedule leading to full attributable costs for each preferred class, but still considerably below full commercial rates. The 3rd class bulk nonprofit increase ranges from 14 to 19 percent depending on presort. A 2-lb. 4th class library rate package

An irregular publication of the American Library Association Washington Office, 110 Maryland Ave., N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002 (202-547-4440). ISSN 0001-1746, Editors: Eileen D. Cooke, Carol C. Henderson. All or part of the **ALA Washington Newsletter** may be reprinted for distribution. Subscriptions, \$15.00/yr.

went from \$.67 to \$.74, a 10 percent increase. That book package had been \$.54 until a 24 percent increase January 1. The current and previous increases in the library rate are shown below:

<u>Library Rate</u>	<u>As of 2/17/85</u>	<u>As of 1/1/86</u>	<u>As of 3/9/86</u>
First pound	\$ .40	\$ .50	\$ .55
Each additional lb. through 7 lbs.	.14	.17	.19
Each additional lb. over 7 lbs.	.08	.09	.10

PRC Hearings. The Postal Rate Commission hearings on preferred postal rates requested by House and Senate postal committee chairmen are being held in Washington, D.C., March 12, in Atlanta March 18, in Denver March 18, in Los Angeles March 24, in Dallas March 25, in New York City March 27, in Chicago April 2, and in Minneapolis April 2. Written statements will be accepted through April 21. Contact the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, 1333 H St., NW, #300, Washington, DC 20268-0001 (202/789-6840).

The PRC hopes to hear from regional and local organizations and interested persons about (1) who uses, and who benefits, from subsidized categories of mail; (2) the content and frequency of subsidized mailings; (3) how eligibility might be restricted for mail which "...advertises or promotes the sale of, recommends the purchase of, or announces the availability of any article, product, service, insurance, or travel arrangements"; (4) how the scope or amount of postal subsidies could be curtailed; and (5) how mailing practices would be adjusted if no longer subsidized through preferred rates.

ACTION NEEDED: Library users of preferred rates are urged to testify or submit written statements, covering at least the impact of the 37 percent increase in the library rate this year, plus the further increase of 27 percent October 1 if there were no subsidy (a 2-lb. library rate package would be \$.94). Full commercial rates would mean a 74 percent increase in less than a year. Send copies of your statement to the PRC to your legislators, and a blind copy to the ALA Washington Office.

#### Balanced Budget & Emergency Deficit Control Act

The presidential sequester order mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget legislation took effect March 1, in the absence of alternative deficit reduction actions by Congress and the President. The effect on nonexempt domestic programs was a 4.3 percent cut from FY '86 appropriated levels. See the budget table attached to the February 10 newsletter for the dollar effects on library and related programs, and the related article in this issue on the Library of Congress budget.

A February 21 memo from the Education Department to state library administrative agencies plus follow-up memos to the states involved will require 16 states to "deobligate" some Library Services and Construction Act title I funds, and 17 states to "deobligate" some LSCA III funds because of the G-R-H sequester order. This was apparently seen as the lesser of two evils. ED's alternatives were to pull funds back from states which had already received allocations, or impose a double cut on states which had not yet received allocations. Two states so far had received LSCA II allocations; they have been told they may not use these funds pending congressional review of the proposed rescission. The number or amount of LSCA IV, VI, & HEA II-B & II-C grants will be reduced to comply with the sequester order.

Library of Congress Budget

"You're playing the role of an intellectual Paul Revere," said Rep. Vic Fazio (D-CA) of Librarian of Congress Daniel Boorstin's eloquent budget testimony "sounding the alarm" about the damage to LC and posterity of the double dose of cuts this year, plus those the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget measure will likely require over the next five years. Boorstin's February 20 statement to the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee was inserted in the March 4 Congressional Record by Chairman Fazio. A reprint with a summary of the impact of the LC cuts is attached to this newsletter.

The G-R-H cut of 4.3 percent effective March 1 came on top of an earlier 3.5 percent cut in congressional appropriations, leaving LC with \$18.3 million (or eight percent) less in FY '86 than in FY '85. The result is a fiscal emergency requiring the elimination of 300 positions, reading rooms closed on Sundays and most evenings, and significantly fewer items purchased, cataloged, preserved, and made available to the blind. See the attachment for more details on the cuts.

ALA President Beverly Lynch, Association of Research Libraries Executive Director Shirley Echelman, American Historical Association Executive Director Samuel Gammon (representing the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History and the Consortium of Social Science Associations), and historian and author Elizabeth Griffiths for the National Humanities Alliance testified March 4 before the House subcommittee. Members seemed sympathetic but noted it will be a tough budget year, and said Congress needs further evidence from constituents that the issue of the LC budget is important "beyond the beltway." Lynch said that researchers from every state travel to use LC's unique resources, and that LC cataloging data and other national library services are relied on by libraries across the country.

Lynch noted that LC, recognizing the concern about deficits, had reduced its original FY '87 request of \$266,197,000 to \$260,750,000. The revised request is only 9 percent above the level of two years ago; it would restore the cuts and barely keep pace with increased costs. ALA strongly recommended approval of LC's request and urged the subcommittee to protect LC in the future.

Sen. Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) inserted into the March 7 Congressional Record (pp. S2294-99) several newspaper articles and columns reporting public dismay with the results on the LC cuts.

ACTION NEEDED: Urge your Representative and Senators to restore these cuts in LC's FY '87 budget. Tell them how the FY '86 cuts will affect your library and its services. It's especially important that House and Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee members (see lists attached) hear from constituents. Make your points to subcommittee chairmen as well as to your own legislators. Please send blind copies to the ALA Washington Office.

Appropriations, FY 1987

ALA Washington Office Director Eileen Cooke testified March 14 before the House Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee. She recommended that, considering the current budget climate, library programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction be funded at a level that would allow the current level of services to continue (a five percent inflation factor figured before the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings FY '86 4.3 percent cut). Exceptions include support of the Administration's request for

increased funds for the Education Department's newly reorganized Center for Statistics (which includes library surveys) at increased levels; and a recommendation for HEA II-A college library resource grants, newly targeted to the neediest institutions under pending HEA reauthorization legislation, at a level which would fund about 1,000 academic libraries with grants of between \$2,000 and \$10,000.

(amounts in thousands)	FY '86 <u>Appropriation</u>	FY '86 <u>After 4.3% Sequester</u>	FY 1987 <u>Reagan Request</u>	FY '87 <u>ALA Recom- mendation</u>
Library Services & Construction Act				
Title I, public library services	\$ 75,000	\$ 71,774	\$ -0-	\$ 78,750
II, public library construction	22,500	21,533	-0-	23,625
III, interlibrary cooperation	18,000	17,226	-0-	18,900
IV, Indian tribes (2% setaside of appropriations for titles I, II, III)				
VI, library literacy programs	5,000	4,785	-0-	5,250
Higher Education Act				
Title II-A, college library resources	-0-	-0-	-0-	5,000
II-B, training, research	1,000	957	-0-	1,050
II-C, research libraries	6,000	5,742	-0-	6,300
Educ. Consolidation & Improvement Act				
Chapter 2 state block grant	528,909	506,166	528,909	555,354
NCLIS	690	660	690	725
Center for Statistics, Dept. of Ed.	8,747	8,371	12,000	12,000
National Library of Medicine (incl. Medical Library Assistance Act)	57,808	55,322	56,408	60,698

#### Appropriations, FY 1986 - Rescissions

On February 5, together with the FY 1987 budget, President Reagan submitted to Congress a 273 page message (H. Doc. 99-161, also in the February 18 Federal Register, pp. 5830-966) proposing rescissions and deferrals of funds already appropriated by Congress and signed into law for FY 1986, the current fiscal year which began last October 1. Included are proposed rescissions (or "unappropriation") of all funds for the Library Services and Construction Act title II public library construction, LSCA VI library literacy programs, Higher Education Act title II-B library training, research and demonstrations, and HEA II-C research library grants. H. Doc. 99-161 notes:

...This proposal is based on the recognition that State and local governments are in a better position to assume responsibility for public library construction and that other public and private sources of funds can be made available to support the other efforts.

...The rescission would eliminate about 210 public library construction projects, about 192 literacy projects in public libraries, about 69 fellowships for librarians, about 3 library research contracts, and about 43 awards to assist major research libraries.

The numbers of grants listed above are based on funding levels after the March 1 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings sequester order. A total of \$34,500,000 was originally appropriated by Congress for these programs. If Congress does not act to approve the rescission requests within 45 legislative days (estimated to expire about April 15), funds must be released.

ALA Washington Office Director Eileen Cooke wrote to each House and Senate Appropriations Committee member recently to urge rejection of the rescission proposals. The points which follow were included in her House appropriations testimony on March 14 as well. Congress already rejected the Administration's original request to eliminate LSCA and HEA II in FY '86. The Education Department is holding up all LSCA II funds (including those of two states which had already received FY '86 allocations) to see whether Congress acts, despite an earlier General Accounting Office opinion that mandatory spending provisions such as LSCA II are not available for rescission. Undoubtedly, if almost half of the states had not already received funds, LSCA I and III would also be part of the rescission request.

Even if Congress does not act, the 45-day delay causes problems for current funded programs such as LSCA and HEA II. Over half the fiscal year will be gone before funds can be released. Required matching funds for construction can only be held so long before other demands are made on them. First time funding for LSCA VI for literacy, a topic of heightened national concern, would be lost. HEA II-B grants to library education programs for fellowships could have been announced in December, allowing institutions to recruit the best candidates. HEA II-C grant applications have already been received and reviewed.

ACTION NEEDED: If you were hoping for an award under LSCA II, VI, HEA II-B or II-C, write to House and Senate L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee chairmen or your Member on these subcommittees (see lists attached to this newsletter). Explain the hardship or problems (matching funds promised, planning done, etc.) caused if Congress were to approve the rescission, or even the delay until mid-April in release of funds. Urge Congress not to act on the proposed rescissions.

### "What Works"

What Works, Research About Teaching and Learning is a new Department of Education publication announced with fanfare at the White House March 4 by President Reagan and Secretary of Education William Bennett. Compiled under the direction of Assistant Secretary for Research and Improvement Chester Finn Jr., the report is designed to make research findings, some of which simply confirm common sense, available in lay terms for parents and school board members. The emphasis is primarily on the home and parent, secondarily the teachers, and lastly the educational system.

Each of three sections (Home, Classroom, School) contains a series of research findings followed by comments and ending with a bibliography of studies consulted and suggestions for further reading. Of interest to librarians and school media specialists is the emphasis placed on reading to children, storytelling that actively involves the listeners, and the amount of independent reading a child does. One finding simplistically states: "Children improve their reading ability by reading a lot. Reading achievement is directly related to the amount of reading children do in school and outside."

The comment section expands on this finding, and includes a shocking statistic: Half of all fifth graders spend only 4 minutes a day reading while they devote 130 minutes a day to viewing television. The report also says: "Children in classrooms that have libraries read more, have better attitudes about reading, and make greater gains in reading comprehension than children in classrooms without libraries." Single copies of the 65-page paperbound report are available at no charge from the Consumer Information Center, Dept. 605-P, Pueblo, CO 81009 (303/948-3334).

WHCLIS II

The list of legislators calling for a second White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1989 has grown to 60 Representatives and 16 Senators. A list of cosponsors through the end of the first session was attached to the December 31 newsletter. Cosponsors of S.J. Res. 112 and H.J. Res. 244 added since the second session began include Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT) and Reps. Tommy Robinson (D-AR), Sala Burton (D-CA), Cathy Long (D-LA), John McKernan, Jr., (R-ME), William Clay (D-MO), Robert Young (D-MO), Gary Ackerman (D-NY), Thomas Downey (D-NY), Hamilton Fish, Jr. (R-NY), Jack Kemp (R-NY), David Martin (R-NY), Stephen Solarz (D-NY), and Alan Mollohan (D-WV).

ACTION NEEDED: Make it a point during the April 8 Legislative Day in Washington, D.C., to thank sponsors Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) and Rep. Bill Ford (D-MI) and all cosponsors, and to urge others to sign on. An updated list will be distributed on Legislative Day and in a future newsletter.

Japanese Technical Literature; NTIS & GPO

The House Science and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA) held hearings in March on the National Bureau of Standards authorization and certain related issues, including whether the National Technical Information Service should be able to contract for printing outside the Government Printing Office, and on U.S. access to Japanese technical literature. Testifying on March 13 along with Senators, Commerce Department officials and representatives of private sector firms and associations were two librarians for ALA, Francis Buckley and Harold Shill. The hearing was an excellent example of Congress turning to the library community for an additional source of expert data and opinion.

NTIS & GPO. ALA Councilor Francis Buckley of the Detroit Public Library discussed proposals which have been made to authorize the Commerce Department's National Technical Information Service to procure printing services from sources other than the Government Printing Office. Although intended to reduce costs and improve the quality and timeliness of printing, Buckley said such a step would have a serious potential impact on access to government information by the public. He questioned whether NTIS would continue to provide copies of its own catalogs and indexes of government technical reports to the depository library system, and whether such an exemption might not set a precedent for similar exemptions for other federal agencies.

Japanese Technical Literature. ACRL Legislation Committee member Harold Shill of West Virginia University's Evansdale Library testified on HR 3831, the Japanese Technical Literature Act, which would direct the National Technical Information Service to monitor Japanese Technical Information and translate selected Japanese technical documents, index government translations and undertake related activities. The bill was introduced by subcommittee member Norman Mineta (D-CA). Shill provided detailed data on the existing limited sources of access to Japanese technical literature, noted that small to medium-sized businesses rely heavily on academic and public libraries for access to information and research results, and warned that a recent vendor-based abstracting service for certain Japanese technical journals is priced out of reach of smaller firms and most university libraries. He supported HR 3831, but recommended technical amendments to improve its effectiveness.

The sponsor of a similar Senate-passed bill, S. 1073, Sen. John Rockefeller IV (D-WV), also testified and urged the subcommittee to pay close attention to Dr. Shill's statement. "He's a pro," Rockefeller said. Then he added, "The perspective of libraries is...particularly pertinent to our consideration of how to make Japanese technical information more widely available."

#### GPO SuDocs Budget

In FY 1985 the Government Printing Office Superintendent of Documents operation received funding of \$28,868,000. GPO requested the same amount for FY 1986, but Congress provided less (\$25,981,000), because of a forecasted decrease in government publications as agencies experienced budget cuts. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget legislation required a further cut effective March 1, 1986, reducing the FY '86 level to \$24,864,000. These two cuts put SuDocs 14 percent below FY '85.

GPO requested \$27,835,000 for FY '87 expecting that cooperation with the Office of Management and Budget in the implementation of OMB Circular A-130, Management of Federal Information Resources, will bring fugitive documents into the depository library system. GPO expects to be able to continue essential services, but even the new budget request is still below the operating level of two years earlier. Documents librarians concerned about the coverage and quality of the Monthly Catalog should support GPO's request as the minimum needed. Contact federal legislators, especially those on House and Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittees (see lists attached).

LATE NOTE - DOCS. RMS. TO BE CLOSED TO PUBLIC: The Joint Committee on Printing, in a March 14 letter to every Representative and Senator, outlined the effects of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent cut as of March 1 on the printing and distribution of Congressional publications. The item with the greatest impact on the public is that "in the near future" the House and Senate Document Rooms will be closed to the public. In addition, copies of bills, reports, committee prints, hearings records, etc., provided for Congressional use will be reduced to such an extent that legislators will be discouraged from providing copies of such documents to their constituents.

For all such Congressional documents, members of the public will be referred to Government Printing Office bookstores to purchase desired items. This means that participation in an active, meaningful and timely way in the federal legislative process will now depend on the ability to pay. It also raises questions about whether GPO would have adequate copies of bills, etc., available to the public as promptly as to Congress. Sometimes very crucial budget, deficit control, or other legislation is available in printed form only a very short time before floor action. The ability to participate in the democratic process could be restricted by even a short delay in the availability of documents, as well as by price. For the last few years, the bulkier bills and reports have not been available to the public in the document rooms, but only by purchase through GPO. For instance, the House tax reform bill and accompanying report cost \$44.00. If the GPO price scale is based on length, are individuals and citizen groups to be precluded from timely participation because the provision of concern is embedded in an omnibus measure? In addition, for many purposes, an official copy is needed; relying on a private sector online database version of a bill or law may not be satisfactory.

ACTION NEEDED: Urge your Senators and Representative to protest this proposed action to the Joint Committee on Printing. The 4.3 percent Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cut for FY '86 is a fact of life, but there must be ways to comply less damaging to the democratic process.

# Congressional Record

Vol. 132

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1986 (pp. E588-9) No. 23

## House of Representatives

### LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS SOUNDS ALARM ON DOUBLE CUTS

Librarian of Congress Daniel Boorstin, in an eloquent statement to the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, later inserted in the *Congressional Record* by Chairman Vic Fazio (D-CA), warned that the "greatest library on Earth" could be "disintegrated in a decade" if the cuts imposed on the Library of Congress this year are not restored.

Congressional funding to LC in FY 1986 was cut 3.5% below FY '85. On March 1, 1986, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (Gramm-Rudman-Hollings) imposed an additional 4.3% cut on all nonexempt domestic programs. Together these cuts reduced LC's funding by \$18.3 million. LC's FY '87 request is \$260,750,000, 9% above two years ago; it would restore the cuts and cover (barely) increased costs.

	FY '86 Funding	FY '86 Funds After Cuts
Library of Congress	\$238,542,000	\$220,269,000
Selected LC Programs		
Research & Reader Services	27,323,000	26,485,000
Purchase of Books	5,242,000	4,091,000
Preparation of Books	43,194,000	42,935,000
Preservation	7,065,000	5,762,000
Automation	17,653,000	16,353,000
Books for the Blind	36,592,000	32,309,000

The effect of the cuts: Some 300 positions are being eliminated, affecting all areas of the Library. Reading room public service hours are being cut from 77½ to 54½ per week. All Sunday and holiday hours are being eliminated and all evening hours except Wednesday. Local researchers who work and out-of-town scholars on limited travel will have restricted access to LC's unique resources.

The 22% cut in purchasing means fewer new materials of all kinds, collection gaps unfilled and few rare items bought. Items not purchased, especially foreign materials, may not be in print or available in future years. About 25,000 books will not be cataloged this year, affecting the comprehensiveness and quality of the nation's bibliographic databases. Most libraries rely on LC's cataloging records. About 77,000 LC books reach a brittle state each year, but preservation microfilming will be cut 25%, and 75,000 books will go without binding. In automation LC is a pioneer; its productivity as well as other libraries' ability to use technology will be affected by cuts.

The National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped is being cut 12%, resulting in 80,000 fewer copies of braille and recorded magazines and 2,000 fewer braille book copies. Patrons can now subscribe to braille and recorded magazines only when current users leave the program or drop a magazine. The waiting list is growing at 1,000 names per month.

DR. DANIEL BOORSTIN: AN  
INTELLECTUAL PAUL REVERE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1986

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1986, the first sequestration order under the Gramm-Rudman Emergency Balanced Budget and Deficit Reduction Act of 1985 took effect. Every agency in the Federal Government felt the sting of the automatic, across-the-board cuts; each agency has had to make painstaking decisions on how to meet the reduction targets mandated by Gramm-Rudman.

As chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I have heard testimony from each of the agencies falling within the purview of my subcommittee. The very stringent fiscal year 1986 appropriations which trimmed the legislative budget by 11 percent, combined with the March 1 Gramm-Rudman sequestration will seriously erode the ability of these agencies to continue the essential services the Congress and the public depend upon.

Dr. Daniel Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress, clearly laid out the ramifications of the budgetary cuts. In presenting his testimony to my subcommittee, Dr. Boorstin acted as an "intellectual Paul Revere" in sounding the alarm about the future of our great National Library. I am inserting Dr. Boorstin's testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so all may understand what these reductions truly mean.

STATEMENT BY DANIEL J. BOORSTIN, THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 20, 1986

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear before this Committee to describe the needs of the Library of Congress for fiscal year 1987.

In the past, on this occasion, I have made a general statement and also filled in the outlines of our budgetary request with the figures for the several items. This morning, with the permission of the Committee, I will follow another procedure. Because of the urgencies, which will appear as I go on, I will devote my statement to the large circumstances which explain our budgetary request, the significance of what we are asking for, and the consequences of our requests being granted, or not being granted.

I must warn the Committee in advance that my statement, unlike all previous statements I have given to this friendly and generous Committee, will sound an alarm. It is not, however, because I am an alarmist—whom the dictionary describes as "a person who habitually spreads alarming rumors, exaggerated reports of danger, etc." Quite the contrary. The Library of Congress has, I hope, acquired a reputation for honesty and conservatism in its requests to this Commit-

(Please turn over)

tee, and in its projections for the future. This Committee has always been sympathetic, and even generous, to the Library, and I like to think this is in part at least because we have done our bit, never asked for what we did not need, and always shared with your helpful staff suggestions as to how our requests might be prudently pared.

But this is not just another budget year. The situation of your, of our, Library is serious, it is even dangerous, and could become tragic for our nation, the Congress, and the whole world of learning. I would be failing in my oath of office if I did not take this opportunity to sound the alarm, and inform the Committee as clearly and as honestly as I can of what is happening to your great Library, and what will happen if this Committee—the only agency of our government with the power to act—does not act promptly.

Only 15 months from now, during fiscal year 1987, the nation will begin to celebrate the Bicentenary of our Constitution. Exactly 199 years ago, the Americans of the former colonies were selecting their delegates to the Constitutional Convention which opened with a quorum in Philadelphia on May 25, 1787. The most recent Library of Congress Building was built by the Congress as a monument to James Madison, the leading chronicler of that meeting, and a principal architect of the Constitution. So that building, all the Library of Congress, our collections, our staff—are dedicated to the proposition that free government is based on free, copious, and current access to knowledge. It would be a historic irony—the only analogy I can think of is the burning of the ancient Library of Alexandria in Egypt—if the Congress should choose this anniversary to direct and promote the disintegration of this great institution.

The greatest of republics has been served by the greatest of the world's libraries. But this will not continue to be possible, unless the Congress takes measures to repair the damage done and to be done by the vast and unprecedented cuts in the Library's budget. As the Librarian who has had a most cordial and respectful relation to this Committee, I cannot help communicating to the Committee some bafflement, sadness, and dismay from my colleagues at the Library, that the Library should have been singled out for a double dose of cuts this year, while some other libraries within the government have had their appropriations modestly increased. As this Committee is aware, our regular budget for the current year had been cut by \$8.4 million below that for the previous year even before current Gramm-Rudman-Hollings brought this cut to a total of more than \$18 million.

Let me summarize the general consequences of these cuts, which foreshadow a tragic future ahead of us. Never before in peacetime have the following consequences ensued:

1. The nation's library will cease collecting needed current material.
2. Doors to the nation's library will be closed for lack of funds to provide normal security.
3. Hours of service will be curtailed, closing on Sundays and holidays, and all evenings except Wednesdays, making the Library's services and resources inaccessible to any person who must hold down a regular job.
4. Materials acquired will remain uncataloged and hence inaccessible.
5. Materials deteriorating for lack of treatment will not be preserved. These are only a few of the disastrous consequences for the Congress, the Nation, and the world of learning. This damage is accelerating, and to a considerable extent will be irreparable.

These steps are abhorrent to us as citizens of a democratic Nation. But I can assure you that we have spent more hours than I can count in meetings of our Library's staff devoted, not as I would have hoped, to discovering ways to be more serviceable to the Congress and to the Nation, and to find rational and deliberate ways to secure economies—but rather to figure out how to meet the sudden demand for a Procrustes cut in each of our appropriations by an arbitrary percentage. How to find the least damaging ways to obey the law? The morale of our staff inevitably suffers. Not only from the need to dismiss some of our ablest people, but from the feeling that the excellence of this institution and its services goes unrecognized and unrewarded. We have become the bewildered victims of a mysterious numbers-game.

This is then a time of crisis in you library, in Congress' library, in the Nation's library. Yet for our nation and the world, these are the times that try men's minds, that tax our consciousness, our resources of wisdom, knowledge, and information. Threats from without and problems within demand every shred of the most ancient wisdom and the most recent information—to cope with the challenges of a nuclear war, to seize the opportunities of unprecedented technological progress, to enrich the resources of freedom. We, the greatest library on Earth serving the greatest republic, are needed as never before by an imprisoned humanity. For many—perhaps most—peoples of the Earth, those behind the Iron Curtain and in other enslaved nations, this Library remains the only place where they can freely learn about themselves.

This crisis has not been created by the Library of Congress. Our Nation's library remains respected and envied worldwide. The crisis has not been created by inexpertise, neglect, waste, indolence, or dishonesty in the Library of Congress. It has been created by the Congress, the same institution and the same people who have built this great Library, and to whom it belongs before all others.

If the announced budgetary policy is pursued for the Library of Congress, the Nation's library—your main resource of knowledge and information—will quickly deteriorate. It has taken two centuries to build this institution. It can be disintegrated in a decade and destroyed in two decades. And so it will be unless the fiscal policy toward the Library is repaired and reversed.

This greatest library on Earth—a monument to our Founders' faith in knowledge, a byproduct of our Nation's faith in freedom of inquiry, will become a byword and a symbol of Nation's lack of faith in itself, a symptom of a Nation in terror and decline. Historians will not fail to note that a people who could spend \$300 billion on their defense would not spend \$18 million on their knowledge—and could not even keep their libraries open in the evening. Historians will look with amazement and incredulity at a Nation that could once afford to build grand structures bearing the names of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and James Madison—all lovers and champions of knowledge—yet decided it could no longer afford to acquire as effectively and abundantly as possible, the current sources of knowledge. They will recall the last epoch of the Roman Empire when Romans were so fearful of the barbarians that they imitated the barbarians. These are not the priorities of civilization and freedom.

The two large retreats mandated on us by the Congress are both antidemocratic and antiknowledge. How can we justify or explain this to our people or to the world?

Dare we say, simply, that our Nation, perhaps the first Nation on Earth explicitly founded on knowledge, is now ready to disintegrate and destroy its own foundations. Knowledge is not a rock that we inherit from the geologic past, it is a living growing organism constantly in need of nourishment and renewal—the special task of your Library of Congress.

The disaster which I describe, the shame which will come on this Nation, if the Congress pursues a policy of disintegrating its Library, can be averted only if this Committee restores in our 1987 budget the cuts made in 1986, and keeps your Library thriving and growing, to keep pace with the progress of knowledge and the need for information. Of course, it is within the power of Congress to proceed as it wishes. But it is my sworn duty under the Constitution to alert the Congress to what it is doing, and use all my efforts to save the Congress and all of us from a historic disaster.

The Congress has become understandably suspicious of all claims for priority on our Nation's public resources. We have been told that the "Government" should only take on what the "Government" can afford. But I would respectfully suggest that the "Government" can afford nothing, not one bomber or aircraft carrier. It is the American people who can or cannot afford. And the Congress determines the priorities in expending what they provide. The fact that some claims of priority are ill-founded or bizarre does not mean that there are no priorities. The fact that "special interests" seek improper special consideration does not mean that there are no rational or patriotic priorities. Among these, alongside our Nation's defense, we must put our Nation's knowledge. An ignorant Nation, an incompletely informed Congress, will not have the power to defend itself. Nor can a Nation that undervalues knowledge hope to remain free.

I beg this Committee to recognize that knowledge is not simply another commodity. On the contrary. Knowledge is never used up; it increases by diffusion, and grows by dispersion. Knowledge and information cannot be quantitatively assessed, as a percentage of the GNP. Any willful cut in our resources of knowledge is an act of self-destruction.

I said at the outset that I am not an alarmist, but an honest person sounding the alarm. We have seen many groups march on Washington—farmers, advocates of school prayer, and many others—all witness to the constitutional freedom of all of us to petition our representatives in Congress. The strength—and the weakness—of the cause which I espouse on behalf of the Congress' Library and the World of Learning is precisely that we do not speak for any special interest or any one party or opinion. The cause of knowledge is the most general of all interests for a free people. The beneficiaries of knowledge, of the information supplied to Congress and the free explorers of knowledge, are everywhere. Their largest numbers are still unborn. We will fail in our duty to our posterity if we do not hand on to them the fully-stocked, properly organized treasure of wisdom of the past which it has taken us two centuries to accumulate.

As a servant of the Congress, I beg this Committee to do what it can to repair the damage being done by budgetary cuts. To restore your great resource of knowledge, your Library, to its stature, its progress, and its promise. My eloquent predecessor, during the last World War, described the Library of Congress as a Fortress of Freedom. There can be no more accurate description of our proper role, and the priority that your Committee should help restore.

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Appropriations

99th Congress, 2nd Session

Jamie L. Whitten (D-MS), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts  
William H. Natcher, Kentucky  
Neal Smith, Iowa  
Joseph P. Addabbo, New York  
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois  
David R. Obey, Wisconsin  
Edward R. Roybal, California  
Louis Stokes, Ohio  
Tom Bevill, Alabama  
Bill Chappell, Jr., Florida  
Bill Alexander, Arkansas  
John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania  
Bob Traxler, Michigan  
Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts  
Charles Wilson, Texas  
Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, Louisiana  
Norman D. Dicks, Washington  
Matthew F. McHugh, New York  
William Lehman, Florida  
Martin Olav Sabo, Minnesota  
Julian C. Dixon, California  
Vic Fazio, California  
W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina  
Les AuCoin, Oregon  
Daniel K. Akaka, Hawaii  
Wes Watkins, Oklahoma  
William H. Gray, III, Pennsylvania  
Bernard J. Dwyer, New Jersey  
William Hill Boner, Tennessee  
Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland  
Bob Carr, Michigan  
Robert J. Mrazek, New York  
Richard J. Durbin, Illinois  
Ronald D. Coleman, Texas

REPUBLICANS

Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts  
Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania  
John T. Myers, Indiana  
Clarence E. Miller, Ohio  
Lawrence Coughlin, Pennsylvania  
C. W. (Bill) Young, Florida  
Jack F. Kemp, New York  
Ralph S. Regula, Ohio  
George M. O'Brien, Illinois  
Virginia Smith, Nebraska  
Eldon Rudd, Arizona  
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan  
Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma  
Robert L. Livingston, Louisiana  
S. William Green, New York  
Thomas G. Loeffler, Texas  
Jerry Lewis, California  
John Edward Porter, Illinois  
Harold Rogers, Kentucky  
Joe Skeen, New Mexico  
Frank R. Wolf, Virginia  
Bill Lowery, California

American Library Association  
Washington Office  
February 1986

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

Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee

William H. Natcher (D-KY), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Neal Smith, Iowa  
David R. Obey, Wisconsin  
Edward R. Roybal, California  
Louis Stokes, Ohio  
Joseph D. Early, Massachusetts  
Bernard J. Dwyer, New Jersey  
Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland  
Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi\*

REPUBLICANS

Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts  
George M. O'Brien, Illinois  
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan  
John Edward Porter, Illinois  
C. W. (Bill) Young, Florida

\* Ex Officio

Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee

Vic Fazio (D-CA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

David R. Obey, Wisconsin  
Bill Alexander, Arkansas  
John P. Murtha, Pennsylvania  
Bob Traxler, Michigan  
Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, Louisiana  
Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi\*

REPUBLICANS

Jerry Lewis, California  
Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts  
John T. Myers, Indiana  
John Edward Porter, Illinois

\* Ex Officio

Treasury - Postal Service - General Government Appropriations Subcommittee

Edward R. Roybal (D-CA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Joseph P. Addabbo, New York  
Daniel K. Akaka, Hawaii  
Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland  
Ronald D. Coleman, Texas  
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois  
Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi\*

REPUBLICANS

Joe Skeen, New Mexico  
Bill Lowery, California  
Frank R. Wolf, Virginia  
Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts\*

\* Ex Officio

February 1986

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Appropriations

99th Congress, 2nd Session

Mark O. Hatfield (R-OR), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Ted Stevens, Alaska  
Lowell P. Weiker, Jr., Connecticut  
James A. McClure, Idaho  
Paul Laxalt, Nevada  
Jake Garn, Utah  
Thad Cochran, Mississippi  
Mark Andrews, North Dakota  
James Abdnor, South Dakota  
Robert W. Kasten, Jr., Wisconsin  
Alfonse D'Amato, New York  
Mack Mattingly, Georgia  
Warren B. Rudman, New Hampshire  
Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania  
Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico

DEMOCRATS

John C. Stennis, Mississippi  
Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia  
William Proxmire, Wisconsin  
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii  
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina  
Lawton Chiles, Florida  
J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana  
Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota  
Patrick J. Leahy, Vermont  
James R. Sasser, Tennessee  
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona  
Dale Bumpers, Arkansas  
Frank R. Lautenberg, New Jersey  
Tom Harkin, Iowa

American Library Association  
Washington Office  
February 1986

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

Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee

Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (R-CT), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon  
Ted Stevens, Alaska  
Mark Andrews, North Dakota  
Warren Rudman, New Hampshire  
Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania  
James A. McClure, Idaho  
Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico

DEMOCRATS

William Proxmire, Wisconsin  
Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia  
Ernest Hollings, South Carolina  
Lawton Chiles, Florida  
Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota  
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii  
Tom Harkin, Iowa  
John C. Stennis, Mississippi\*

\* Ex Officio

Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee

Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Ted Stevens, Alaska  
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon

DEMOCRATS

Dale Bumpers, Arkansas  
Tom Harkin, Iowa  
John C. Stennis, Mississippi\*

\* Ex Officio

Treasury - Postal Service - General Government Appropriations Subcommittee

James Abdnor (R-SD), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Paul Laxalt, Nevada  
Mack Mattingly, Georgia  
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon\*

DEMOCRATS

Dennis DeConcini, Arizona  
William Proxmire, Wisconsin  
John C. Stennis, Mississippi\*

\* EX Officio

February 1986

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Budget

99th Congress, 2nd Session

William H. Gray, III (D-PA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Jim Wright, Jr., Texas  
W. G. (Bill) Hefner, North Carolina  
Thomas J. Downey, New York  
Mike Lowry, Washington  
Butler Derrick, South Carolina  
George Miller, California  
Pat Williams, Montana  
Howard Wolpe, Michigan  
Martin Frost, Texas  
Vic Fazio, California  
Marty Russo, Illinois  
Edgar L. Jenkins, Georgia  
Michael D. Barnes, Maryland  
Marvin Leath, Texas  
Charles E. Schumer, New York  
Barbara Boxer, California  
Kenneth H. (Buddy) MacKay, Jr., Florida  
Jim Slattery, Kansas  
Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts

REPUBLICANS

Delbert L. Latta, Ohio  
Jack F. Kemp, New York  
Lynn Martin, Illinois  
Bobbi Fiedler, California  
Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Ohio  
Thomas G. Loeffler, Texas  
Connie Mack, Florida  
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania  
W. Henson Moore, Louisiana  
Denny Smith, Oregon  
Vin Weber, Minnesota  
Hank Brown, Colorado  
Beau Boulter, Texas

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Budget

Pete V. Domenici (R-NM), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

William L. Armstrong, Colorado  
Nancy L. Kassebaum, Kansas  
Rudy Boschwitz, Minnesota  
Orrin G. Hatch, Utah  
Mark Andrews, North Dakota  
Steven D. Symms, Idaho  
Charles E. Grassley, Iowa  
Robert W. Kasten, Jr., Wisconsin  
Dan Quayle, Indiana  
Slade Gorton, Washington  
John C. Danforth, Missouri

DEMOCRATS

Lawton Chiles, Florida  
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina  
J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana  
James R. Sasser, Tennessee  
Gary W. Hart, Colorado  
Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio  
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York  
J. James Exon, Nebraska  
Frank R. Lautenberg, New Jersey