



ALA Washington Newsletter

Contents:

May 31, 1988, Volume 40, Number 5

Congressional Budget	p. 1	Copyright	p. 7
Appropriations, FY 1989	p. 1	HEA II-B Training Regs	p. 7
302(b) Allocations	p. 1	HEA II-C Research Library Regs .	p. 8
THANKS, ACTION NEEDED	p. 2	HEA VI Internat'l Educ. Regs . .	p. 8
Library Programs	p. 2	Grant Deadlines and Regulations .	p. 8
Library of Congress	p. 2	Vocational Education	p. 8
THANKS NEEDED	p. 3	Govt. Debarment and Suspension	p. 9
GPO	p. 4	Dept. of Educ. Acquisition Regs	p. 9
Depository Libraries	p. 4	Copyright Office, AV Hearing .	p. 9
NTIS	p. 5	OMB Paperwork Regs	p. 9
FBI Visits to Libraries	p. 5	School Dropout Demonstration .	p. 9
Year of the Young Reader	p. 6	Corr.--Literacy, Star Schools .	p. 9
ACTION NEEDED	p. 6	FCC Access Charges	p. 9
Video and Library Privacy	p. 6	Dept. of Educ., Fraud Regs . .	p. 9

Attachment: Reprint on Library of Congress from May 19, 1988, Congressional Record

Congressional Budget

The House has passed and the Senate is expected to approve soon the conference version (H. Rept. 100-658) of the FY 1989 congressional budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 268). The House vote on May 26 was surprisingly close, 201-181. Although defense and domestic budget totals had been set by last fall's budget summit agreement, a compromise between House and Senate budgets was delayed by differences among domestic priorities. The House emphasized education and low-income programs; the Senate had big increases in space exploration. Function 500, which includes education and libraries, compares in billions as follows: President's budget, \$36.3; House, \$37.6; Senate, \$36.6; conference agreement, \$37.2. The compromise assumes enough postal revenue forgone funding to keep preferred rates at current levels.

Appropriations, FY 1989

302(b) Allocations. The delay in final agreement on the budget meant that it lost a good bit of its impact, since Appropriations Committees moved ahead during the protracted negotiations. The House committee made allocations to its subcommittees under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, and several individual bills were passed. However, as a result of the budget outcome, the committee now finds itself with \$1.7 billion less for domestic programs than originally planned. It is not yet clear where this difference will be made up.

May 31, 1988

Education and libraries appear to have been shortchanged in the Senate 302(b) allocation process. On May 13, the Senate Appropriations Committee had pending a tentative plan which provided a very unsatisfactory \$39 billion for the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee. (Most of the allocation for the L-HHS-ED subcommittee comes from budget Function 500, but it is not an exact translation, nor are budget assumptions binding on Appropriations Committees.) Three substitutes were voted on, and the lowest of the three for L-HHS-ED was approved 13 to 10--a DeConcini (D-AZ) plan with \$39.4 billion. This level is \$800 million below the comparable House amount allocated to Rep. Natcher's L-HHS-ED subcommittee, and \$100 million below the President's budget for these programs.

A Lautenberg (D-NJ) plan with \$39.9 billion failed 5-14, and a Chiles (D-FL) plan lost 11-14. Sen. Chiles, the L-HHS-ED subcommittee chairman, offered \$40.2 billion, the same as the House amount. Its three-vote margin of loss might have been turned around if absent Senators had attended or left proxies.

It is possible that the Senate might reconsider its subcommittee allocations. Useful background is provided by Congressional Quarterly in an analysis in the May 28 issue:

Wide differences between the budget resolution and proposed spending bills also exist in education and urban-development programs, which would fare better under the budget resolution than under the Senate's proposed appropriation formula. And energy and interior programs could fare much better in the appropriations process than they did in the budget.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, was particularly incensed at the low funding levels the Appropriations panels allotted for education programs. He reportedly challenged the funding formula at a caucus of Senate Democrats May 24, and was told the allocations for education were only "tentative" and still subject to change.

Democrats are particularly sensitive to charges that they are shortchanging education, since they plan to make it a major issue in the fall presidential campaign.

THANKS, ACTION NEEDED: Thank Sens. Chiles (D-FL) and Weicker (R-CT) especially for their leadership, and other Senators who voted yes on the Chiles 302(b) plan: Proxmire, Inouye, Leahy, Sasser, Harkin, Mikulski, Garn, Specter, and Grassley. Senators who did not attend the May 13 meeting or leave proxies were Hollings, Bumpers, Byrd, and Kasten. Appropriations Committee Senators not named here voted against the Chiles plan. Sen. Kennedy (D-MA) also deserves thanks. Urge all Senators on the Appropriations Committee to press for reconsideration of the Senate 302(b) allocations to reinstate education as a priority.

Library Programs. The House Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee met May 26 to make FY 1989 funding recommendations for library and education programs. The session was closed and the results embargoed until the full Appropriations Committee meets.

Library of Congress. House passage of the FY 1989 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill (HR 4587) was a testament to the power of library grassroots contacts with legislators. On May 19, the House rejected an attempt by Rep. Hank Brown (R-CO), with support by Rep. Frederick Upton (R-MI), to cut the Library of Congress budget. Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Vic Fazio (D-CA), in arguing strenuously against the amendment, said: "We really do need to provide some relief, and the librarians across the country have asked us for this, and I

know each of my colleagues have heard from them, and they will hear more if they are so inclined to vote for a reduction today."

The appeal by Reps. Fazio, Lindy Boggs (D-LA), and Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH) resulted in no roll call vote on the amendment, and its defeat on a voice vote. An amendment offered by Rep. Bill Frenzel (R-MN) to cut the bill across the board by 1.6 percent was defeated 184-211. The House went on to pass HR 4587 by 277-104, with no cuts to LC or GPO. Relevant excerpts from the May 19 Congressional Record are reprinted in an attachment to this newsletter.

THANKS NEEDED: At hearings in March, ALA President Margaret Chisholm pointed out that in the last five years, LC funding increased only 6.5 percent, and promised a grassroots campaign of letters. Thanks to all of you who responded; your letters obviously had an effect. Except for Reps. Hank Brown and Fred Upton, it is best, on a voice vote, to assume your Representative voted as you would have wished, so thank them for doing so and tell them why it is important to your library. Reps. Fazio, Boggs, and Oakar deserve special thanks for their leadership.

As approved by the House Appropriations Committee on May 12, HR 4587 includes a total of \$256,883,000 (including \$13,034,000 from receipts) for LC, a 3.6 percent increase over FY 1988. While less than the Library's request of \$274,198,000, it compares favorably with the Committee's recommended 1.6 percent overall growth for the Legislative Branch.

The Library had wanted to double its preservation microfilming; the House Committee approved about half the increase requested, and in its report (H. Rept. 100-621) directed LC "to enlist the aid of the Nation's research libraries and other libraries to determine the extent of the brittle book inventory, including its potential growth over the next 20 years, and to determine the goals for microfilming or otherwise preserving that inventory."

H. Rept. 100-621 also includes approval for LC's request to contract with the private sector for a mass deacidification facility, but not for a "sole source" technology solution:

The Office of Technology Assessment has completed a thorough study of the book deacidification efforts of the Library of Congress, as well as the current state of the art in that technology. Their findings are generally laudatory of the Library's diethyl zinc (DEZ) process, although they stipulate there are still safety, engineering and operational concerns that need further evaluation. Furthermore, OTA finds alternative processes which may be safer and less expensive, although they are not as far developed as the diethyl zinc gas phase technology. To some extent, the lack of progress with promising alternatives has been caused by the almost total commitment that the Library of Congress has given to DEZ. That commitment may prove to have short run benefits, but the real question is long term in nature since acid deterioration is a worldwide problem which will take many years and substantial expenditures to resolve.

The Library desires to contract the entire effort to the private sector. If their analysis is correct, that may be a most desirable strategy, and the Committee will support it. The Committee, however, is not willing to support a "sole source" technology solution. If there are technologies available in the private sector, or elsewhere, that can meet the safety, mass production, and quality standards required by the Library of Congress and the library community, they should be considered. It may be that the Library of Congress has underestimated the ability of the

private sector, or the benefits of a freely competitive procurement in proposing to restrict their mass deacidification plans to DEZ. While that may well be the outcome, the Committee believes that any procurement for such services should specify only the results or product required, not the technology to be used.

The Committee directs that the Library of Congress consult with the General Accounting Office concerning the appropriate type of procurement, the specifications, and requirements. The General Accounting Office should be asked to review all documents before release, as well as the proposal evaluation process. The Library should also enlist the aid of appropriate outside experts in developing specifications and reviewing bidder response.

GPO. For the Government Printing Office Superintendent of Documents operation, HR 4587 would provide \$25,155,000, which includes \$11,424,000 from the revolving fund from the sale of publications. SuDocs received \$24,662,000 in FY '88, and requested \$26,800,000 for FY '89. The House Appropriations Committee put a toe in the water regarding distribution of government information in electronic formats to depository libraries. See the article, "Depository Libraries," below.

Depository Libraries

Electronic Formats. After the Government Printing Office announced a plan in December 1987 to make electronic information available to depository libraries through private-sector information vendors (see December 31, 1987, ALA Washington Newsletter, p. 5), the Joint Committee on Printing asked GPO to suspend planning for this proposal and develop a broader plan for electronic dissemination projects "appropriate within existing funds." This plan has not yet been made public.

In the meantime, the Census Bureau is making available a compact disk of data from the 1982 economic censuses and other sources which will be sent soon to all depository libraries. The House Legislative Appropriations Committee included report language (H. Report 100-621) relating to the distribution of electronic products to depositories:

The Committee agrees with providing cost-effective methods of electronic dissemination of information to depository libraries such as CD-ROMS. Other methods, however, such as on-line access, which may increase funding requirements, must be submitted to the Committee before being implemented. In addition, a copy of the plan for the electronic dissemination of information to depository libraries which is being developed jointly by the GPO and the Joint Committee on Printing should be forwarded to the Committee when it is finalized.

In a May 16 editorial, "Guaranteeing Access," Federal Computer Week applauded the government's efforts to automate the dissemination of the information it collects, analyzes and stores, and noted recent GPO and Census Bureau initiatives to make electronic information accessible to the public through depository libraries. Recognizing that securing the equipment to use electronic formats may present a problem for libraries, the editorial said:

However, even the cost of a PC may be beyond the resources of some libraries, let alone some individuals. It is important to make government information available, not only in quantity but in a variety of formats, so that even users without computers can reach the data gathered and stored at taxpayer expense. It is equally essential for

the government and industry to work together to fund the purchase of equipment--PCs, CD-ROM drives and the like--to make access possible through the depository library system.

National Technical Information Service

Sen. John D. Rockefeller (D-WV) chaired a hearing of the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space on May 20 on the reauthorization of the Commerce Department's technology programs. In his opening statement, Rockefeller described ALA witness Harold Shill of West Virginia University as "a wealth of information on technical information issues."

Commerce Deputy Secretary Donna Tuttle announced a proposal to realign the Department's chief components dealing with science and technology as a "Science and Technology Administration" to be headed by a new under secretary. Offices reporting to the new Administration would be NTIS, the National Bureau of Standards, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology, and Innovation. She said the proposal would maintain NTIS within the government while "allowing it to seek an appropriate degree of private sector involvement in the collection, storage and distribution of government technical materials." The proposed bill would allow NTIS to carry out any of its individual functions through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements. In addition, the proposal would "relieve NTIS from the obligation to use Government Printing Office printing services in all cases, and would permit NTIS to use monies collected from its operations for the purchase of capital equipment and inventories."

Hal Shill described the role NTIS plays in distributing scientific and technical information and reaffirmed ALA's opposition to the privatization of NTIS. Language prohibiting large-scale contracting is contained in the trade bill (HR 3) which was recently vetoed by the President. The House quickly overturned the veto, but Senate action is uncertain.

The House initiative to recast NTIS as a government corporation is now part of the FY 1989 reauthorization of the National Bureau of Standards, HR 4417. The language of HR 2159, National Technical Information Corporation, was incorporated substantially unchanged as Title II of HR 4417 as an amendment during markup by the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. HR 4417 has been reported out of committee, but not yet filed. The Senate has not acted on NTIS as a government corporation.

FBI Visits to Libraries

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT) chaired an FBI oversight hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 17, 1988, with FBI Director William Sessions as the only witness. In his opening remarks, Sen. Leahy said the Committee was concerned about the FBI's using librarians for counterespionage purposes. In his written statement he said:

We also learned that the Bureau was utilizing investigative techniques that seemed more likely to harass innocent Americans than to help the Bureau combat crime. The Bureau's use of librarians for counterespionage purposes seems ineffective at best. At worst, it is a direct threat to the freedoms we in this country cherish.

Leahy questioned Sessions about the Library Awareness Program through which the FBI asks librarians to report suspicious behavior by library patrons, and asked: If

there is a serious intelligence problem, why turn to librarians instead of law enforcement personnel? Sessions replied that the Bureau takes the threat very seriously. He went on to say that he had misspoken at some earlier time about the awareness program when he said that it was in three cities: San Francisco, Washington, and New York. The Library Awareness Program has been conducted only in New York where 21 scientific and technical libraries have been visited since 1986, and that outside New York the FBI follows specific investigative leads in connection with the use of those libraries in other areas of the country. Sessions said that the Library Awareness Program is necessary under FBI counterintelligence responsibilities, and that the FBI will carry out their responsibility as compatibly as they can with the needs of libraries. Sessions said that in some of the scientific and technical libraries which were contacted in New York, the FBI did get cooperation from librarians and continues to do so.

Sessions said that any librarian is entitled to say to any FBI agent at any time, any place--"I do not choose to give that information," or to say to that FBI agent, "Our State law prohibits our doing that." He continued that the FBI had prepared three reports on the situation: top secret, secret and unclassified versions. The unclassified version of "The KGB and The Library Target, 1962-Present," was released at the hearing. The 33-page report, dated February 1988, states that the FBI has documented a number of instances where librarians at specific institutions have been targeted for agent development, but offers no documentation.

Sessions said that libraries are used for recruiting, targeting, and by hostile foreign intelligence gatherers in a surreptitious fashion. "Where they are, we believe we must be, and when they are, we think we must be." Sessions said that he doesn't understand how pursuing leads invades the rights of Americans to have free access to information at all under any circumstances.

In a May 20 letter to Leahy, ALA Executive Director Thomas Galvin contested Session's assertion that all visits by FBI agents to libraries outside the New York City area have been for the purposes of following investigative leads on specific individuals, citing several general visits to libraries in other parts of the country. The letter asked members of the Senate Judiciary Committee to do what they can to convince officials of the FBI that solicitation of librarians as monitors of patrons' use of the library is illegal in many states, and is inappropriate and must cease.

Year of the Young Reader

Measures (S.J. Res. 315, H.J.Res. 565) declaring 1989 as the Year of the Young Reader were introduced May 10 by Sen. Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ) and Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-OR). Both sponsors noted that among the organizations promoting this theme are the Library of Congress, its Center for the Book and the state centers, and ALA. Cosponsor Sen. Sarbanes (D-MD) linked the resolution to National Library Week, said he met regularly with members of the Maryland Library Association, and noted the Maryland library community's strong support for the measure.

ACTION NEEDED: These two resolutions need cosponsors. So do S.J.Res. 298 and H.J.Res. 549, designating September 1988 as National Library Card Sign-up Month. Urge legislators to sign on, or follow up on your Legislative Day requests to be sure action was taken.

Video and Library Privacy Protection Act

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT), with cosponsors Grassley, Simon and Simpson, introduced S. 2361, the Video and Library Privacy Protection Act, on May 10. The

bill is known as the "Bork bill" because of the wide publicity over a reporter's story about the video tapes Supreme Court nominee Judge Bork and his family had rented at a local video store. S. 2361 would protect personal privacy by prohibiting disclosure of video rental records and library patron records except with the person's consent or under court order.

Copyright

On May 10, the House passed by a vote of 420-0 a bill, HR 4262, to amend title 17 USC to implement the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, an international copyright convention. The bill assumes that U.S. adherence to Berne can be accomplished with only minimal changes to U.S. law. The Berne Convention prohibits formalities, which means that the copyright notice requirement must be eliminated. However, the U.S. requirement of registration as a precondition to an infringement suit is not changed. The bill also makes no change to U.S. law regarding the moral rights of authors. Senate legislation, S. 1301, is pending.

HEA II-B Training Regulations

Final regulations for the Higher Education Act, title II-B Library Career Training Program were published in the May 26 Federal Register, pp. 19138-43. The two major changes from the previous regulations are an increase in the amount of allowable costs for participants, and providing authority for the Secretary to select annual priorities from among those in the regs. For copies or further information, contact Frank Stevens or Louise Sutherland, Dept. of Education, OERI Library Programs, 555 New Jersey Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20208-1430 (202/357-6315).

The Department of Education received 22 comments on the earlier draft proposal to delete language that cited the training and professional advancement of traditionally underrepresented groups as an objective of the program. The vast majority of the comments (including ALA's) opposed such deletion. No change has been made in the six priorities among which the Secretary may choose:

- (1) To train or retrain library personnel in areas of library specializations where there are currently shortages, such as school media, children's services, young adult services, science reference, and cataloging.
- (2) To train or retrain library personnel in new techniques of information acquisition, transfer, and communication technology.
- (3) To increase excellence in library leadership through advanced training in library management.
- (4) To increase excellence in library education by encouraging study in librarianship and related fields at the doctoral level.
- (5) To provide advanced training in the development, structure, and management of new library organizational formats, such as networks, consortia, and information utilities.
- (6) To train or retrain library personnel to serve the information needs of the elderly, the illiterate, the disadvantaged, or residents of rural America.

However, a definition of "disadvantaged" has been added which would apply to priority (6). One commenter had suggested that this term be clarified because it "does not adequately cover the needs of ethnic and racial minority populations which are newer to the United States and are increasing in size." The discussion in response includes the following:

For purposes of this program and to maintain consistency with other library programs, the term "disadvantaged" refers to persons whose socio-economic or educational deprivation or whose cultural isolation from the general community may preclude them from benefitting from library services to the same extent as the general community benefits from these services. The Secretary feels this adequately covers the varied minority and other special groups for which library service has become critical.

On the deletion of the former program objective concerning minorities, the discussion includes the following:

With respect to the expressed concern about the decline in the number of minorities graduating from ALA-accredited library schools, the Secretary will endeavor to select for funding those applications whose proposed projects are most responsive to the critical training needs of the library community. The Secretary believes that an award under this program provides an incentive to the grantee to recruit the best possible participants. The Secretary presumes that the recommended slate will include a number of ALA-accredited schools and that the participants selected will include minority persons.

HEA II-C Research Library Regulations

Final regulations for the Higher Education Act title II-C Strengthening Research Library Resources Program were published in the May 13 Federal Register, pp. 17150-55. The regulations implement the Higher Education Amendments of 1986, specifically to permit an organization otherwise found ineligible as a major research library to compete for a grant if additional information provided demonstrates "the national or international significance for scholarly research of the particular collection described in the grant proposal." The intent of the change in the law is to allow libraries with smaller holdings, but with specific collections of significance to scholars and researchers, to compete.

In response to comments on the draft regulations from ALA, the Association of Research Libraries, and others, provisions were dropped giving the Secretary the authority to set priorities and expanding the Secretary's discretion on geographical distribution of awards. For copies or further information, contact Frank Stevens or Louise Sutherland, Dept. of Education, OERI Library Programs, 555 New Jersey Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20208-1430 (202/357-6315).

HEA VI International Education Regulations

Final regulations for the HEA title VI National Resource Centers Program for Foreign Language and Area or International Studies were published in the May 20 Federal Register, pp. 18228-32, to implement the Higher Education Amendments of 1986. Selection criteria include strength of library; library activities are allowable under grants. For copies or further information, contact Joseph Belmonte, Center for International Education, Dept. of Education, Rm. 3053, ROB-3, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-3308 (202/732-3283).

Grant Deadlines and Regulations

Vocational Education Act, request for public comments on reauthorization. Deadline July 31. May 31 Federal Register, pp. 19813-14.

Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) Rules. In the May 26 Federal Register, pp. 19160-211, 28 agencies published a common final rule to implement Executive Order 12549 of February 1986 which requires departments and agencies to participate in a governmentwide system for nonprocurement debarment and suspension. A person who is debarred or suspended is excluded from assistance and benefits under federal programs and activities. Debarment or suspension in one program has governmentwide effect. Agencies involved include USIA, Dept. of Education, National Archives, National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, and ACTION. The notice includes some agency-specific interim final rules on which comments are invited. The deadline for such comments for the Dept. of Education, for instance, is July 25.

Dept. of Education Acquisition Regulation (EDAR), final regulations with invitation to comment by July 25. The new EDAR, together with FAR (Federal Acquisition Regulation), incorporates all regs governing the contracting process between the Dept. of Education and contractors. May 26 Federal Register, pp. 19118-28.

Copyright Office (CO) requests information, will hold hearing September 8 on new technology and audiovisual works. At the request of the House copyright subcommittee, the CO is conducting an inquiry and preparing a report on the effect new technologies such as colorization, time compression, and panning-and-scanning have on the creation and exploitation of AV works, including motion pictures and TV programming. Libraries are among those from whom CO particularly invites comments. Issues include impact of new technologies on public access to AV works. May 25 Federal Register, pp. 18937-38. To testify, contact the CO at 202/287-8350 by August 24.

Office of Management and Budget, final rule on control of paperwork burdens on the public, regulatory changes implementing 1986 amendments to the Paperwork Reduction Act. May 10 Federal Register, pp. 16618-32. Regs require agencies to estimate average burden hours per response of information collection activities. Of interest is the discussion of comments on the earlier draft regs on whether the benefits of information collection were being ignored. Regs also encourage automated collection techniques.

School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program, Dept. of Education, notice and application package. Deadline June 10. May 10 Federal Register, pp. 16666-78. Allowable activities to help reduce the number of dropouts include use of educational telecommunications and broadcasting technologies, educational materials, extended day or summer programs, and use of community resources.

Corrections to previous application notices for Workplace Literacy, Star Schools programs, May 9 Federal Register, pp. 16447-50. This notice contains a useful list of names and addresses of state single points of contact for programs with intergovernmental review requirements (where applications must be submitted to both the Dept. of Education and the state single point of contact).

Federal Communications Commission published a summary of its decision to terminate CC Docket 87-215, dropping its proposal to impose access charges on enhanced service providers or value-added networks, in the May 6 Federal Register, p. 16301.

Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, final regulations for Department of Education implementation. May 3 Federal Register, pp. 15673-84.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 100th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 134

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1988

No. 71

House of Representatives

Pages H3401, H3431-32

Mr. FAZIO.

* * * *

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

Mr. Chairman, I want to make special note of title II of this bill—the "other agencies" title.

Too often, we think of this bill as merely funding the House and Senate. Some realize that the Congressional Budget Office and Architect of the Capitol are also in the bill. But few Members focus on that very substantial portion which funds other activities of the legislative branch.

As I have noted, we have the Library of Congress, an institutional leader throughout the country for the library community, scholarly research, preservation technologies, copyright registration, books for the blind and physically handicapped and other important programs. Just one of their programs, machine readable cataloging, is a great example of the help the Library of Congress gives to libraries throughout the country. This program saves the Nation's libraries over \$250 million each year, dollars and staff time that your State and local libraries would have to expend to catalog a book or magazine before placing it on one their shelves. I will place an analysis of these savings in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

* * * *

Then there is the Superintendent of Documents, a part of the Government Printing Office. That program distributes Government documents and reports to over 1,400 Federal depository libraries all over the country. They also sell or distribute free about 70 million publications yearly to the general public. In many ways, that program brings the Government as close to the average citizen as any program in the entire Federal structure.

* * * *

The Savings to the Nation's Libraries from the Distribution of Cataloging Records by the Library of Congress in Machine-readable Form

1. The Cataloging of Books:

Number of academic and public libraries.....	13,883
1986 book purchases nationwide in dollars (Average cost per book = \$30.00).....	\$577,518,468

1986 number of books purchased nationwide..	19,250,619
Number cataloged using LC records (82%) (Average savings per title cataloged = \$11.29)	15,785,507
Total savings nationwide for books cataloged	\$178,218,370
2. The Cataloging of Serials:	
Number of academic libraries.....	5,034
Average number of new titles cataloged per year per academic library.....	1,000
Total new titles in academic libraries.....	5,034,000
Number of public libraries.....	8,849
Average number of new titles cataloged per year per public library.....	20
Total new titles in public libraries.....	176,980
Estimated total new titles cataloged	5,210,980
Estimated number of records derived from LC cataloging (estimate of 50%) (Average savings per title cataloged = \$28.23)	2,605,490
Total savings nationwide for serials cataloged	\$73,552,982
3. The Cataloging of Maps, Music, Sound Recordings and Visual Materials	
Annual number of times these records were used for cataloging on the OCLC database (Average savings per title cataloged = \$21.71)	147,172
Total savings nationwide for maps, music, sound recordings, and visual materials	\$3,195,169
Total savings nationwide for cataloging books serials, maps, music, sound recordings and visual materials, grand total estimated savings.....	\$254,966,521

(Estimates based on data for academic and public libraries from the 1986 Bowker Annual, an LC study Alternative Methods for Transmitting Machine-readable Bibliographic Data: a Feasibility Study and statistics supplied by OCLC, Inc.)

The House rejected an attempt by Rep. Hank Brown (R-CO), supported by Rep. Frederick Upton (R-MI), to cut the Library of Congress budget. Legislative Appropriations Subcom. Chairman Vic Fazio (D-CA), Rep. Lindy Boggs (D-LA) and Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH) argued against the amendment, which was defeated on a voice vote. As Rep. Fazio notes, the outcome was influenced by librarian letters to Congress. The House went on to pass HR 4587, the FY 1989 Legislative Appropriations Bill, by 277-104. An amendment offered by Rep. Bill Frenzel (R-MN) to cut the bill across the board by 1.6% was defeated 184-211. Excerpts from the May 19 debate are reprinted here.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 19, line 2, strike "\$152,647,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$148,031,980".

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the document that stands before us recommends a 6.3-percent increase in spending for the Library of Congress. This is one of many areas that have had an explosion in spending over recent years. The amendment suggests that they should be allotted a 3-percent increase instead of a 6.3-percent increase. The 3 percent is a reflection of the cost-of-living adjustment that will be recommended for other Federal employees. We are suggesting that the members of the Library of Congress staff should be treated as other employees should.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason that they should have a higher increase than other Federal employees.

There is no reason that we should talk about further expansion in the Library at a time when our deficit still runs in enormous figures.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are going to be two amendments offered here in the next half hour to 45 minutes, one cutting the Library of Congress, and the other, the General Accounting Office. I think they are the two most important amendments we will deal with on this bill.

The Library of Congress has not done any profligate spending. There has been no explosion of spending at the Library of Congress. We have in the last several years allowed for an \$80 million renovation and restoration of the Adams and Jefferson buildings, but the Library salaries and expenses account has been held very tightly. We really do need to provide some relief, and the librarians across the country have asked us for this, and I know each of my colleagues have heard from them, and they will hear more if they are so inclined to vote for a reduction today.

Mr. Chairman, we need to expand the reading room and other reader services when the renovation of these buildings is completed. We began the process of doing that.

This is a library that is not only for the Congress of the United States. As my colleagues know, it is for intellectual inquiry in our country. We spend a lot of time talking about competitiveness, we are really in need of giving the library the resources to help the intellectual and research element of our population find the answers to the future. We have not been making adequate book purchases. We are falling further and further behind.

□ 1440

As the major book repository in this country, and indeed in this world, for the written word, we need these services. We believe we need to do more in preserving the documents that are already published. We are not doing enough. We are providing authority in this bill to acquire services to preserve books through the process of deacidification. If we didn't begin that soon, many books will become too brittle or will disintegrate, and will no longer be available to all mankind.

Mr. Chairman, because of the appropriations in this bill to the Library of Congress there will be an estimated savings to State and local libraries across the country of some \$250 million because of the cataloguing done at the Library of Congress. These libraries benefit from Library of Congress cataloguing, including the university and research laboratories, as well.

The reduction in this amendment will severely impact the ability of the

entire American library system to work.

This is one of the two most important no votes I am asking you to cast today.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise also, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to the amendment. The Library of Congress is a national library and it has many general services, both to other governmental agencies and to the general public. We have to realize that from those services they have many receipts. They have receipts for copyright fees and sale of catalog cards and publications, income from gift and trust funds and reimbursements for several services performed for other Government agencies.

We have cut back this bill \$7 million over the 1988 budget, \$13½ million less than was requested, and we have only given 4 out of the 30 permanent positions that were requested.

We need indeed not only to preserve the books on the deacidification program, but we also need to continue to put the microfilming on line and to be able to go into the optical disc program.

These are costly items, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that we would not cut back on the splendid services of the Library of Congress, not only to the Congress itself and to the Congressional Research Service, but to every conceivable library entity in this country and to all the other Government agencies it serves so well.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, just to set the record straight, the amendment in no way cuts the Library of Congress. It does not in any way deal with the Congressional Research Service. It allows, on the contrary, an increase in the funding for the Library of Congress, only it allows a 3-percent increase, not a 6.3-percent increase.

The other aspect that I think is important here is that it does not in any way cut out the other funding that is available from fees that come into the Library. That is not restrictive at all. All it deals with is the congressional funding.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct on those points.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would cut the Library of Congress funding by, let us make it very clear, it cuts the Library

of Congress funding by \$4.6 million, so it is a hefty cut.

I think we ought to give the President's appointee, Dr. Billington, who is the new Librarian of Congress, a chance to do a good job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HALL). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. MFUME asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Library of Congress needs some areas of concern in terms of repairs. They are trying to go to a computerized system with respect to their cataloguing, et cetera. This is a time when they really do need some extra funding, and it is minimal at best.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago when the Library of Congress had to reduce its hours in terms of serving the American people. This is not just the Congress' Library. People come from all over the country, and indeed all over the world, to partake in the written word in all accessible wonderful forms of information which the Library of Congress has.

Mr. Chairman, we are a free society. God forbid that we should cut the premier library in this country that serves every library in the Nation by \$4.6 million.

I think it is a very, very poor amendment. I really hope that if there is one amendment that we reject today wholesale, I hope it is this amendment. Let us send a strong signal to the American people that we are a Nation that believes in our libraries and indeed in the Library of Congress.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to take just a few minutes to indicate that this is not a cut. We still allow for a 3-percent increase from the 6.3-percent increase that is in the bill.

When we look at the total dollar volume in the legislative appropriation bill, we see \$1.4 billion. Is there not a way that we can shave just a little bit, in this case \$4.2 million? They are still getting an increase. It is not a cut. They are still getting an increase, and with the deficit the way it is today I think we need to take every look and turn every stone to see where we can save any money at all. I think this is one that is a fairly easy vote to cast "yes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was rejected.