



ALA Washington Newsletter

Contents:

April 25, 1989, Volume 41, Number 4

NLW Legislative Day	p. 1	Permanent Paper, ACTION NEEDED . . .	p. 4
LSCA Reauthorization	p. 1	National Library Card Sign-Up . . .	p. 5
Joint Hearing	p. 1	ACTION NEEDED	p. 5
Administration Proposal	p. 3	Congressional Budget	p. 5
Technology Title	p. 3	ACTION NEEDED	p. 5
Preservation Component	p. 3	National Agricultural Library . . .	p. 5
WHCLIS II	p. 4	ACTION NEEDED	p. 6
Funding, ACTION NEEDED	p. 4	Government Information	p. 6
Advisory Committee	p. 4	Grant Deadlines and Regulations . .	p. 7
NLW Speeches	p. 4	CEF Budget Analysis	p. 7

- Attachments:
- 1) House and Senate Cosponsors of Permanent Paper Measures
 - 2) Summary of the Library Services Improvement Act
 - 3) Problem Areas in Administration's Proposed Library Legislation
 - 4) Congressional Record Reprint and Text of Permanent Paper Measures

NLW Legislative Day

More than 600 library supporters from 44 states and the District of Columbia participated in the 15th annual National Library Week Legislative Day on April 11. Issues raised during congressional office visits ranged from congressional budget priorities (for which the timing of the day was especially fortuitous) through funding for the WHCLIS and federal library programs, LSCA reauthorization, and cosponsorship of measures on permanent paper and National Library Card Sign-Up Month. The day's events were cosponsored by the ALA Washington Office, the D.C. Library Association, and the Special Libraries Association. A variety of library-related events took place in Washington, D. C., during NLW, as reported in this newsletter.

LSCA Reauthorization

Joint Hearing. The House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee and the Senate Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee held a joint hearing on reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act on April 11 with many Legislative Day participants in attendance. Members of the Subcommittees who were present for all or part of the hearing included House Chairman Pat Williams (D-MT), who presided, Reps. Major Owens (D-NY), Charles Hayes (D-IL), Glenn Poshard (D-IL), William Goodling (R-PA), and Steve Gunderson (R-WI); and Senate Chairman Claiborne Pell (D-RI), Sens. Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) and Thad Cochran (R-MS). Witnesses from the Department of Education summarized the Administration's proposed legislation. (See page 3.)



ALA President F. William Summers' testimony recommended: (1) reauthorization of LSCA as currently focused; (2) such improvements or technical amendments as are needed to meet urgent needs or improve the efficient working of LSCA; (3) an amendment to LSCA I to clarify that grants of title I funds to multitype library systems result in improved public library services; (4) an increased emphasis on the use of technology to improve library services and access to information in all formats; (5) a component within LSCA to accommodate the needs within the states for preservation of library materials; and (6) increased authorization for LSCA VI library literacy projects to accommodate the demonstrated need.

California State Librarian Gary Strong, speaking on behalf of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, enthusiastically supported LSCA reauthorization. LSCA most effectively assists the states, he said, in individual innovation and creative problem-solving, statewide library development, and libraries of all types working together. On behalf of COSLA, he presented five suggestions for amendments: (1) a provision for review and restatement every five years of the maintenance of effort/matching floor for LSCA I; (2) ratable reduction of grants to Major Urban Resource Libraries in the event of reduced appropriations or population changes in the cities; (3) a new LSCA III-B preservation cooperation program of \$5.1 million (\$100,000 per state) plus an increase of \$7.5 million in LSCA III interlibrary cooperation for technology needs; (4) coordination between Education Department discretionary grants and state programs under LSCA (allowing State Librarian comment on grant applications such as HEA II-D and LSCA VI); and (5) allowing LSCA I grants to multitype library systems when the intent is to improve public library services.

Other witnesses were Sara Parker, Pennsylvania State Librarian; R. Earl Beck, Chairman, Mississippi Library Commission; Dorothy Elliott, Director, St. Joseph (Mo.) Public Library; George Abrams, President, Board of Trustees, Seneca Nation of Indians, Salamanca, N.Y.; Dale Thompson, Librarian, Providence (R.I.) Public Library; Jane Hatch, Librarian, S.W. Kansas Library System; and Sam Morrison, Director, Chicago Public Library. Each had been asked to concentrate on various aspects of LSCA such as library literacy projects, technology, Indian library services, title I priorities in both urban and rural areas, and interlibrary cooperation. Questioning by members of the Subcommittees ranged widely and included the following very thoughtful questions, to which witnesses were asked to respond in writing. Librarians who can provide data or anecdotal information on any of the topics below are urged to share them with the ALA Washington Office.

Rep. Owens asked for documentation of the interconnection between education and libraries. Rep. Owens also asked for documentation of the benefits libraries obtain through using technology to improve access to information compared with the equipment, personnel, and other costs of technology. Finally, Rep. Owens asked for documentation of the contribution of libraries to economic development. Rep. Williams asked for specific recommendations on any changes needed in LSCA to better meet the needs in three areas--literacy, technology, and Indian library services. Rep. Poshard asked for an articulation of ways the business community could assist libraries, either monetarily or otherwise. Rep. Poshard also said he was interested in encouraging children to read, and how could that aim be reconciled with the shortage of librarians?

Chairman Williams indicated that LSCA reauthorization legislation would be introduced within a month, and that it would be on a fast legislative track. Senate staff later indicated a similar timetable. The House Subcommittee also held a reauthorization hearing on LSCA in Kalispell, Mont., on March 31. Witnesses included the State Librarians of Montana and Utah, the Montana State Library Commission Chair,

the Montana Library Association, and other Montana witnesses. No further reauthorization hearings are scheduled.

Administration Proposal. The text of the proposed "Library Services Improvement Act of 1989" was sent to Congress by Secretary of Education Lauro Cavazos on March 16. No member of Congress has introduced it as yet. The proposal was summarized at the April 11 LSCA reauthorization hearing by Charles Kolb, Deputy Undersecretary for the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. He was accompanied by Anne Mathews, Library Programs Director, and Carol Cichowski, a division director in OPBE. The proposal, with an authorization level of \$137.2 million, would concentrate federal assistance on services for handicapped and economically disadvantaged people, resource sharing, and research and assessment. A Department of Education fact sheet on the proposal is attached to this newsletter, as is an excerpt from ALA testimony listing problem areas.

Legislators, especially Reps. Poshard and Gunderson, expressed a bipartisan concern about service to rural areas under the proposal, and whether the definition of disadvantaged in purely economic terms would hinder libraries' ability to meet rural needs with federal funds. Sen. Pell asked why the library proposal was not included in the President's high priority Educational Excellence Act, and what was the reaction of state librarians ("mixed, ...many are quite satisfied with the Act as it is"). Rep. Owens asked about consultation in the development of the proposal, or whether any evaluation or review of LSCA had been done. Witnesses said no evaluation had been conducted prior to development.

Kolb said he hoped the proposal would be considered seriously. Chairman Williams responded that any time the President sends a proposal to Capitol Hill, the Subcommittee gives it all due consideration. That is why, he explained, the Department officials were the lead-off witnesses. Williams agreed that protecting the status quo just for that purpose is not worthwhile. But Congress wants to build on successes, and does not need incentive to be innovative. LSCA was innovative when it began, he continued, and innovations have continued each time it was reauthorized, often without assistance from the White House. This time, he concluded, the Subcommittee would take all innovative suggestions from all sources.

Technology Title. Rep. Major Owens (D-NY) introduced on April 18 a bill (HR 2054) to add a new state-based title VII to LSCA for library and information technology enhancement for public libraries with an authorization level of \$15 million per year. The bill is similar to the proposal Rep. Owens advanced about two years ago for suggested inclusion in the education component of the omnibus trade and competitiveness bill.

Preservation Component. During his National Library Week speech, House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee Chairman Pat Williams (D-MT) referred to the April 11 LSCA reauthorization hearing where, he said, "...we learned about some of the new challenges facing libraries that need to be addressed in the upcoming reauthorization." He devoted the rest of his statement to the preservation problem caused by acid-based paper, and noted he had introduced H.J.Res. 226 to establish a national policy on the use of permanent papers. See the April 13 Congressional Record, p. H1201. Rep. Williams concluded:

Public libraries are important to this preservation effort. In addition to their holdings of books and publications, many public libraries maintain historic materials for their local communities. I believed that the Library Services and Construction Act would be the appropriate vehicle to

support our public libraries in this effort. Witnesses testifying at the joint hearing recommended that title III of the LSCA be amended to include funding for preservation activities. This would allow State library agencies to educate local libraries on basic preservation techniques as well as provide limited dollars for the preservation of certain materials. This recommendation should be given careful consideration by the Congress.

WHCLIS II

Funding. Legislative Day visits indicate that additional action is needed to be sure the \$6 million authorized for the second White House Conference on Library and Information Services is actually appropriated. States which have received approval to move forward on pre-WHC activities need federal guidance and funding quickly.

ACTION NEEDED: All Appropriations Committee members, especially those on L-HHS-ED Subcommittees, need to hear from constituents on the importance of funding for the WHCLIS. Urge such members to contact House L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman William Natcher (D-KY) and Senate Chairman Tom Harkin (D-IA).

Advisory Committee. Gordon Ambach, Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Officers, has been appointed by the Speaker of the House to the WHCLIS Advisory Committee to replace Nelwyn Murphy who resigned. Ambach is a former member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

National Library Week Speeches

Rep. Major Owens (D-NY) again took out a special order during National Library Week to highlight the work of the nation's libraries, and to provide an opportunity for members to make one-minute speeches. Twenty-one members took advantage of the opportunity. Topics included the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, LSCA reauthorization, permanent paper, federal library programs, Library of Congress, literacy, latchkey children, and resource sharing. Much of the material for the speeches came from fact sheets provided by Legislative Day participants.

See the April 13 Congressional Record, pp. H1198-1205 for remarks by Reps. Owens, Rangel (D-NY), Moakley (D-MA), Williams (D-MT), Oberstar (D-MN), Quillen (R-TN), Frenzel (R-MN), Collins (D-IL), Spence (R-SC), Ravenel (R-SC), Horton (R-NY), Dwyer (D-NJ), Sikorski (D-MN), Goodling (R-PA), Patterson (D-SC), Spratt (D-SC), Derrick (D-SC), and Mazzoli (D-KY); and p. H1132 for Rep. Hopkins (R-KY). See also the April 11 CR, p. E1159, for Rep. Tallon (D-SC); and the April 17 CR, pp. E1246-47, for Rep. Weiss (D-NY).

Permanent Paper

Many Senators and Representatives agreed during Legislative Day visits to cosponsor S.J.Res. 57 and H.J.Res. 226, measures to establish a national policy to promote and encourage the printing of books and other publications of enduring value on alkaline, permanent papers. However, few congressional offices have followed up Legislative Day visits and actually signed on.

ACTION NEEDED: Reminders are needed. In your thank you letters or separate communications, urge all members not listed on the attached list of cosponsors to get in touch with Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) to cosponsor S.J.Res. 57, or Rep. Pat Williams (D-MT) to cosponsor H.J.Res. 226. Introductory remarks plus the text of the identical measures are also attached.

National Library Card Sign-Up Month

Measures, H.J.Res. 231 and S.J.Res. 102, to designate September 1989 as National Library Card Sign-Up Month were introduced on April 5 by Rep. Major Owens (D-NY) and, April 13 by Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY). The legislation picks up on the joint efforts of ALA and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to promote a national library card campaign.

ACTION NEEDED: Both measures need cosponsors. Urge your Representatives and Senators to sign on to H.J.Res. 231 and S.J.Res. 102.

Congressional Budget

A document known as the "Bipartisan Budget Agreement Between the President and the Joint Leadership of Congress" was announced on April 14 as the result of budget negotiations between Office of Management and Budget Director Richard Darman and a bipartisan group of congressional leaders. The agreement meets the FY 1990 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of reducing the deficit to \$100 billion through a combination of caps on defense and domestic discretionary spending, entitlement savings, asset sales, and what many have called rather rosy assumptions about the performance of the economy. Budget negotiators all seemed to want to allow President Bush to keep his "no new taxes" pledge in his first year, but the agreement does allow \$3.6 billion over the Congressional Budget Office current service level (current funding plus an inflationary adjustment) for domestic discretionary spending. However, the agreement is \$300 million under the current service level in outlays (what is actually paid out in FY '90, compared with what is appropriated) for domestic programs.

On the House side, thanks to the House leadership and a major effort by the Committee for Education Funding (a coalition of education groups to which ALA belongs), the House Budget Committee plans to include in its implementation of the agreement a Leadership Children's Budget Initiative. The Children's Initiative includes \$1.7 billion for education above the FY '89 level, plus funds for Head Start, child care, and other children's programs. This would make education (including libraries) a high priority in the House budget resolution.

The Senate Budget Committee has approved a plan which includes a \$1.9 billion increase for education, Head Start, and child care; but the outlay increase of \$300 million is too small to be able to accommodate increases in both education (including libraries) and children's programs.

ACTION NEEDED: Because of the overall agreement with the White House, congressional budget resolutions are expected to move quickly. It is best to concentrate letters and contacts on the next stage, the L-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittees (see lists attached to the February 27 ALA Washington Newsletter). Urge members of these subcommittees to fund library programs at least at current services levels, and to fund the White House Conference on Library and Information Services at \$6 million.

National Agricultural Library

For Legislative Day library supporters visiting congressional offices, among the agenda items was the budget request of the National Agricultural Library. A last-minute error in the FY 1989 agriculture funding bill signed by the President last fall gave NAL \$1 million less than the \$14,268,000 agreed to by Congress. This unintended eight percent cut threatened NAL networking development with land-grant institutions and various NAL information center activities. On April 12, North

Dakota State University Director of Libraries, John Beecher, testified on the NAL budget on behalf of the U.S. Agricultural Information Network before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies. ALA submitted a statement for the hearing record. Beecher's testimony was dramatically interrupted in midstream to inform him that a supplemental funding bill, which the Subcommittee had just approved, restored the missing \$1 million (possibly setting an all-time speed record for response to a witness' request!). The FY '89 supplemental (HR 2072) is awaiting House floor action at this writing.

ACTION NEEDED: Constituent support is still needed for Senate action to restore the \$1 million error, and for House and Senate approval of NAL's FY 1990 request of \$14,947,000.

Government Information

On April 18, Rep. Bob Wise (D-WV) chaired the first of a series of hearings before the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture on federal information dissemination policies and practices. Rep. Wise said the Subcommittee intends to conduct a comprehensive review of issues, problems, and activities that affect the public availability of government information. He observed that it has become increasingly difficult to separate one information dissemination issue from another.

...in order to evaluate the operations of the EDGAR system at the Securities and Exchange Commission, we need to review the SEC's organic statute, the FOIA, the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Depository Library Act, and possibly other laws as well. If this hearing has an overall theme, it is that changes in technology are making our information dissemination laws obsolete. Most of our statutes were written in an era when all information was on paper. Today, more information is kept in electronic formats, and this raises new problems that existing laws do not resolve.

One subtheme of the hearings was the development and implementation of new electronic information systems by federal agencies. Officials of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Agriculture described, respectively, the EDGAR system, the Toxics Release Inventory, and the EDI system. In response to a question from Rep. Wise about what arrangements these agencies have with depository libraries, and whether depositories have shown interest in their systems, Edward J. Hanley, Director, EPA Office of Information Resources Management, said that a pilot project is planned involving TRI on CD-ROM to 400 depositories, and to a number of other libraries around the country. USDA Assistant Secretary for Administration John J. Franke, Jr., announced that Agriculture plans to broaden their definition of cooperators to include libraries so that they will be eligible for limited access to the EDI database at a subsidized rate. SEC's Director of the Office of EDGAR Management, John Penhollow, said that depositories had shown no interest in microfiche when the SEC offered it.

Another panel of newspaper-related witnesses looked at the operation of the Freedom of Information Act. Each of the witnesses in the third panel mentioned the importance of libraries in providing public access to government information as they discussed the way in which the federal government makes information dissemination policy. The witnesses were Jerry Berman, American Civil Liberties Union and Benton Foundation Fellow; Alan F. Weston, Columbia University and Reference Point Foundation; and Kenneth Allen, Information Industry Association. The next hearing in the series is scheduled for May 25 and will feature witnesses from several associations, including ALA.

Grant Deadlines and Regulations

Institutional Eligibility under HEA, Dept. of Education. Proposed regulations add a requirement that institutional ownership changes must be reviewed by the Secretary and clarify the conditions governing eligibility of an institution's additional locations. Comments are due by May 1. See the March 17 Federal Register, pp. 11354-58. Further information: John De Cleene, 202/732-4888.

Disaster Assistance, Federal Emergency Management Agency, interim rule with request for comments. Changes in the public assistance program include the addition of a sixth eligible category, "other nonprofit facilities which provide essential services of a governmental nature to the general public," including facilities such as libraries. Comments are due by May 22. See the March 21 Federal Register, pp. 11610-54. Further information: Charles Stuart, 202/646-3691 (public assistance eligibility); or Robert Chappell, 202/646-3615 (general disaster assistance).

Even Start, Dept. of Education, final regulations and invitation to apply for program of grants to local educational agencies for family-centered education projects (including literacy training for parents). Changes from the proposed regulations include emphasis on collaboration, if appropriate, with community-based organizations or other appropriate nonprofit organizations. Deadline for local educational agencies to apply for grants is May 26. See the March 23 Federal Register, pp. 12138-62. Further information: Thomas Fagan, 202/732-4682.

Copyright Registration, Copyright Office, Library of Congress. Final regulations establish special deposit procedures for computer programs containing trade secrets and for computer screen displays; permit registration of an automated database and its revisions on a single application; and, implement deposit requirements in connection with such registration. See the March 31 Federal Register, pp. 13173-82. Further information: Dorothy Schrader, 202/707-8380.

Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Dept. of Education. Final regulations add "purchase of library books, periodicals, microfilm, and other educational materials" and "joint use of facilities, such as laboratories and libraries" as eligible activities for use of grant funds. See the April 6 Federal Register, p. 14041. Further information: Dr. Caroline J. Gillin, 202/732-3308.

Adult Education, Dept. of Education, proposed regulations. Under the basic grant program, state plans must include expanded delivery of services through use of nonpublic school agencies, such as libraries. Ten percent of funds are set aside for institutionalized adults, with programs to include library development and library service. State advisory council membership must include representatives of libraries. Comments are due by June 12. See the April 12 Federal Register, pp. 14740-65. Further information: Sharon Jones, 202/732-2470.

CEF Budget Analysis

The Education Budget Impact Alert for Fiscal Year 1990 is available from the Committee for Education Funding at the special members' price. The nearly 200-page publication provides Congress and the public with basic information about federal education programs and an analysis of the President's budget. The ALA Washington Office contributes sections on library and postal programs. CEF is a 20-year-old coalition of almost 100 education organizations to which ALA belongs. Send a check for \$17.40 and a mailing label to the Committee for Education Funding, 505 Capitol Court, NE, Suite 200, Washington DC 20002.

ADDENDUM TO
HOUSE AND SENATE COSPONSORS OF PERMANENT PAPER MEASURES

as of April 26, 1989

The following House members have signed on to H.J.Res. 226 as of April 26, 1989, becoming the most recent cosponsors of this resolution.

House Cosponsors of H.J.Res. 226

CONNECTICUT	Morrison (D)
INDIANA	Jacobs (D)
MARYLAND	Morella (R)
MASSACHUSETTS	Moakley (D)
MICHIGAN	Schuette (R)
NEW YORK	Gilman (R), Scheuer (D)
SOUTH CAROLINA	Spratt (D)
WEST VIRGINIA	Mollohan (D), Wise (D)

(See over for listing of House and Senate Cosponsors of Permanent Paper Measures.)

HOUSE AND SENATE COSPONSORS OF PERMANENT PAPER MEASURES

as of April 24, 1989

Companion measures to establish a national policy to promote and encourage the printing of books and other publications of enduring value on alkaline, permanent papers have been introduced in both the Senate and House. Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) introduced S.J.Res. 57 on February 8; it has been referred to the Governmental Affairs Committee. Rep. Pat Williams (D-MT) introduced H.J.Res. 226 on March 23; it has been referred jointly to two committees: the Government Operations Committee and the House Administration Committee. Both sponsors are encouraging their colleagues to cosponsor the measures.

States with Cosponsors	H.J.Res. 226 Cosponsors	S.J.Res. 57 Cosponsors
ALABAMA ALASKA ARIZONA CONNECTICUT FLORIDA ILLINOIS INDIANA IOWA KENTUCKY LOUISIANA MARYLAND MASSACHUSETTS MICHIGAN MISSOURI MONTANA NEBRASKA NEW YORK NORTH CAROLINA OREGON OKLAHOMA PENNSYLVANIA RHODE ISLAND SOUTH CAROLINA TENNESSEE UTAH VERMONT VIRGINIA	Annunzio (D), Yates (D) Boggs (D) Coleman (R) WILLIAMS (D) Owens (D) Walgren (D)	Heflin (D) Murkowski (R), Stevens (R) DeConcini (D), McCain (R) Dodd (D), Lieberman (D) Graham (D) Simon (D), Dixon (D) Lugar (R) Grassley (R) Ford (D) Sarbanes (D), Mikulski (D) Kennedy (D), Kerry (D) Levin (D) Bond (R) Burns (R) Exon (D) Moynihan (D) Sanford (D) Hatfield (R) Boren (D) PELL (D), Chafee (R) Thurmond (R) Sasser (D) Hatch (R) Jeffords (R), Leahy (D) Warner (R)

SUMMARY OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES IMPROVEMENT ACT

In spring 1989, the Bush Administration will propose a major restructuring of Federal support for library programs. Designed to increase the impact that libraries have on education and lifelong learning, the new legislation reflects an appropriate and needed Federal role as we approach the 21st century.

The Library Services Improvement Act would refine programs currently authorized under the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) and Title II of the Higher Education Act.

The legislation emphasizes three program areas:

Title I would improve library services to economically disadvantaged and handicapped individuals. Title II would increase access to library books and other materials through resource sharing. And, Title III would support research and assessment needed to improve the quality of library services.

The Administration's request for these activities in fiscal year 1990 is \$137.2 million.

TITLE I: SERVICES TO DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE

Under Title I, \$91 million is requested to assist the States in support of local projects to provide new or expanded library services to economically disadvantaged or handicapped individuals.

Typical Title I projects would include, but are not limited to:

- literacy training;
- expansion of library collections in rural areas;
- English instruction;
- information and referral centers;
- summer reading programs;
- after-school homework programs;
- services to correctional institutions, nursing homes, or hospitals;
- specialized training of library personnel; and
- purchase and distribution of large-print books and other materials for handicapped persons.

Although Title I funds may not be used for the acquisition, expansion, or construction of buildings, funds may be used for minor remodeling if doing so would improve access to libraries for handicapped individuals.

State library agencies may either support projects directly or through subgrants to public and private agencies. Collaborative projects would be encouraged.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Education,
March 1989

TITLE II: RESOURCE SHARING

Under Title II, \$45 million is requested to encourage increased access to library books and other materials through new or expanded library resource-sharing networks. Under Part A, \$30 million would be allocated to the States for the development of interstate and intrastate networks or for the expansion of existing ones. The remaining \$15 million (Part B) would be earmarked for discretionary grants for the development or expansion of library networks across State lines.

Title II funds could be used for the following activities:

- specialized training of library personnel to operate library networks;
- acquisition and maintenance of computer hardware, software, and communications lines;
- purchase and/or restoration of materials to complete significant collections; and
- the support of other activities that lead to the sharing of books and other materials among libraries.

TITLE III: RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

Under Title III, \$1.2 million is requested to support field-initiated research, evaluation, and policy studies needed to improve and strengthen all types of libraries.

Title III funds could be used for the following types of studies:

- studies on improving library services for economically disadvantaged or handicapped persons;
- investigations of methods to increase resource sharing and make library services more efficient;
- assessments of users' needs;
- assessments of the effectiveness and efficiency of library services; and
- studies in the area of funding and policy.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

All \$91 million of Title I funds and the \$30 million Title II-A funds would be offered as State formula grants. Under both Titles, each State would receive the same minimum grant. Under Title I, one-half of the additional funding would be allocated to each State on the basis of relative population and the remaining one-half on the basis of relative population below the poverty level. Under Title II, additional funding would be allocated to each State solely on the basis of relative population. State library agencies would serve as the administrative and fiscal agent for these funds. In addition, the territories and outlying areas would receive one-half of one percent of these Title I and Title II-A funds.

To receive the discretionary grant money provided for in Title II-B and Title III, eligible organizations - including libraries of all types - would apply directly to the U.S. Department of Education.

PROBLEM AREAS IN ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED LIBRARY LEGISLATION

The text of the Administration's proposed "Library Services Improvement Act of 1989" was sent to Congress on March 16. ALA President F. William Summers, in testimony April 11 at a joint House-Senate hearing on reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act, noted: "A recognition of a legitimate federal role in assistance to libraries is a significant reversal of policy--a change welcomed by ALA." He then indicated a number of problem areas in the legislative proposal:

- Last year's proposal represented a significant cut from then current funding, and this year the library programs are among those in the Administration's lower priority category of domestic programs to be negotiated with Congress.
- The proposed authorization level of \$137.2 million for FY 1990 compares with a current authorization total of \$181 million for LSCA plus "such sums" for HEA II. The most recent specific authorizations for HEA II totaled \$30 million in FY 1987.
- All maintenance of effort and matching requirements would be removed, thus eliminating the strength of LSCA as an incentive to state and local effort.
- Minimum state allotments would vary according to appropriation levels (0.5 percent of total state grants) instead of the current and stable fixed amount.
- Half of title I funds would be allocated in proportion to poverty population rather than total population, with as yet uncalculated effects.
- State and local flexibility would be considerably narrowed. The proposed title I lists only two purposes: enhancing educational opportunities or facilitating greater use of library services for the economically disadvantaged or handicapped individuals.
- The list of authorized activities seems to broaden the purposes of title I, but some of the examples are quite narrow in scope. For instance, could "English instruction" or "summer reading programs for school children" be provided only for the economically disadvantaged or handicapped? What is the relationship of "the development of library collections in rural areas" to title I purposes, and is collection development the greatest need in all rural areas?
- No statutory emphasis would be placed on the current priorities of service to the elderly, strengthening major urban resource libraries, strengthening state library agencies, increasing the capacity of libraries to keep up with rapidly changing technologies, or improving service to geographical areas without adequate service; and no funds at all to administer the act.
- Construction or renovation would be an ineligible purpose except for minor structural changes for handicapped access.
- The five-year limitation on funding a project is unnecessary, particularly with increased evaluation requirements, and will lead to artificial distinctions and decreased state and local flexibility.
- No funds would be targeted to college and university libraries. Academic libraries would be eligible, along with all other public or private organizations, agencies, institutions, and Indian tribes, for grants under the discretionary portion of title II for the sole purpose of developing new or expanding existing interstate library networks.
- It is unclear, in title III library research and assessment, how much of the \$1 million authorization would be intended for evaluation of federal programs and for directed research and development, as opposed to field-initiated research.
- Federal assistance for fellowships in library science would be eliminated, although training and continuing education related to the purposes of titles I and II would be eligible.