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NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK LEGISLATIVE DAY
Tuesday, April 19, 1988


SCHEDULE

Morning Briefing: 8:15-9:30 a.m., Senate Dirksen Office Building, Auditorium, C St. entrance. Information folders, last-minute instructions, and a briefing on the status of library-related legislation. 8:40 a.m., briefing by Eileen D. Cooke, Director, ALA Washington Office; Susan Frost, Executive Director of the Committee for Education Funding; and a Congressional staff person. Coffee can be purchased in the Dirksen cafeteria or snack bar. Unfortunately, no food or beverages are allowed in the auditorium, nor can coffee service be provided in the foyer.

Congressional Office Visits: 9:45 a.m.-3:30 p.m., according to your previously set appointments. Consult the Capitol Hill map and directory in your folder for Congressional office and telephone numbers. The first-floor foyer in the Rayburn House Office Building is reserved for participants' use between 10 a.m.-8 p.m.

Wrap-up Session: 4:00-5:00 p.m., Rayburn House Office Building, first-floor foyer. Informal reports by participants on their meetings with legislators and aides, and general discussion of the day's events.

Congressional Reception: 5:00-7:00 p.m., Rayburn House Office Building, Room 2175. A photographer will be available if you wish to have pictures taken with your Senator or Representative for your local press.

LUNCHEON SUGGESTIONS

The Capitol and Congressional office buildings contain cafeterias, lunch counters, and snack bars. Check with Capitol police for specific locations. Seating may be crowded, and at certain times is restricted to employees only. Early hours are often best. The main Hill cafeterias are listed below with the times of public operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cafeteria/Shop</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Coffee Shop</td>
<td>7:30 - 3:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Restaurant (House Side)</td>
<td>8:00 - 11:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Carry Out</td>
<td>8:00 - 5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirksen Cafeteria</td>
<td>7:30 - 10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Carry Out (Senate Chef)</td>
<td>7:30 - 7:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longworth Cafeteria</td>
<td>7:30 - 11:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longworth Carry Out</td>
<td>8:00 - 4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison-Library of Congress Cafeteria</td>
<td>8:30 - 10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayburn Cafeteria</td>
<td>7:30 - 11:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayburn Carry Out</td>
<td>8:00 - 4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Coffee Shop</td>
<td>7:30 - 11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Cafeteria</td>
<td>7:30 - 10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Snack Bar</td>
<td>10:30 - 3:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Restaurants: A variety of sandwich shops and restaurants are within walking distance of the Hill. From the House side, go up Independence Ave. to the first few blocks of Pennsylvanian Ave., S. E. From the Senate side, go to 2nd & D Sts., N. E., and to the 200 block of Massachusetts Ave., N. E.
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State Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Library Association</th>
<th>State Library Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Library Association</td>
<td>Mississippi Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Library Association</td>
<td>Missouri Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Library</td>
<td>Montana Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Library Association</td>
<td>Nebraska Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Library Association</td>
<td>Nevada Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Library Association</td>
<td>New Jersey Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Library Association</td>
<td>New Mexico Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Library Association</td>
<td>New York Library Association/Florida Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Library Association/Indiana Library</td>
<td>Association of Library Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Library Association</td>
<td>North Carolina Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Library Association</td>
<td>Ohio Library Association/Ohio Library Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Library Association</td>
<td>Oklahoma Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Educational Media Organization</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Library Association</td>
<td>South Carolina Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Library Association</td>
<td>Tennessee Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Library Association</td>
<td>Texas Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Library Association</td>
<td>Virginia Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Library Association</td>
<td>West Virginia Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming Library Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Library Related Organizations and Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC-CLIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Libraries Society of North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Library and Information Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound to Stay Bound Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks County Free Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon U.S.A., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Information Service, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium of Universities of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Metropolitan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County Library System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.R. Donnelley &amp; Sons, Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Library of Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Alabama Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord Brothers, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Federation of Women’s Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Council of Public Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf-Western Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highsmith Co., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram Book Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Communications Industries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkus Service, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak Library System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacesaver Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Libraries Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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WAYS TO COMMUNICATE WITH LEGISLATORS

PERSONAL VISITS. Face to face discussion is the most effective means of communication, and essential to the establishment of a solid working relationship if you do not already know each other. A meeting is more easily arranged early in a session, before pressures build up.

All legislators have one or more district offices. Visits there will often be more convenient for you than in Washington. Members of Congress return periodically (check with the district office), during Congressional recesses, and between sessions.

Constituents are always welcome in Washington. Be sure you have a firm appointment. Use the district office to make local or capitol appointments. (Get to know district staffs: secretaries and administrative assistants. Close working relationships will benefit in many ways.)

Take along others -- library director, trustee, Friend, representative of a community organization, citizen activist. Keep the delegation small enough for an easy exchange of viewpoints with the legislator. Leave your card and any written information you may have prepared. Follow up with a letter of appreciation for the time given to you, and include any additional information suggested by the visit.

TELEPHONE CALLS. Once you have made the acquaintance of your representative, telephone calls are appropriate and easy. Make them sparingly to the legislator, whose time is heavily occupied. (Regular contact with staff is possible and desirable.)

Telephone to ask support before a hearing or floor vote; to ask for help with legislative colleagues; to convey urgent local concern. Judge how far to pursue by the reaction. Remember that it is more difficult for a legislator to temporize in a conversation than by letter.

LETTERS, LETTERS, LETTERS. These are the chief fuel which powers any legislative vehicle. They are read. They elicit responses. They represent votes. (Each letter writer is deemed to represent several like-minded if less highly motivated constituents.)

Letters may be formal or informal, typewritten or handwritten. They should be composed by you, giving your reasons for your position (and giving the legislator reasons to support it). If you are asking support for a particular bill, cite it by number and author, and give its title or subject matter.

TELEGRAMS & MAILGRAMS. These are fast, easy ways to communicate with legislators when the need for action is critical: just prior to a committee or floor vote. Use Western Union's nationwide toll-free telephone number: 800-325-6000. Various low rates are available.

* * *

FIVE BASIC RULES FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

1. Be Brief. A legislator's time is limited. So is yours.
2. Be Appreciative. Acknowledge past support, and convey thanks for current action.
3. Be Specific. Refer to local library and district needs.
4. Be Informative. Give reasons why a measure should be supported.
5. Be Courteous. Ask; do not demand or threaten. Be positive but polite.

AL. Washington Office, with thanks to California Library Association.
The most frequently used, correct forms of address are:

**To your Senator:**
The Honorable (full name)  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

**To your Representative:**
The Honorable (full name)  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

"Sincerely yours" is in good taste as a complimentary close. Remember to sign your given name and surname. If you use a title in your signature, be sure to enclose it in parentheses.

Forms similar to the above, addressed to your state capital, are appropriate for your state representatives and senators.

Where possible use your official letterhead. If this is not in order, and you write as an individual, use plain white bond paper, and give your official title following your signature as a means of identification and to indicate your competency to speak on the subject.

**DO's**

1. Your Legislators like to hear opinions from home and want to be kept informed of conditions in the district. Base your letter on your own pertinent experiences and observations.

2. If writing about a specific bill, describe it by number or its popular name. Your Legislators have thousands of bills before them in the course of a year, and cannot always take time to figure out to which one you are referring.

3. They appreciate intelligent, well-thought-out letters which present a definite position, even if they do not agree.

4. Even more important and valuable to them is a concrete statement of the reasons for your position—particularly if you are writing about a field in which you have specialized knowledge. Representatives have to vote on many matters with which they have had little or no first-hand experience. Some of the most valuable information they receive comes from facts presented in letters from people who have knowledge in the field.

5. Short letters are almost always best. Members of Congress receive many, many letters each day, and a long one may not get as prompt a reading as a brief statement.

6. Letters should be timed to arrive while the issue is alive. Members of the committee considering the bill will appreciate having your views while the bill is ripe for study and action.

7. Don't forget to follow through with a thank-you letter.

**DON'Ts**

1. Avoid letters that merely demand or insist on votes for or against a certain bill; or that say what vote you want but not why. A letter with no reasoning, good or bad, is not very influential.

2. Threats of defeat at the next election are not effective.

3. Boasts of how influential the writer is are not helpful.

4. Do not ask for a vote commitment on a particular bill before the committee in charge of the subject has had a chance to hear the evidence and make its report.

5. Form letters or letters which include excerpts from other letters on the same subject are not as influential as a simple letter drawing on your own experience.

6. Congressional courtesy requires Legislators to refer letters from non-constituents to the proper offices, so you should generally confine your letter-writing to members of your state's delegation or members of the committee specifically considering the bill.

7. Do not engage in letter-writing overkill. Quality, not quantity, is what counts.
Representatives Office Room Numbers
with three digits are in the Cannon;
Four digits beginning with one are in
the Longworth; Four digits beginning
with two are in the Rayburn.

Senators Office Room
Numbers are prefaced
by "s" and the first
letter of the building
name with the following
number being the floor.

Visitors Entrances are marked with
a "v". These are the only doors
open to the public.

Metro Rail
1 = Capitol South Stop
1st and C St SE
2 = Union Station Stop
Five block walk

* Ala Washington Office
110 Maryland Avenue NE
547-4440
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committees on Appropriations

100th Congress, 2nd Session

Jamie L. Whitten (D-MS), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts
William H. Natcher, Kentucky
Neal Smith, Iowa
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.icks, 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
Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland
Bob Carr, Michigan
Robert J. Mrazek, New York
Richard J. Durbin, Illinois
Ronald D. Coleman, Texas
Alan B. Mollohan, West Virginia
Robert Lindsay Thomas, Georgia

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 Regula, Ohio
Virginia Smith, Nebraska
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan
Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma
Bob Livingston, Louisiana
Bill Green, New York
Jerry Lewis, California
John Edward Porter, Illinois
Harold Rogers, Kentucky
Joe Skeen, New Mexico
Frank R. Wolf, Virginia
Bill Lowery, California
Vin Weber, Minnesota
Tom DeLay, Texas

[Under Committee rules, the chairman is a member of each subcommittee and the ranking minority member is an ex officio member of each subcommittee.]

(Please turn over for Appropriations Subcommittees on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education; Legislative; and Treasury-Postal Service-General Government.)
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Labor-Health and Human Services-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

REPUBLICANS

Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts
Carl D. Pursell, Michigan
John Edward Porter, Illinois
C.W. Bill Young, Florida
Vin Weber, Minnesota

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

REPUBLICANS

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

Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Appropriations Subcommittee

Edward R. Roybal (D-CA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Daniel K. Akaka, Hawaii
Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland
Ronald D. Coleman, Texas
Edward F. Boland, Massachusetts
Sidney R. Yates, Illinois

REPUBLICANS

Joe Skeen, New Mexico
Bill Lowery, California
Frank R. Wolf, Virginia
U.S. SENATE
Committee on Appropriations
100th Congress, 2nd Session
John C. Stennis (D-MS), Chairman

DEMOCRATS
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
Jim Sasser, Tennessee
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona
Dale Bumpers, Arkansas
Frank R. Lautenberg, New Jersey
Tom Harkin, Iowa
Barbara Mikulski, Maryland
Harry Reid, Nevada

REPUBLICANS
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Ted Stevens, Alaska
Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut
James A. McClure, Idaho
Jake Garn, Utah
Thad Cochran, Mississippi
Robert W. Kasten, Jr., Wisconsin
Alfonse M. D'Amato, New York
Warren Rudman, New Hampshire
Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania
Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico
Charles E. Grassley, Iowa
Don Nickles, Oklahoma

[Messrs. Stennis and Hatfield are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members.]

(Please turn over for Appropriations Subcommittees on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies; Legislative Branch; and Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.)
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Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee

Lawton Chiles (D-FL), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia
William Proxmire, Wisconsin
Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina
Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii
Tom Harkin, Iowa
Dale Bumpers, Arkansas

REPUBLICANS

Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Connecticut
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Ted Stevens, Alaska
Warren Rudman, New Hampshire
Arlen Specter, Pennsylvania
James A. McClure, Idaho
Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico

Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee

Dale Bumpers, (D-AR), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Barbara Mikulski, Maryland
Harry Reid, Nevada

REPUBLICANS

Charles E. Grassley, Iowa
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee

Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

William Proxmire, Wisconsin
Barbara Mikulski, Maryland

REPUBLICANS

Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico
Alfonse M. D'Amato, New York
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Budget

100th Congress, 2nd Session

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

DEMOCRATS

Thomas S. Foley, Washington
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
Ed Jenkins, Georgia
Marvin Leath, Texas
Charles E. Schumer, New York
Barbara Boxer, California
Buddy MacKay, Florida
Jim Slattery, Kansas
Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts
James L. Oberstar, Minnesota
Frank J. Guarini, New Jersey
Richard J. Durbin, Illinois
Mike Espy, Mississippi

REPUBLICANS

Delbert L. Latta, Ohio
Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Ohio
Connie Mack, Florida
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania
Denny Smith, Oregon
Beau Boulter, Texas
Mickey Edwards, Oklahoma
William M. Thomas, California
Harold Rogers, Kentucky
Don Sundquist, Tennessee
Nancy L. Johnson, Connecticut
Richard K. Armey, Texas
Jack Buechner, Missouri
Amory Houghton, Jr., New York

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Budget

100th Congress, 2nd Session

Lawton Chiles (D-FL), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Ernest F. Hollings, South Carolina
J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana
Jim Sasser, Tennessee
Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan
J. James Exon, Nebraska
Frank R. Lautenberg, New Jersey
Paul Simon, Illinois
Terry Sanford, North Carolina
Timothy Wirth, Colorado
Wyche Fowler, Georgia
Kent Conrad, North Dakota
Christopher J. Dodd, Connecticut

REPUBLICANS

Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico
William L. Armstrong, Colorado
Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Kansas
Rudy Boschwitz, Minnesota
Steven D. Symms, Idaho
Charles E. Grassley, Iowa
Robert W. Kasten, Jr., Wisconsin
Dan Quayle, Indiana
John C. Danforth, Missouri
Don Nickles, Oklahoma
Warren Rudman, New Hampshire
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### U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

**Committee on Education and Labor**

**100th Congress, 2nd Session**

Augustus F. Hawkins (D-CA), Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATS</th>
<th>REPUBLICANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William D. Ford, Michigan</td>
<td>James M. Jeffords, Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (Bill) Clay, Missouri</td>
<td>E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Biaggi, New York</td>
<td>Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin J. Murphy, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Marge Roukema, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale E. Kildee, Michigan</td>
<td>Steve Gunderson, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Williams, Montana</td>
<td>Steve Bartlett, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew G. Martinez, California</td>
<td>Thomas J. Tauke, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major R. Owens, New York</td>
<td>Richard K. Armey, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Hayes, Illinois</td>
<td>Harris W. Fawell, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl C. Perkins, Kentucky</td>
<td>Paul B. Henry, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas C. Sawyer, Ohio</td>
<td>Fred Grandy, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen J. Solarz, New York</td>
<td>Cass Ballenger, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Wise, Jr., West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Penny, Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Richardson, New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy F. Robinson, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter J. Visclosky, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Jontz, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[The Chairman is an ex officio voting member of all subcommittees. The ranking minority member, or his designee, is an ex officio voting member of all subcommittees.]

(See over for Subcommittees on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, Postsecondary Education, and Select Education.)

American Library Association, Washington Office

March 1988
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education

Augustus F. Hawkins (D-CA), Chairman

DEMOCRATS
William D. Ford, Michigan
Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Pat Williams, Montana
Matthew G. Martinez, California
Carl C. Perkins, Kentucky
Mario Biaggi, New York
Charles A. Hayes, Illinois
Thomas C. Sawyer, Ohio
Stephen J. Solarz, New York
Robert E. Wise, Jr., West Virginia
Bill Richardson, New Mexico
Tommy F. Robinson, Arkansas
Peter J. Visclosky, Indiana
Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts

REPUBLICANS
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania
Steve Bartlett, Texas
Harris W. Fawell, Illinois
Paul B. Henry, Michigan
Fred Grandy, Iowa
Steve Gunderson, Wisconsin
Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin
Marge Roukema, New Jersey

Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

Pat Williams (D-MT), Chairman

DEMOCRATS
William D. Ford, Michigan
Major R. Owens, New York
Charles A. Hayes, Illinois
Carl C. Perkins, Kentucky
Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania
Matthew G. Martinez, California
Tommy F. Robinson, Arkansas
Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts

REPUBLICANS
E. Thomas Coleman, Missouri
William F. Goodling, Pennsylvania
Marge Roukema, New Jersey
Thomas J. Tauke, Iowa
Richard K. Armey, Texas

Subcommittee on Select Education

Major R. Owens (D-NY), Chairman

DEMOCRATS
Pat Williams, Montana
Mario Biaggi, New York

REPUBLICANS
Steve Bartlett, Texas
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JOINT COMMITTEES OF THE U. S. CONGRESS
100th Congress, 2nd Session

(Democrats in roman; Republicans in italic.)

Joint Committee on the Library

SENATE
Claiborne Pell, Rhode Island (Chair)
Dennis Deconcini, Arizona
Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
Ted Stevens, Alaska

HOUSE
Frank Annunzio, Illinois (Vice-Chair)
Mary Rose Oakar, Ohio
Ed Jones, Tennessee
Newt Gingrich, Georgia
Pat Roberts, Kansas

Joint Committee on Printing

SENATE
Wendell H. Ford, Kentucky (Vice-Chair)
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona
Albert Gore, Jr., Tennessee
Ted Stevens, Alaska
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon

HOUSE
Frank Annunzio, Illinois (Chair)
Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania
Leon E. Panetta, California
Robert E. Badham, California
Pat Roberts, Kansas
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U. S. SENATE

Committee on Rules and Administration

100th Congress, 2nd Session

Wendell H. Ford (D-KY), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Claiborne Pell, Rhode Island
Robert C. Byrd, West Virginia
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona
Albert Gore, Jr., Tennessee
Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York
Christopher J. Dodd, Connecticut
Brock Adams, Washington

REPUBLICANS

Ted Stevens, Alaska
Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon
James A. McClure, Idaho
Jesse Helms, North Carolina
John W. Warner, Virginia
Robert Dole, Kansas
Jake Garn, Utah
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LEGISLATIVE DAY IN WASHINGTON, D. C. - APRIL 19, 1988

(Each participant should fill out a separate form. Please complete and leave with ALA Washington Office staff or mail to ALA Washington Office, 110 Maryland Ave., N. E., Washington, D. C., 20002. Thank you.)

Name ____________________________ State ____________________________

Title/Affiliation ____________________________ Phone ( ) ____________

Address __________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

PART I: Report on Congressional Office Visits

List the names of legislators visited and primary contact in each office (the person with whom you spent the most time):

1. Legislator ____________________________
   Contact & title ____________________________
   Comments _______________________________________________________

2. Legislator ____________________________
   Contact & title ____________________________
   Comments _______________________________________________________

3. Legislator ____________________________
   Contact & title ____________________________
   Comments _______________________________________________________

4. Legislator ____________________________
   Contact & title ____________________________
   Comments _______________________________________________________  
   (over)
PART II: Evaluation - Legislative Day Activities

1. Did the morning briefing present helpful information?  Yes  No
   Comment

2. Was the afternoon wrap-up session valuable?  Yes  No
   Comment

3. Did the packet of materials contain helpful information?  Yes  No
   Comment

4. Was Legislative Day valuable for you and your delegation?  Yes  No
   Comment

5. In future Legislative Days, what areas would you like to see added or changed?

6. Other comments, criticisms and/or suggestions?

7. Do you have any relevant information about a Member of Congress which can be useful to the ALA Washington Office? For example: Member is a (a) trustee of a local college or university, (b) a library board member, past or present, (c) related to a practicing librarian, (d) "graduate" of the public library.

8. Do you have any such information on Congressional staff members?
Monday
March 21, 1988

Part VI

Department of Education

34 CFR Part 779
College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Notice

NOTE: Blank pages 9252, 9254, and 9256 are not included.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

34 CFR Part 779

College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: These regulations implement the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program authorized under Title II-D of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1986. The program is designed to encourage resource-sharing projects among the libraries of institutions of higher education and to improve library and information services provided to them by public and nonprofit private organizations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 5, 1988.

ADDRESS: All comments concerning these proposed regulations should be addressed to Frank Stevens or Louise Sutherland, Library Programs, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Room 402, Washington, DC 20208-1430.

A copy of any comments that concern information collection requirements should also be sent to the Office of Management and Budget at the address listed in the Paperwork Reduction Act section of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank Stevens or Louise Sutherland, (202) 357-6315.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program was designed to improve the sharing of library resources throughout the higher education community by the use of technology and networking. Funds may also be granted to conduct research or demonstration projects to meet special needs in using technology to enhance library and information sciences.

Executive Order 12291

These regulations have been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12291. They are not classified as major because they do not meet the criteria for major regulations established in the order.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Secretary certifies that these proposed regulations would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

It is anticipated that approximately 82-120 grants will be made under this program to institutions of higher education and to public and nonprofit private organizations providing library and information services to institutions of higher education. The regulations do not impose burdensome requirements on any grantee participating in the program.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980

Sections 779.20, 779.21 and 779.30 contain information collection requirements. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, the Department of Education will submit a copy of these sections to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review. (44 U.S.C. 3504(h))

Organizations and individuals desiring to submit comments on the information collection requirements should direct them to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Room 3002, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; Attention: James D. Houser.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. The objective of the Executive Order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism by relying on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

In accordance with the order, this document is intended to provide early notification of the Department's specific plans and actions for this program.

Invitation to Comment

Interested persons are invited to submit comments and recommendations regarding these proposed regulations. The Secretary specifically invites comments on proposed § 779.21(e)(1), a selection criterion relating to the sufficiency of an applicant's description of its project, and whether the point value awarded to that section should be diminished by the Secretary.

All comments submitted in response to these proposed regulations will be available for public inspection, during and after the comment period, in Room 402D, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday of each week except Federal holidays.

To assist the Department in complying with specific requirements of Executive Order 12291 and the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 and their overall requirement of reducing regulatory burden, the Secretary invites comment on whether there may be further opportunities to reduce any regulatory burdens found in these proposed regulations.

Assessment of Educational Impact

The Secretary particularly requests comments on whether the proposed regulations in this document would require transmission of information that is being gathered by or is available from any other agency or authority of the United States.

List of Subjects in 34 CFR Part 779

Colleges and universities, Education, Grant programs—education, Libraries, Library and information science, Libraries—resource sharing, Networks, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.


William J. Bennett, Secretary of Education.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.197, College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants)

The Secretary proposes to amend Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations by adding a new Part 779 to read as follows:

Part 779—COLLEGE LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY AND COOPERATION GRANTS PROGRAM

Subpart A—General

Sec. 779.1 What is the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program?

779.2 What types of grants does the Secretary provide?

779.3 Who is eligible for an award?

779.4 What activities may the Secretary fund?

779.5 What priorities may the Secretary establish?

779.6 What regulations apply?

779.7 What definitions apply?

779.8 What is the time period for expenditure of grant funds?

Subpart B—How Does One Apply for an Award?

779.10 What assurance must an applicant give regarding maintenance of effort?

Subpart C—How Does the Secretary Make an Award?

779.20 How does the Secretary evaluate an application?

779.21 What selection criteria does the Secretary use?
Subpart D—What Conditions Must Be Met After an Award?

779.30 What agency must be informed of activities funded by this program?

Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1021 and 1047, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—General

§ 779.1 What is the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program?

The College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program provides grants for technological equipment and other special purposes designed to encourage the use of technology to enhance library resource sharing.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047]

§ 779.2 What types of grants does the Secretary provide?

Under the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program, the Secretary shall make competitive awards in each of the following four types of grants:

(a) Networking Equipment Grant. These grants are designed to plan, develop, acquire, install, maintain, or replace technological equipment necessary to participate in networks for sharing of library resources.

(b) Joint-Use Grant. These grants are designed to establish and strengthen joint-use library facilities, resources, or equipment.

(c) Services to Institutions Grant. These grants are designed to establish, develop, or expand programs or projects that improve the grantee's services to institutions of higher education.

(d) Research and Demonstration Grant. These grants are designed to conduct research or demonstration projects to meet specialized national or regional needs in utilizing technology to enhance library and information sciences.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047]

§ 779.3 Who is eligible for an award?

The following are eligible to receive an award under this program:

(a) For Networking Equipment Grants, institutions of higher education.

(b) For Joint-Use Grants, combinations of institutions of higher education.

(c) For Services to Institutions Grants, public or nonprofit private organizations which provide library and information services to institutions of higher education on a formal cooperative basis.

(d) For Research and Demonstration Grants, institutions of higher education.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047]

§ 779.4 What activities may the Secretary fund?

(a) The Secretary awards grants under this program to enable eligible recipients to develop or implement activities or services that the Secretary determines are likely to carry out a purpose specified in § 779.2.

(b) The following types of activities or services are illustrative:

(1) Networking membership fees and expenses;

(2) Acquisition of equipment and supplies, including computer hardware and software;

(3) Telecommunications expenses;

(4) Evaluation of the project; and

(5) Dissemination of information about the project.


§ 779.5 What priorities may the Secretary establish?

(a) Each year, the Secretary may select as a priority one or more of the types of grants listed in § 779.2.

(b) The Secretary announces these priorities in a notice published in the Federal Register.

(c) Each year, the Secretary announces the approximate amount of funding available for each type of award.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047] Cross Reference. (See 34 CFR 75.106 Annual priorities.)

§ 779.8 What regulations apply?

The following regulations apply to the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program:

(a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Part 74 (Direct Grant Programs), Part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations), Part 78 (Education Appeal Board), and Part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities).

(b) The regulations in this Part 778.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1021]

§ 779.7 What definitions apply?

(a) Definitions in EDGAR. The following terms used in this part are defined in 34 CFR 77.41:

Applicant

Application

Awards

Contract

EDGAR

Grant

Grantee

Nonprofit

Private

Project

Project period

Public

Secretary

(b) Other definitions. The following definitions also apply to this part:

"Combination of institutions of higher education" means—

(1) Two or more institutions of higher education that have entered into a formal cooperative agreement for the purpose of carrying out a common objective; or

(2) A public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution designated or created by a group of institutions of higher education for the purpose of carrying out a common objective on their behalf.

"Institution of higher education" means a public or nonprofit private institution of higher education as defined in 34 CFR 606.3.

"Librarianship" means the principles and practices of library and information science, including the acquisition, organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information resources.

"Library organization or agency" means a public or nonprofit private organization or agency that provides library services or programs.

"Network" means a system of sharing library resources that is developed, maintained, or operated by a library organization or agency and that possesses the following characteristics:

(1) The system is primarily or exclusively used by other library organizations or agencies.

(2) The system provides users with cooperative services or activities beyond traditional interlibrary loan services.

(3) The system is not restricted in access or use to units, departments, branches, or components that are part of the library organization or agency sponsoring the system.

(4) The system is constituted under a formal written instrument that describes services, activities, and membership offered by the system.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1021]

§ 779.9 What is the time period for expenditure of grant funds?

Grant funds for these projects may be expended over a three-year period.

[Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047]
Subpart B—How Does One Apply for an Award?

§ 779.10 What assurance must an applicant give regarding maintenance of effort?
An applicant shall, in its application, give satisfactory assurance that, if it is selected as a grantee, it will—
(a) Expend, for the same purpose as the purpose for which the grant is made, an amount not less than one-third of the grant during the three-year period for which the grant is made; and
(b) Make that expenditure from funds other than funds received under Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1988.  

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047)

Subpart C—How Does the Secretary Make an Award?

§ 779.20 How does the Secretary evaluate an application?
(a) The Secretary uses the general selection criteria in § 779.21(a) and the special program criteria in § 779.21(b) to evaluate applications for new grants.
(b) The maximum possible score for the general criteria is 60 points.
(c) The maximum possible score for the special criteria is 40 points.  

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047)

§ 779.21 What selection criteria does the Secretary use?
(a) General selection criteria. An applicant may receive up to 60 points under the general selection criteria in this section, for each type of grant, as follows:
(1) Project description (10 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the applicants' project, including—
(i) A concise description of the project;
(ii) A clear statement of the project objectives; and
(iii) Evidence of adequate planning.
(2) Plan of operation (15 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the plan of operation for the project, including—
(i) The quality of the design of the project;
(ii) The effectiveness of the plan of management to assure proper and efficient administration of the project;
(iii) How well the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the program; and
(iv) The quality of the applicant's plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve each objective.
(3) Quality of key personnel (15 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of key personnel the applicant plans to use on the project, including—
(i) The qualifications of the project director (if one is to be used);
(ii) The qualifications of each of the other key personnel to be used in the project;
(iii) The time that each person referred to in paragraph (a)(3)(i) and (ii) of this section will commit to the project; and
(iv) Knowledge of librarianship and library technology.
(4) Budget and cost-effectiveness (10 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which—
(i) The budget is adequate to support the project; and
(ii) Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project.
(5) Adequacy of resources (5 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the adequacy of the resources that the applicant plans to devote to the project, including facilities, equipment, and supplies.
(6) Evaluation plan (5 points). The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the evaluation plans for the project, including the extent to which the applicant's methods of evaluation—
(i) Are appropriate to the project; and
(ii) Are objective and produce data that are quantifiable.

Cross Reference. (See 34 CFR 75.590 Evaluation by the grantee.)
(b) Special program criteria. An applicant may receive up to 40 points under the special program criteria in this section for each type of grant, as follows:
(1) Networking Equipment Grant. The Secretary reviews each Networking Equipment Grant application to determine the extent to which—
(i) The project strengthens the academic programs of the institution;
(ii) There is a need for special assistance as evidenced by the inability of the institution to establish and strengthen joint use of library facilities, resources, or equipment with its existing resources because of fiscal constraints, institutional size, or any other factors;
(iii) There is evidence of commitment to the project, capability to continue the project, and the likelihood that the applicant will build upon the project when the grant period ends;
(iv) There is evidence of willingness to share library resources and to participate in cooperative arrangements with other libraries;
(v) The academic programs of the institutions of higher education described in the application would be strengthened by the project;
(vi) Local, regional, or national resource-sharing would increase; and
(vii) Technological expertise would be shared with the library community.
(2) Services to Institutions Grant. The Secretary reviews each Services to Institutions Grant application to determine the extent to which—
(i) The project would establish, develop, or expand local, regional, or national resource-sharing programs;
(ii) There is a demonstrated level of support from institutions of higher education that the project is needed and desired;
(iii) There is evidence of the applicant's commitment to the project and capability to continue the project, and of the likelihood that the applicant will build upon the project when the grant period ends; and
(iv) There is evidence that formal written cooperative agreements to provide library and information services exist between the applicant and the institutions of higher education identified in the application.
(3) Research and Demonstration Grant. The Secretary reviews each Research and Demonstration Grant
application to determine the extent to which—

(i) The applicant proposes an innovative approach in utilizing technology for library services;

(ii) There is evidence from library users, library educators, or library administrators that the research or demonstration project is desirable;

(iii) The project would meet a special national or regional need in utilizing technology to enhance library or information sciences; and

(iv) The project has been developed in consultation with leading experts and has taken account of current research.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1047)

Subpart D—What Conditions Must Be Met After an Award?

§ 779.30 What agency must be informed of activities funded by this program?

Each institution of higher education that receives a grant under this part shall inform the State agency designated under section 1203 of the Higher Education Act, as amended, of its activities under this part.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1022)
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No.: 84.197]

Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards Under the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program for Fiscal Year 1988

Purpose of Program: To encourage resource-sharing projects among the libraries of institutions of higher education and to improve the services provided to them by public and nonprofit private organizations.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: May 16, 1988

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: July 15, 1988

Available Funds: $3,590,000

Estimated Average Size of Awards: Networking Equipment Grant—$30,000, Joint-Use Grant—$125,000, Services to Institutions Grant—$25,000, Research and Demonstration Grant—$100,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: Networking Equipment Grant—67, Joint-Use Grant—5, Services to Institutions Grant—10, Research and Demonstration Grant—7.

Project Period: 12–36 months. The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Application: This notice is a complete application package containing all the necessary information, application forms, and instructions needed to apply for a grant under this program.

Application Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Part 74 (Administration of Grants), Part 75 (Direct Grant Programs), Part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Departmental Grant Programs), Part 78 (Education Appeal Board) and Part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities); (b) The regulations governing the College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program as proposed to be codified in 34 CFR Part 79.

Applications are being accepted based on the notice of proposed rulemaking which is published in this issue of the Federal Register. If any substantive changes are made in the final regulations for this program, applicants will be given the opportunity to revise or resubmit their applications.


The objective of Executive Order 12372 is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and to strengthen federalism by relying on State and local processes for State and local government coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance. Applicants must contact the appropriate State Single Point of Contact to find out about, and to comply with, the State’s process under Executive Order 12372. Applicants proposing to perform activities in more than one State should contact, immediately upon receipt of this notice, the Single Point of Contact for each State and follow the procedure established in those States under the Executive Order. If you want to know the name and address of any State Single Point of Contact, see the list published in the Federal Register on November 16, 1987, pages 44338–44340.

In States that have not established a process or chosen a program for review, State, area-wide, regional, and local entities may submit comments directly to the Department.

Any State Process Recommendation and other comments submitted by a State Single Point of Contact and any comments from State, area-wide, regional, and local entities must be made or hand-delivered by the date indicated in this notice to the following address: The Secretary, E.O. 12372—CFDA #84.187, U.S. Department of Education, M.S. 6355, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202.

In those States that require review for this program, applications are to be submitted simultaneously to the State Review Process and the U.S. Department of Education.

Proof of mailing will be determined on the same basis as applications.

Instructions for Transmittal of Applications: (a) If an applicant wants to apply for a grant, the applicant shall:

(1) Mail the original and three copies of the application on or before the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: [CFDA No.: 84.197], Washington, DC 20202 or

(2) Hand deliver the original and three copies of the application by 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on the deadline date to: U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: [CFDA No.: 84.197], Room 3023, Regional Office Building Number 3, Seventh and D Streets, SW., Washington, DC 20202

Note to Applicants: Although 34 CFR 75.109(a) requires only an original and two copies, an additional copy is requested for this program.

(b) An applicant must show one of the following as proof of mailing:

(1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.

(2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.

(3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

(4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary.

Notes: (1) The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, an applicant should check with its local post office. (2) An applicant wishing to know that its application has been received by the Department must include with the application a stamped, self-addressed post card containing the CFDA number and title of this program. (3) The applicant must indicate on the envelope the CFDA number—and letter, if any—of the competition under which the application is being submitted.

Application Instructions and Forms: These forms and instructions are found in the appendix to this notice. No grants may be awarded unless a completed application form has been received.

For Further Information Contact:
Frank A. Stevens or Louise V. Sutherland, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Library Programs, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Room 402M, Washington, DC 20208–1430. Telephone Number: (202) 357–6315.

Assessment of Educational Impact: The Secretary requests comments on whether any information collection in this document would require transmission of information that is being gathered by or is available from any other agency or authority of the United States.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.
Chester E. Finn, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary and Counselor to the Secretary.

Appendix

Form Approved

OMB No. 1850–0622

Expiration Date 1/1991
Application Instructions—Fiscal Year 1988 College Library Technology and Cooperation Grants Program

General

The application is divided into 3 parts. Applications to be submitted should follow this organization.

The Sections are as follows:

PART I: Federal Assistance Face Sheet (Form SF 424)

PART II: Budget Data

PART III: Program Narrative—General and Special

No grants may be awarded unless a completed application form has been received (20 U.S.C. 1021, 1041; 34 CFR 779).

Submit the original application and three copies to:

U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: 84.197, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202

Note: In addition to the instructions listed below, joint applicants should refer to sections 75.127 through 75.129 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) which explains group applications.

Instructions for Part I—Federal Assistance Face Sheet (SF 424)

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required face sheet for applications.

The applicant completes only items 1-23. Items 24-33 are completed by Federal agencies.

Items 1, 6, 7, 11, 14, 17 and 19 are reprinted.

Items which are not applicable have been marked “N/A.”

Joint applications must include a separate face sheet (SF 424) for each cooperating institution and must designate a primary applicant as fiscal agent. (See EDGAR 75.127-129)

Below is a list of instructions to assist you in completing the form.

Item 4. Indicate the legal name of applicant, the name of the primary organization unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete the address of applicant, and the name and telephone number of the person who can provide further information about this request.

Item 5. Employer identification number assigned by Internal Revenue Service (IRS). If the applicant organization has been assigned an ED entity number consisting of the IRS employer identification number prefixed by “1” and suffixed by a two-digit number, enter the full ED entity number in item 5.

Item 12. For joint applications, the total amount of funding requested for the project should be given in Item 12 of the primary applicant; this item should be blank on the SF 424’s of the other institutions. Section IV “Remarks” of the SF 424’s should state that a joint application is being submitted and list the institutions.

Item 16. Indicate the proposed length of the project. This may be one, two or three years.

Item 22. The applicant certifies that they have complied with all state regulations and procedures required under E.O. 12372.

Item 23. Give the name and title of the person authorized by the applicant to sign applications for Federal assistance.

Designation of Different Payee: If the payee will be other than the applicant, enter the following information in Section IV—Remarks, of the SF 424: the payee’s name, complete address, and Employer Identification number or ED entity number. If an individual’s name and/or title is desired on the payment instrument, the name and/or title of the designated individual must be specified.
**FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

1. **TYPE OF SUBMISSION**
   - □ NOTICE OF INTENT (OPTIONAL)
   - □ PREAPPLICATION
   - □ APPLICATION

2. **APPLICANT'S APPLICATION IDENTIFIER**
   - a. NUMBER
   - b. DATE
   - c. STATE
   - d. NUMBER

3. **STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER**
   - a. NUMBER
   - b. DATE
   - c. STATE
   - d. NUMBER

4. **LEGAL APPLICANT/RECIPIENT**
   - a. Applicant Name
   - b. Organization Unit
   - c. Street/PO.BOX
   - d. City
   - e. State
   - f. Contact Person (Name)
   - g. Telephone No.

5. **EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN)**
   - a. NUMBER

6. **PROGRAM (From CPDA)**
   - a. NUMBER

7. **TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT**

8. **AREA OF PROJECT IMPACT** (Names of states, counties, cities, etc.)

9. **PROPOSED FUNDING**
   - a. Federal:
   - b. Applicant:
   - c. State:
   - d. Local:
   - e. Other:
   - Total:

10. **ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS BENEFITING**

11. **TYPE OF ASSISTANCE**
   - a. Direct
   - b. Indirect
   - c. Other

12. **FEDERAL AGENCY TO RECEIVE REQUEST**
   - a. E.D., Department of Education

13. **ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT (IF APPLICABLE)**
   - a. Application Control Center

14. **ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT (IF KNOWN)**
   - a. Name
   - b. Address
   - c. City
   - d. State
   - e. ZIP Code

15. **DATE RECEIVED**
   - a. Year
   - b. Month

16. **FEDERAL AGENCY IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**
   - a. FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
   - b. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
   - c. STATE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
   - d. LOCAL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

17. **REMARKS ADDED**
   - Yes □ No □

18. **CERTIFYING RESPONSIVE REPRESENTATIVE**
   - a. Type
   - b. Signature

19. **ACTION TAKEN**
   - a. AWARDED
   - b. ACCEPTED
   - c. RETURNED FOR AMENDMENT
   - d. RETURNED FOR E.O. 12372 SUBMISSION
   - e. WITHDRAWN

20. **FEDERAL APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**

21. **FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**

22. **APPLICATION DATE**
   - a. Year
   - b. Month

23. **APPLICATION RECEIVED**
   - a. Date

24. **ACTION DATE**
   - a. Date

25. **CONTACT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
   - a. Name
   - b. Telephone number

26. **STARTING DATE**
   - a. Date

27. **ENDING DATE**
   - a. Date

28. **REMARKS ADDED**

29. **FUNDING**
   - a. Federal:
   - b. Applicant:
   - c. State:
   - d. Local:
   - e. Other:
   - Total:

30. **STARTING DATE**
   - a. Date

31. **ENDING DATE**
   - a. Date

32. **REMARKS ADDED**
   - Yes □ No □

---

**SECTION VIII—FEDERAL GRANT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**

**SECTION IX—ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**SECTION X—REMARKS ADDED**

---

**STANDARD FORM 424 PAGE 1 (Rev 4-84)**

**Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102**

---

NSN 7540-01-006-8162

PREVIOUS EDITION IS NOT USBABLE

BILLING CODE 4000-01-C

---

**OMB Approval No. 0734-0006**

---

424-103
Sections A, B, C, and D are to be completed by the applicant. Please check the appropriate box at the top of the budget form indicating the type of grant requested.

Section A—Detailed Budget by Categories

Line 1. Indicate salary and wages to be paid to personnel employed in the project only.

Fees and expenses for consultants are to be included in line 6.

Line 2. Include contributions for Social Security, employees insurance, pension plans, etc., should not go on this line, nor should local transportation (i.e., where no out-of-town trip is involved).

Line 3. Indicate travel of employees only. Travel of consultants, resource persons, evaluators, etc., should not go on this line, nor should local transportation (i.e., where no out-of-town trip is involved).

Line 4. Indicate the cost of non-expendable personal property. Such property means tangible personal property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of $500 or more per unit.

A grantee may use its own definition of non-expendable personal property provided that such definition would at least include all personal property as defined above.

Line 5. Indicate cost of consumable supplies and materials to be used in the project. These should be items which cost less than $500 per unit with a useful life of less than two years.

Line 6. Show the amount to be used for (1) procurement contracts (except those which belong on other lines such as supplies or equipment listed above); and (2) subgrants or payments for consultants and secondary recipient organizations such as affiliates, cooperating institutions, delegate agencies, etc.

Line 7. Indicate all direct costs not clearly covered by lines 1–6 above.

Line 8. Show totals for lines 1 through 7.

Line 9. Indicate the amount of indirect cost. Indirect costs must be the institution’s federally negotiated rate. Line 10. Total lines 8 and 9.

Section B—Estimate of Expenditures

Lines 1, 2, and 3. If project is more than one year, indicate expenditure of funds for each year the project is planned.

Section C—Budget Narrative

Attach a budget narrative which explains amounts for individual direct costs categories including the indirect cost rate and base. This narrative should not exceed five double-spaced pages.

Include in the narrative details about the following items:

Section A. Salaries and Wages from Line 1:

Show the total commitment of time and the salary to be charged to the project for each key member of the project staff.

Equipment and Supplies from Lines 4 and 5:

List items of equipment and supplies in the following format: Item, Number and Units, Cost per Unit, Total cost.

Contractual Services from Line 6:

Indicate the names of the agency or organization that will receive each proposed contract, if available. If not, clearly indicate what factors the number on line 6 is based upon.

Other from Line 7:

Provide itemized breakdown of all items figured into the number on line 7.

Indirect costs from Line 9:

Attach a copy of the approved negotiated rate agreement.

Section D—Maintenance of Effort

Sign and date the assurance of maintenance of effort as required under 779.9 of the program regulations.

Instructions for Part III—Program Narrative

The narrative should address how the project will meet the objectives of the program as stated in the regulations. The narrative portion of the application should not exceed 20 double-spaced typewritten pages.

It should be typed on one side only of standard 8½” × 11” paper, consecutively paginated, and stapled at the upper left corner. The application should not be bound or enclosed in a folder. The type of grant requested, either Networking Equipment Grant, Joint-Use Grant, Services to Institutions Grant or Research and Demonstration Grant, should be clearly stated on the first page of the program narrative.

The program narrative must include a response to the General Selection Criteria in Section 779.21(a) and the Special Program Criteria in Section 779.21(b) of the program regulations. Please be careful to respond to the Special Program Criteria in § 779.21(b) which relate directly to the type of grant you are seeking. Applicants may provide other relevant information, including pertinent exhibits, but each application must be a self-contained document.

It is advisable to respond to each of the criterion in the order presented.

In responding to the criteria under 779.21(a)(1)(A) Budget and Cost

Effectiveness, applicants are encouraged to submit an itemized breakdown and justification of the proposed budget.

It is suggested that single-page abstract be prepared which summarizes the content of the proposed project. The abstract should be used as a cover page to the program narrative and provide the following information: (a) Name and address of applicant; (b) title of project; (c) project director’s name, title, address, and telephone number; (d) funding level being requested; (e) beginning and ending date of the project period; and (f) a single-spaced statement of 150 words or less summarizing the proposed project.

Narratives for joint applicants (a single application submitted by combinations of institutions should detail the activities that each member of the group plans to perform (see § 75.127 through § 75.129 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, which explains group applications).
PART II - BUDGET INFORMATION
FY 88

CHECK TYPE OF GRANT REQUESTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Networking Equipment</th>
<th>C. Services to Institutions Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Joint-Use Grant</td>
<td>D. Research and Demonstration Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section A - Detailed Budget by Categories

1. Salary and Wages $  
2. Fringe Benefits  
3. Travel  
4. Equipment  
5. Supplies  
6. Contractual Services  
7. Other (itemize)  
8. Total Direct Costs (lines 1 to 7 totaled)  
9. Total Indirect Costs  
10. Total Project Costs (lines 8 - 9)

Section B - Estimate of Expenditures

1. Year One $  
2. Year Two  
3. Year Three  

Section C - BUDGET NARRATIVE - see Budget Information.

Section D - Maintenance of Effort

An assurance of maintenance of effort is required under section 779.9 of the program regulations. Please certify that:

If selected as a grantee, the applicant will expend, for the same purpose as the grant, an amount not less than one-third the grant during the period for which the grant is sought; and make that expenditure from funds other than funds received under Title II of the Higher Education Act.

Signed ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Title ____________________________
# STATUS OF MAJOR LIBRARY-RELATED LEGISLATION ACTIVE THIS MONTH

As of April 15, 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House-passed budget gives highest priority to Function 500, education (including libraries) &amp; human services programs with increase of $2.4 billion, compared with Senate's $1.5 billion. Senate-passed budget gives highest priority to space exploration with $2 billion increase. Although education assumptions are similar, experience has shown that unless the F 500 total is adequate, the assumed increases in education &amp; libraries will not be realized. Both budgets assume enough postal revenue forgone funding to keep preferred rates at new April 3 levels.</td>
<td>S.Con.Res.113 passed 69-26 April 14</td>
<td>H.Con.Res.268 passed 319-102 March 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ACTION NEEDED: The Senate's Function 500 total, nearly $1 billion below the House, needs to be raised to the House level in House-Senate conference, which could begin this week. |

| LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1989 | Approp. Subcom. hearings underway | Approp. Subcom. hearings underway |
| Administration for first time recognizes modest federal role in support of libraries, but would replace $136 million for LSCA & HEA II with new $76 million legislative proposal. Approp. Subcoms. will have to act on basis of current law, for which no funds at all are requested. | Approp. Subcom. bill to be out of committee by 5/15 |

| POSTAL REVENUE FORGONE | Approp. Subcom. hearings underway | Approp. Subcom. hearings underway |
| Administration would eliminate all postal revenue forgone approp. except free mail for blind. 4th class library rates just jumped 19% April 3. Without revenue forgone funding, a similar increase would take effect October 1. USPS' revised estimate of amount needed to keep preferred rates at 4/3 levels - $436.4 million. |

| GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE | Approp. Subcom. hrgs. concluded | Approp. Subcom. hrgs. concluded, bill to floor by mid-May |
| GPO SuDocs budget request is $26,800,000. ALA strongly supports inclusion of electronic formats in Depository Library Program within this budget. GPO's plan for doing so is not yet public, but a Census Bureau compact disc will soon be sent to depository libraries. |

| LIBRARY OF CONGRESS | Approp. Subcom. hrgs. concluded | Approp. Subcom. hrgs. concluded, bill to floor by mid-May |
| Over last 5 years, LC's budget has grown only 6.5%. LC's budget request of $274,198,000 would enable a doubling of preservation microfilming and make up some, not all, lost ground. |

| NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR HUMANITIES | Approp. Subcom. hearings underway | Approp. Subcom. hrgs. concluded |
| Admin. requests level funding of $140,535,000, but Humanities Projects in Libraries would be cut 28% to $2,100,000. Preservation would be cut marginally to $4,495,000, but should go up to $6,500,000, so serious is the problem. |
As of April 15, 1988, cont.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES, NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS & RECORDS COMMISSION
Admin. request for NARA is $117,862,000, up slightly. NHPRC grants, $4 million in FY 88, would again be eliminated. HR 3933 would reauthorize NHPRC at $5 million for FY 89, rising to $10 million in FY 93.

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION & IMPROVEMENT ACT
Major reauthorization, HR 5, in final stages of congressional approval. Would retain school library resources as priority area in Chapter 2 school block grant.

WHC ON LIBRARY & INFORMATION SERVICES
Legis. for a 2nd WHCLIS is awaiting action by conferees on H.J.Res. 90, who are Reps. Hawkins, Williams, Ford of MI, Owens of NY, Jeffords, and Coleman of MO; and Sens. Pell, Kennedy, Matsunaga, Dodd, Mikulski, Stafford, Hatch, Quayle, and Thurmond.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
Commerce Secy. Verity opposes OMB plan to contract out NTIS, according to news repts. Bipartisan opposition to contracting out NTIS was expressed at Feb. 24 hrg. by Hse. Science, Research, Tech. Subcom. Hse-Sen. prohibitions on further contr. out of NTIS are tied to final action on HR 3 trade bill, still in conference.

NATL. LIB. OF MEDICINE, MEDICAL LIB. ASST. ACT
Admin. request would increase NLM & MLAA 4% to $70,626,000. S. 2222 would reauthorize MLAA at $14 million for FY 89, such sums for FY 90, 91.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
Admin. request would increase NAL 11.5% to $13,599,000. Pending bills would consolidate and expand statutory authority for NAL.

TAXATION - MANUSCRIPT DONATIONS
Pending bills would restore tax deduction for artwork or manuscripts donated by creators to libraries and museums.

TO BE INTRODUCED DURING NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK
Legis. by Rep. Oakar and Sen. DeConcini to designate 1989 as The Year of the Young Reader, as rec. by Libn. of Congr. & Center for Book. Legis. by Rep. Owens of NY, Sen. D'Amato to designate September as National Library Card Sign-Up Month; as recommended by NCLIS.

Senate
Approp. Subcom. hearings underway
S. 1856
Gov. Aff. Com. approved 4/14

House
Approp. Subcom. hearings underway
HR 3933
passed 370-42
March 30
Hse.-Sen. conferees on HR 5 have completed work. Final Hse. & Sen. votes on conf. rept. (H. Rept. 100-567) expected soon.
S.J.Res. 26 passed 12/15/87 by voice vote
H.J.Res. 90 passed 6/9/87 by voice vote
Major trade bill, HR 3, in final stages of Hse-Sen conference
S. 2222 intro. March 29
No House
bill yet
S. 2138 intro. March 4
HR 1435 intro. 3/5/87
S. 1940, 2160 HR 2050, 2239
Legislation will need cosponsors

**Summary of American Library Association Appropriations Recommendations**

**FY 1989 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Services &amp; Construction Act</strong></td>
<td>$125,500,000</td>
<td>$125,037,000</td>
<td>$181,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$132,357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Pub. Lib. Services</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
<td>78,986,000</td>
<td>95,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>83,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, Pub. Lib. Construction</td>
<td>22,500,000</td>
<td>22,595,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>23,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, Interlib. Coop.</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>18,669,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>19,453,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, Indian Libraries</td>
<td>(funded at 2% setaside of appropriations for LSCA I, II, &amp; III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, Foreign Lang. Materials</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI, Library Literacy</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,787,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education Act</strong></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$10,052,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$23,294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II-A, College Lib. Resources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-B, Training, Research</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,042,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-C, Research Libraries</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>5,744,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6,252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-D, Technology</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3,590,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI, Sec. 607 Foreign Periodicals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Consolidation &amp; Improvement Act Chapter 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El/Sec Educ. State Block Grant</td>
<td>529,337,000</td>
<td>508,439,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>575,000,000</td>
<td>575,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Libraries &amp; Info. Science</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>755,000</td>
<td>755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Education Statistics (incl. library surveys)</td>
<td>8,900,000</td>
<td>20,953,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>29,469,000</td>
<td>29,469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl. Library of Medicine (incl. Medical Library Asst. Act)</td>
<td>61,838,000</td>
<td>67,910,000</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>74,435,000</td>
<td>74,435,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Administration will submit $76 million legislative proposal to replace LSCA and HEA II.
2. ALA generally recommends funding at amounts required to restore FY '88 cuts and adding a current services factor of 4.2 percent.
3. For currently unfunded HEA library programs, ALA recommends amounts authorized for FY 1987.
4. Five million dollars is amount authorized for FY '87. Ed. Dept. received over 400 inquiries from potential II-D applicants, even before regs were issued, but estimates awarding only 89 grants from first-time '88 funding of $3.6 mil.
5. Forward funded consolidation includes former ESEA IV-B School Library Resources and Instructional Equipment.

April 1988
H.J.Res. 90, calling for a second White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be held between 9/1/89 and 9/30/91, was passed by voice vote by the House on June 8, 1987, and by the Senate on December 15, 1987. H.J.Res. 90 (H.Rept. 102-121) had a total of 178 cosponsors; S.J.Res. 26 (S.Rept. 100-156) had a total of 72 cosponsors. The measures were introduced on January 21, 1987, by Rep. William Ford (D-MI) in the House and Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-RI) in the Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>H.J.Res. 90 Cosponsors</th>
<th>S.J.Res. 26 Cosponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Bevill (D), Callahan (R)</td>
<td>Shelby (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Young (R)</td>
<td>Murkowski (R), Stevens (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Hammerschmidt (R), Robinson (D), Anthony (D), Alexander (D)</td>
<td>Bumpers (D), Pryor (D) DeConcini (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Sunia (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Fazio (D), Bellums (D), Brown (D), Martinez (D), Coelho (D), Fannetta (D), Dymally (D)</td>
<td>Cranston (D), Wilson (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Gejdenson (D), Rowland (R), Morrison (D), Kennelly (D)</td>
<td>Dodd (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Carper (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Shaw (R), Fascell (D), Smith (D), Grant (D), Chappell (D), Lehman (D), MacKay (D)</td>
<td>Chiles (D), Graham (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Lewis (D), Rowland (D), Gingrich (R), Barnard (D), Swindall (R)</td>
<td>Nunn (D), Fowler (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Porter (R), Fawell (R), Hayes (D), Gray (D), Evans (D), Price (D), Bruce (D), Hastert (R), Durbin (D), Madigan (R)</td>
<td>Simon (D), Dixon (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Jontz (D), Jacobs (D), Visclosky (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Grandy (R), Leach (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Perkins (D), Mazzoli (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Livingston (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Snowe (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Cardin (D), McMillen (D), Mfume (D), Morella (R), Dyson (D), Bentley (R), Byron (D), Hoyer (D)</td>
<td>Sarbanes (D), Mikulski (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Donnelly (D), Moakley (D), Atkins (D), Conte (R), Studds (D), Frank (D)</td>
<td>Kennedy (D), Kerry (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Ford (D), Kildee (D), Levin (D), Traxler (D), Dingell (D), Crockett (D), Conyers (D), Puskar (R)</td>
<td>Riegle (D), Levin (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Oberstar (D), Penny (D), Sabo (D), Weber (R), Stangeland (R), Vento (D), Frenzel (R), Sikorski (D)</td>
<td>Durenberger (R), Boschwitz (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Dowdy (D), Lott (R), Montgomery (D)</td>
<td>Cochran (R), Stennis (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Clay (D), Coleman (R), Taylor (R)</td>
<td>Bond (R), Danforth (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>H.J.Res. 90 Cosponsors</th>
<th>S.J.Res. 26 Cosponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Williams (D)</td>
<td>Melcher (D), Baucus (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Bereuter (R)</td>
<td>Exon (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Bilbray (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Dwyer (D), Roe (D), Florio (D), Howard (D), Torricelli (D), Courter (R), Rinaldo (R), Rodino (D), Hughes (D), Gallo (R), Roukema (R)</td>
<td>Lautenberg (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Richardson (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Ackerman (D), Biaggi (D), Downey (D), Fish (R), Horton (R), Kemp (R), Manton (D), Mrazek (D), Owens (D), Rangel (D), Solarz (D), Towns (D), Weiss (D), Wortley (R), Stratton (D), Garcia (D), LaFalce (D), Scheuer (D), DioGuardi (R), Schumer (D), Hochbrueckner (D), Martin (R), Slaughter (D), Green (R), McHugh (D)</td>
<td>D'Amato (R), Moynihan (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanford (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Traficant (D), Oakar (D), Sawyer (D)</td>
<td>Metzenbaum (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Weldon (R), Kostmayer (D), Kolter (D), Yatron (D), Ridge (R), Gekas (R), Foglietta (D), Goodling (R), Clinger (R), Shuster (R), Borski (D)</td>
<td>Heinz (R), Specter (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Puster (D)</td>
<td>FELL (D), Chafee (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>St Germain (D), Schneider (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Derrick (D), Spence (R), Ravenal (R), Spratt (D), Tallon (D), Patterson (D)</td>
<td>Hollings (D), Thurmond (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Boner (D)</td>
<td>Pressler (R), Daschle (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Wilson (D), Leland (D), de la Garza (D), Frost (D), Hall (D), Gonzalez (D)</td>
<td>Pressler (R), Daschle (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Nielson (R), Owens (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>de Lugo (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Boucher (D), Wolf (R), Pickett (D)</td>
<td>Trible (R), Warner (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Swift (D)</td>
<td>Adams (D), Evans (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Mollohan (D), Rahall (D), Staggers (D), Wise (D)</td>
<td>Rockefeller (D), Byrd (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Kastenmeier (D), Roth (R), Gunderson (R), Petri (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT THE STATES WOULD LOSE
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES (LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT TITLE I)

Purpose: Grants to the states for the extension and improvement of public library services to geographic areas or groups of persons in the state for whom current services are inadequate. When appropriations exceed $60 million, a portion of the additional funds is earmarked for urban libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation FY 1988</th>
<th>$78,968,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Request FY 1989</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA RECOMMENDATION FY 1989</td>
<td>83,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: In FY '89, for the seventh year in a row, the Administration proposes zero LSCA funding. Although federal funding accounts for only four percent of public library support, these funds are critical because they enable libraries to serve disadvantaged citizens who otherwise would be denied access to library services. Because LSCA is not yet advance funded, the impact of zero-funding would be immediate. If LSCA is zero-funded, the states would lose the following sums based on the FY '88 appropriation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>What States Would Lose Based on $78,986,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>$1,308,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>343,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1,079,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>850,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>7,464,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1,091,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1,073,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>371,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>371,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>3,331,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1,846,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>489,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>476,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>3,379,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1,715,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>993,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>874,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1,227,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>1,436,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>521,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1,410,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1,803,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2,704,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1,355,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>920,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1,587,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$ 427,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>642,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>458,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>475,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>2,283,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>599,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>5,090,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1,925,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>388,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>3,161,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1,111,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>940,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>3,469,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>1,101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>466,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1,119,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>395,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1,513,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4,716,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>653,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>347,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1,771,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1,414,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>733,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>1,516,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>340,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of this amount, 2% is a setaside for LSCA IV Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives.

WHAT THE STATES WOULD LOSE
PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION (LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT TITLE II)

Purpose: Grants to states for building new library structures, purchase of existing historic buildings for conversion to public libraries, renovation of libraries and initial equipment except books. Includes remodeling to meet handicapped accessibility requirements, to conserve energy and to accommodate new technology. Federal share of each project may not exceed one half.

Appropriation FY 1988 $22,595,000
Budget Request FY 1989 -0-
ALA RECOMMENDATION FY 1989 23,544,000

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: The Administration has recommended elimination of LSCA title II for the seventh year in a row. During 1981-85, states reported a need for more than 2900 public library building projects costing in excess of $2.3 billion; yet, only 757 building projects costing $629 million were completed, according to data reported annually to Library Journal. Federal funds are desperately needed to help provide adequate library facilities. If LSCA II is zero-funded, the states would lose the following amounts based on the FY '88 appropriation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>What States Would Lose Based on $22,595,000*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>$379,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>136,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>321,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>263,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,931,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>324,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>320,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>143,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>143,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>889,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>515,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>173,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>169,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>901,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>482,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>300,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>270,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>359,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>411,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>180,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>405,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>504,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>731,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>391,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>281,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>449,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$157,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>211,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>165,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>169,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>625,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>200,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1,333,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>535,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>147,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>846,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>329,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>286,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>924,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>327,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>167,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>331,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>149,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>431,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1,238,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>214,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>137,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>496,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>406,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>234,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>431,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>135,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of this amount, 2% is a setaside for LSCA IV Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives.

WHAT THE STATES WOULD LOSE
INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION (LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT TITLE III)

Purpose: Grants to states for planning, establishing and operating cooperative networks of libraries at local, regional or interstate levels. These cooperative networks provide for "the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic and special libraries and information centers for improved supplementary services for the special clientele served by each type of library or center."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation FY 1988</th>
<th>$18,669,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Request FY 1989</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA RECOMMENDATION FY 1989</td>
<td>19,453,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: Interlibrary cooperation of all kinds has been stimulated by LSCA III. Zeroing-out title III, as the Administration recommends for the seventh year in a row, will severely limit the effectiveness of the cooperative library networks operating in all 50 states. These networks significantly improve service to the public by making it possible for each library to share its resources with other libraries. Books and other materials are often shared by sending them through the U.S. Postal Service, but the Administration's budget would also zero-out revenue forgone funding for the preferred postal rates used by libraries. If LSCA III is zero-funded, the states would lose the following amounts based on the FY '88 appropriation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>What States Would Lose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>$ 308,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>74,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>252,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>197,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,797,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>255,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>251,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>81,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>81,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>797,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>438,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>110,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>106,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>809,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>406,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>232,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>203,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>288,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>339,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>117,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>332,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>428,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>646,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>319,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>214,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>375,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$ 95,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>147,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>102,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>106,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>544,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>136,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1,223,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>457,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>85,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>756,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>260,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>219,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>831,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>258,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>104,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>262,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>87,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>347,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1,132,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>149,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>75,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>420,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>333,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>169,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>358,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>74,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of this amount, 2% is a setaside for LSCA IV Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives.

Administration's Postal Budget. The Administration proposes, for the fourth time, that Congress appropriate no funds at all for preferred 2nd-, 3rd-, and 4th-class rates. The $19 million requested would provide only for free mail for the blind and overseas voters. In legislation to be transmitted later, the Administration "proposes to eliminate virtually all taxpayer subsidies while shifting the cost of reduced rates for most religious and charitable mailings to commercial mailers." Such a cross-subsidization proposal is currently illegal; it has had no congressional support.

Why Postal Subsidies? Some postal subsidies date back to the earliest days of the Republic. The purpose now, as it was then, is to promote the dissemination of information throughout the nation through free and reduced rate postage for certain preferred classes of mail. The act says the statutory criteria for setting postal rates and fees shall include special recognition of the "educational, cultural, scientific, and informational value to the recipient of mail matter" (39 USC 3622(b)(8)).

Who Benefits? Those who benefit from free and reduced rate postage include the blind and visually handicapped, local newspapers, libraries, schools and colleges, and religious, charitable and other nonprofit organizations who qualify for free matter for the blind, and 2nd-, 3rd-, and 4th-class preferred rates. Also, in many cases, those who mail items to such entities are able to use preferred rates, thus reducing postal costs passed to eligible institutions.

Kinds of Activities Supported. (1) Free mailing to or from blind or visually handicapped persons of braille or recorded books and other eligible materials and equipment. (2) Mailings at reduced rates of small circulation or in-county publications such as local and rural newspapers; publications for use in school classrooms or in religious instruction classes; publications of religious, educational, charitable, and other nonprofit organizations; bulk rate mailings of similar nonprofit organizations for purposes such as fund-raising letters; books, periodicals, audiovisual materials, loaned or exchanged between schools, colleges, or libraries, and shipments of such items to eligible entities by publishers or distributors.

Funding History.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administration Budget</th>
<th>Postal Service Estimate*</th>
<th>Congressional Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 1985</td>
<td>$452,000,000</td>
<td>$801,000,000</td>
<td>$801,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1986</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>981,000,000</td>
<td>748,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1986 after 4.3% sequester as of March 1, 1986</td>
<td>650,000,000</td>
<td>715,836,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1987</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>650,000,000</td>
<td>650,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1988</td>
<td>71,795,000**</td>
<td>702,400,000</td>
<td>517,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1989</td>
<td>19,023,000***</td>
<td>527,482,000</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* By law, USPS must estimate the amount needed to return preferred rates to Step 16, the final step in the phased rate schedule leading to full attributable costs.
** Transition funding, free mail for the blind and overseas voters only.
*** Free mail for the blind and overseas voters only.
Impact of the Administration's Budget. If the revenue the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) forgoes because some rates are set lower than full commercial rates is not provided by congressional appropriations, or is provided at less than the full amount needed, rates can be raised immediately to make up the difference. The effect of eliminating all postal revenue forgone funding would be drastic.

Such increases, if necessary on October 1, would be a double whammy this year, because they would be applied on top of a general postal increase affecting all rates which took effect April 3. Librarians planned for postal expenses based on the increases USPS requested last year, but the rates eventually approved by the USPS Board of Governors were considerably higher in many instances. The 4th-class library rate was to jump 13 percent; instead it went up 19 percent. A two-pound, 4th-class library rate book or film went from $.73 to .87. Lack of revenue forgone funding would mean a similar or higher library rate increase again on October 1.

Preferred rate mailers began paying their full direct-mailing costs in 1986 with the end of a 16-year phase-out schedule. For preferred rates' share of indirect or USPS overhead costs, the Act calls for a permanent subsidy. Due to an appropriations shortfall, preferred rates were raised above Step 16 in spring of 1986, remained higher until the general rate increase took effect April 3, 1988. As of that date, preferred rates are once again at Step 16 (albeit a new and higher Step 16).

Two major increases in a six-month period would devastate school, college and library services such as film-sharing circuits, interlibrary loan, and books-by-mail to rural and isolated readers. New York Public Library has estimated that elimination of revenue forgone funding would add over $1 million in additional postage costs. For libraries, every additional $1 for postage is $1 less for books.

A congressionally mandated study, "Report to the Congress: Preferred Rate Study," conducted by the Postal Rate Commission in 1986, documented the dependence of schools, colleges and libraries on these rates. Educational organizations accounted for 32.6 percent of 3rd-class, nonprofit mail volume. Educational publications were 22.4 percent of the volume of preferred 2nd-class mail. Of the subsidy for the 4th-class library rate for books and audiovisual materials, schools and colleges accounted for 54 percent (23 percent as senders and 26 percent as recipients of packages from publishers and distributors where the postal cost is paid by the recipient as part of a purchase). Libraries represented 22 percent of library rate subsidy (including four percent as recipients of publisher/distributor mailings).
HIGHER EDUCATION ACT TITLE II-A - COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES
(PL 89-329 as amended by PL 89-752, PL 90-575, PL 92-318, PL 94-484,

Purpose: To assist the neediest academic libraries in the maintenance and improvement of their library collections and to enable them to share resources and participate in library networks.

Authorization: PL 99-498, signed into law October 17, 1986, amends and extends the Higher Education Act for five years through FY 1991. Program authorizations are specified for FY 1987, with "such sums as may be necessary" for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Program: Part A, College Library Resources provides Resource Development grants of between $2,000 and $10,000 to institutions of higher education, their branches in other communities, to combinations of institutions, and to other public and private nonprofit library institutions which provide library and information services to institutions of higher education on a formal, cooperative basis. Grants for library resources are now targeted to the neediest academic libraries based on criteria developed by ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries. These criteria provide funding to those libraries which rank below the norm when compared to like institutions for both "materials expenditures per full time equivalent student" and "volumes held per full time equivalent student". The grants may be used for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audio-visual materials and other related library materials, for any necessary binding, and for the establishment and maintenance of networks for sharing library resources with other institutions of higher education.

Insufficient appropriations will result in fewer grants, not smaller grants. An evaluation will be conducted after two years to determine the effectiveness of the program. Recipient institutions must maintain library materials expenditures at a level not less than the average of the two preceding fiscal years (except in very unusual circumstances). This maintenance-of-effort requirement may be figured on either an aggregate or a per student basis.

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: The Administration has recommended elimination of HEA II-A for the seventh year in a row. College library resource grants have been unfunded since 1984 pending development of criteria to target grants to the neediest colleges. These need criteria have now been developed and were included in PL 99-498, the HEA reauthorization legislation passed in October 1986.

Funding of II-A at $2 million in FY '89 would provide grants averaging $5,000 to about 400 of the nation's neediest academic libraries. These relatively small grants are critical to the needy libraries struggling to keep pace with rapid inflation in the cost of books and journals and continuing growth in the output of these materials. Between FY '75 and FY '86, the average cost of acquiring college and university library materials increased by 138 percent. The average U.S. journal price in 1987 was $71.41, up ten percent from the previous year, and journals are particularly important to students and researchers because they contain the latest information. Many libraries now find it impossible to add a new journal without canceling something else.

Purpose: Provides grants for 1) the training of persons, especially minorities, in librarianship; and, 2) research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries.

Authorization: PL 99-498, signed into law October 17, 1986, amends and extends the Higher Education Act for five years through FY 1991. Program authorizations are specified for FY 1987, with "such sums as may be necessary" for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Authorization such sums such sums $ 5,000,000 $35,000,000
Budget Recommendation -0- -0- -0- -0-
Appropriations pending $ 718,000 1,000,000 1,000,000*
Training pending 478,667 635,000 635,000*
R and D pending 239,333 365,000 365,000*

* $957,000, $608,000 and $349,000 respectively, after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

Description of Program: Authorizing legislation requires that funding be split two-thirds for training and one-third for research.

Training: Section 222 provides grants upon application to institutions of higher education and library organizations or agencies for training persons in librarianship. Grants may be used: (1) to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study (including institutes); (2) to establish and maintain fellowships or traineeships with stipends; and (3) to establish, develop or expand programs of library and information science, including new techniques of information transfer and communication technology. Not less than 50 percent of the grants shall be for fellowships or traineeships.

Research and Demonstrations: Section 223 provides research and demonstration grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations for the improvement of libraries, for training in librarianship, and for the dissemination of information derived from the grant projects.

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination:

Training: The "1988-89 Occupational Outlook Handbook" cites two main reasons for the growing shortage of trained librarians: (1) a larger-than-average proportion of librarians will reach retirement age through the year 2000; and (2) master's degree graduates in library science have dropped to less than half the level of the mid-'70s. In 1979, there were 8,091 graduates, in 1985, 3,484. Shortages of librarians are expected to continue through the end of the century in areas of strong demand:

- Children's and Young Adult Services. Acute shortages have been reported in Washington, Massachusetts, Michigan, California, New York, New Jersey, Arkansas, Connecticut, and Ohio.

(over)
School Librarianship. Massachusetts will need more than 200 school library media specialists by 1990, but in-state accredited programs produced only 30 in 1987.

Cataloging. In 1985, 56 percent of open cataloging positions were vacant for a mean of seven months or more.

Minority Studies and Services. The number of minority librarians with master's degrees declined 40 percent between 1979 and 1984, paralleling the decline in HEA II-B funding. The California Library Association has targeted, as its highest priority, recruitment of blacks and Hispanics because of disparities between their representation in libraries and in the general population.

Research and Demonstrations. The only coordinated program of research in library and information science would be eliminated. Funded projects have made a particular impact in two areas where further R&D remains critical: (1) innovative methods of extending service to underserved groups who are most in need of libraries' contributions through self-help to excellence in education; and (2) effective and efficient adaptation of the new and rapidly changing information and communications technologies to library operations.

Higher Education Act, Title II-C - Strengthening Research Library Resources


Purpose: Provides grants to major research libraries to maintain and strengthen their collections and to make their holdings available to other libraries whose users have need for research materials.

Authorization: PL 99-498, signed into law October 17, 1986, amends and extends the Higher Education Act for five years through FY 1991. Program authorizations are specified for FY 1987, with "such sums as may be necessary" for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>such</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>$5,744,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $5,742,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

Description of Program: HEA II-C is a program of grants to major research libraries. A major research library is defined as "a public or private nonprofit institution, including the library resources of an institution of higher education, an independent research library, or a state or other public library, having library collections which are available to qualified users and which (1) make a significant contribution to higher education and research; (2) are broadly based and are recognized as having national or international significance for scholarly research; (3) are of a unique nature and contain material not widely available; and (4) are in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with that institution."

Institutions receiving a title II-C grant are not eligible for a II-A Resource Development Grant in the same year.

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: Elimination of HEA II-C, recommended by the Administration for the seventh year in a row, would dramatically affect program development in three key areas in which costs cannot be totally absorbed by individual institutions:

- Projects which bring our nation's significant research collection under better bibliographic control. Computerized catalogs and electronic tracking of library holdings have improved access for scholars and contained cataloging expenses for libraries. However, recent projections indicate that there are six to seven million unique bibliographic records for books of academic significance that do not yet appear in nationally available online catalogs. Thus, scholars unable to travel to research library collections are limited in their access to this large body of knowledge. Examples of recent projects funded in this area include:

  Univ. of Maryland, Univ. of Delaware, Texas A&M Univ., and the New York State Library: joint award to provide machine-readable full cataloging records for the Goldsmiths'-Kress Library of Economic Literature, the preeminent collection of materials on economic history. Microfilm sets of this collection are located at research libraries throughout the country, but access has been restricted by nonstandard cataloging.

(over)
Northwestern University: award to convert 30,000 records of its Africana collection to machine-readable form. Most of these represent items not found elsewhere in the U.S.

Southern Illinois University: award to catalog onto OCLC seven collections containing First Amendment Freedom material dating from the 17th century to the present.

- Projects which seek to preserve our cultural heritage. The use of acidic paper in books produced since 1850 has created a disaster on research library shelves. Studies indicate that as much as one-fourth of the collections of the nation's major libraries are in such poor condition that further use by circulation or photocopying may result in loss of text. Without treatment, all but about ten percent of the remainder of book collections are expected to reach the same brittle state. Funding is desperately needed to assist research libraries in preserving their deteriorating materials and coordinating their preservation efforts. Recent HEA II-C funding has allowed the Center for Research Libraries to microfilm ethnic newspaper files in its collection that are not already preserved on film. Included are titles in Arabic, Chinese, Danish, French, German, Japanese, Norwegian, Persian, Spanish, Swedish, and Yiddish. The library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin is using another HEA II-C grant to preserve a collection of pamphlets on U.S. and Canadian social and cultural history, collected from 1854 to 1966.

- Projects to strengthen acquisitions programs. Costs of acquiring research materials rose dramatically in the late 1970s and have continued to rise with steady but more moderate increases in the 1980s. Currently, the devaluation of the dollar is significantly raising the cost of foreign material, purchase of which already may consume half of an academic library's acquisitions budget. Through resource sharing, grants to one library can benefit libraries all over the country. The University of Vermont, Burlington, has received a II-C grant to identify, acquire, and catalog Canadian documents on acid rain. A selection of the documents will be forwarded to the National Agricultural Library, which will distribute them on CD-ROM disks to 42 land grant libraries as a full-text database on acid rain.

Research materials are a national resource, and the benefits of preserving them and making them more widely accessible are felt nationwide. Thus, federal funding is crucial to provide impetus for such programs.
Purpose: To provide funds for technological equipment for sharing of library resources, consortia and joint use library projects, networking, and other special purposes.

Authorization: PL 99-498, signed into law October 17, 1986, amends and extends the Higher Education Act for five years through FY 1991. Program authorizations are specified for FY 1987, with "such sums as may be necessary" for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1989</th>
<th>FY 1988</th>
<th>FY 1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,590,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Program: This is a new program of competitive grants of at least $15,000 for up to three years with a one-third matching requirement for technological equipment and other special purposes to:

1. institutions of higher education which demonstrate a need for special assistance for the planning, development, acquisition, installation, maintenance, or replacement of technological equipment (including computer hardware and software) necessary to participate in networks for sharing of library resources;

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

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

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

Impact of Proposed Program Elimination: The goal of nationwide networks of information resources in support of scholarship and research and development is strengthened with each library that is able to participate. HEA II-D, which helps make that participation possible, will fund about 89 grants with initial FY 1988 appropriations, but over 400 potential applicants had inquired of the Department of Education about II-D, even before regulations were issued. High capitalization costs have made it impossible for many academic libraries to take full advantage of new technological applications and to supply their students, faculty, researchers, scientists, and local business persons with the latest information, often available only in electronic form.
LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT (LSCA)

Purpose: The purpose of LSCA is to assist the states in the extension and improvement of public library services to geographic areas or groups of persons in the state for whom current services are inadequate; extend library services to persons in rural and urban settings, the institutionalized, the physically handicapped, those with limited English speaking proficiency and the aged; assisting libraries to serve as community information and referral centers; strengthen state library administrative agencies; support and expand services of major urban resource libraries; strengthen metropolitan libraries that serve as national or regional resource centers; assist in construction, remodeling and renovation of public libraries; assist in the purchase of existing historic buildings for conversion to public libraries; promote cooperative library networks among all types of libraries; improve library services to Indian tribes; and support library literacy programs.


General Provisions: For all titles, a basic allotment is made to each state with any funds remaining distributed proportionately to the states, each state's share based on its population in relation to the total U.S. population. Title I and II funds must be matched on the basis of a ratio of the state's per capita income to the average per capita income of the U.S. To participate in any LSCA program, each state must have a state plan approved by the Secretary of Education, plus a comprehensive three- or five-year plan on state priorities, procedures and activities for meeting the library and information needs of the people.

All library users and potential library users of the country's more than 15,000 public libraries benefit from the new, expanded and improved programs resulting from LSCA support.

TITLE I - SERVICES

To participate in Title I, each state, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia must meet minimum qualifications for basic federal allotments of $200,000; for American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas Islands, the Virgin Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the basic allotment is $40,000. Maintenance of state and local effort is required.

Description of Program: Grants are awarded to assist the states to:

1) Develop and improve library service to areas and populations which are disadvantaged because of distance, institutionalization, physical handicap, limited English speaking proficiency, residence, income, age or literacy level;
2) Assist libraries to serve as community information referral centers;
3) Provide literacy programs for adults and school drop-outs in cooperation with other agencies and organizations, if appropriate;
4) Strengthen the capacity of the state library agency to meet the library and information needs of all the people;
5) Strengthen metropolitan libraries that serve as national or regional resource centers;
6) Support major urban resource libraries in cities of over 100,000 which provide services throughout a regional area.

Urban Libraries: When appropriations for LSCA exceed $60 million, as they have most years since FY 1979, a portion of the additional amount is earmarked for libraries in cities over 100,000 in population.

Use of Title I Funds: Title I funds may be used for books and other library materials, equipment, salaries, other operating expenses, statewide planning and evaluation of programs, and administration of the state plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>78,986,000</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
<td>75,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $71,774,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

TITLE II - CONSTRUCTION

Description of Program: Grants are made to states for public library construction. The law defines "construction" as construction of new library buildings, acquisition, expansion, remodeling and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such buildings (except books). Architects' fees, land costs, removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped, and renovation for energy conservation are also eligible expenses. Providing appropriations are sufficient, the basic allotment for each state is $100,000 and for each outlying territory, $20,000. The federal share of any project cannot exceed one-half the total cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>22,595,000</td>
<td>22,500,000</td>
<td>22,500,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $21,533,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

TITLE III - INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

Description of Program: Grants are made to states for the planning, establishment and operation of cooperative networks of libraries at the local, regional or interstate level. Such cooperative networks should provide for the "systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic and special libraries and information centers...." Providing appropriations are sufficient, the basic allotment for each state is $40,000 and for each outlying territory, $10,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>18,669,000</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>18,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $17,226,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

TITLE IV - LIBRARY SERVICES FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND HAWAIIAN NATIVES

Description of the Program: Grants are made to promote the extension of public library services to Indian people living on or near reservations, to provide
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incentives for the establishment and expansion of tribal library programs, and to improve the administration and implementation of library services for Indians by providing funds to establish and support ongoing library programs.

Indian tribes are defined as any Indian tribe, band, nation, organized group or community, Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation recognized by the Secretary of the Interior. Indians from California, Oklahoma and Alaska (who do not live on reservations) are eligible. Funds allotted but not used because of non-application or nonqualification are allocated among Indian tribes submitting approved plans for special project grants. Funds received under either the basic allotment or a special project grant can be used for training of Indians as library personnel, purchase of library materials, special programs, salaries, construction, transportation of library users, dissemination, needs assessment and contracts to provide public library services to Indians or for any of the eligible uses.

Funding: The authorized level of funding for Indian Tribes for FY 1985-1989 is 1.5 percent of appropriations for Titles I, II, and III; 0.5 percent of I, II, and III funds is for "grants to organizations primarily serving and representing Hawaiian Natives that are recognized by the Governor of the State of Hawaii."

**TITLE V - FOREIGN LANGUAGE MATERIALS ACQUISITION**

Description of Program: Discretionary grants of up to $15,000 are authorized directly to state and local public libraries on a competitive basis for the acquisition of foreign language materials.

Funding: The authorized level is $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1985 through 1988, with an automatic one-year extension through 1989. No funds have been recommended in the Administration's FY 1989 budget.

**TITLE VI - LIBRARY LITERACY PROGRAMS**

Description of Program: Literacy program discretionary grants of up to $25,000 are authorized directly to state and local public libraries on a competitive basis. Grants to state libraries are to be used for coordinating and planning library literacy programs, and making arrangements for training librarians and volunteers to carry them out. Grants to local public libraries are to be used for promoting the use of voluntary services of individuals, agencies and organizations, acquisition of materials, and using library facilities for literacy programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>FY 1989</th>
<th>FY 1988</th>
<th>FY 1987</th>
<th>FY 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Recommendation</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>4,787,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $4,785,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3 percent sequester.

**IMPACT OF PROPOSED PROGRAM ELIMINATION:**

**Title I - PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES:** The elimination of LSCA has been firmly rejected by Congress each year since FY 1983. The loss of all federal support for public library programs would trigger the elimination of the most far-reaching and innovative programs offered by public libraries. Although federal funding accounts for only four percent of public library support, this money is used to reach that part of the population without library services or with very inadequate services, or for whom provision of library and information services requires extra effort or special materials and equipment. Examples of the impact include:
Alaska uses 72 percent of its LSCA I funds to provide service to individuals in rural areas without library services. Rural in Alaska may mean several hundred miles from anywhere, and 30 percent of Alaskans live in communities of 400 or less. LSCA funds are critical to maintaining library services under these conditions of distance and isolation.

In California, LSCA I funds have been used in San Diego to purchase children's materials in branch libraries that serve disadvantaged, racially mixed, and low-income populations. Oakland has a project of reading and writing exercises for young children at four branches in disadvantaged areas. San Bernadino County is completing a two-year project of opportunities for 1400 communicatively handicapped children to experience literature and libraries.

LSCA I funds have been used in Illinois for a program to assist the unemployed by expanding information resources on low-technology and manufacturing jobs.

Service to young adults is being enhanced in Massachusetts by purchase of career information and videocassettes on topics such as drug awareness.

Minnesota uses LSCA I to support approximately 20 bookmobiles which are primary providers of service to some 350,000 people. Elimination of LSCA would terminate these services as well as grant programs for library services for residents of state hospitals and for persons who are blind or physically handicapped.

The public library in Maplewood, Missouri, developed a special collection of books, periodicals, and audiovisual materials around issues of parenting and child care to meet the information needs of the parents of young children and to provide resources and services supporting local organizations working with parents and young children.

In Oklahoma, elimination of LSCA I would force the elimination of the statewide summer reading program for young children, the statewide audiovisual materials center, and grants to encourage the establishment or expansion of public library services for the 512,000 persons without such service.

Title II - CONSTRUCTION: The Administration has recommended elimination of LSCA title II for the seventh year in a row. Currently, demand for federal construction funds exceeds availability by several magnitudes; when LSCA funds are available, they stimulate twice the required amount of nonfederal matching money. Examples of the impact include:

California's $1.7 million in LSCA II funds stimulated $15 million in local funds for four libraries that had been unsuccessful in getting construction approved until federal dollars were available. Weaverville in Trinity County will replace the oldest public library in the state, now housed in an 1856 blacksmith shop.

Michigan has used LSCA II to fund more than 100 projects, with priority given to improving handicapped accessibility, energy conservation, and alterations which promote the use of new technology.

New York's FY '86 and '87 construction grant awards of $2.6 million were matched by $10.5 million in local funds for projects at 33 public libraries.
A needs assessment conducted in the fall of 1986 identified 171 public library construction projects needed at a cost of $1.12 million.

- In Pennsylvania, circulation of library materials has doubled in the new or expanded facilities funded by LSCA II. In several instances, the presence of the new library facility has galvanized economically depressed communities into action to attract other new developments.

- In 1987, 15 libraries in Virginia requested $2,562,979 in funding, exceeding by five times the $493,068 available.

**Title III - INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION:** For the seventh straight year the Administration has recommended elimination of this title. Federal support is crucial to cooperative library programs. In most states, a small number of regional resource-sharing organizations have been established. These link the resources of all the libraries within a given area and provide a central clearinghouse for interlibrary loan and reference services. If a question cannot be answered at the local library or if the local library does not own a requested item, the regional library authority is called upon. LSCA III provides major funding for these organizations, which may cross local and state boundaries. Zeroing-out LSCA title III will result in:

- Limited effectiveness for the regional library systems operating in all 50 states and severe limits on the resources which encourage continued cooperative endeavors. Michigan uses LSCA III funds to enhance the work of 14 Regions of Cooperation. A combination of cooperative efforts among public, school, academic, and special libraries, and the use of new technology has allowed many Michigan citizens to access all kinds of information, regardless of their location within the state.

- Termination of local, regional and state "union list" projects which collect information on all library holdings. Union lists are invaluable tools to researchers, students and library managers, and are essential to avoid costly duplication of little-used or expensive materials. LSCA III helped to fund the New Jersey Union List of Serials with information on 68,444 periodicals and serial publications, 85 percent of such titles owned by New Jersey libraries.

- Reduced effectiveness of statewide reference and referral services. The Utah State Library uses LSCA III funds to help support an information services program which acts as an interlibrary loan service and reference hub for small libraries.

- Interlibrary loan capabilities will be reduced significantly or eliminated in many states. In Vermont, LSCA III funded an electronic mail interlibrary loan system on microcomputers, replacing the 15-year-old teletype network. Electronic mail was found to be faster, less expensive, and more efficient. In Oklahoma, elimination of LSCA III would discontinue support of the statewide interlibrary service which fills 100,000 requests annually.

- Local cooperative projects in school, public, academic, and special libraries would not be undertaken. These projects are often to share information about resources, to share the resources themselves, or to combine staff expertise to provide improved reference by accessing computerized national databases. A recent project between school and public libraries in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, strengthened the reading skills of second graders. In Iowa, LSCA III funds have been used by a public library and hospital library for interlibrary cooperation and health outreach.
Title IV - LIBRARY SERVICES FOR INDIAN TRIBES AND HAWAIIAN NATIVES: Indian tribes often have no access to libraries; they are generally considered separate nations and seldom eligible for direct library allocations from states. For these reasons, Congress decided to allocate LSCA funding directly to Indian tribes through title IV. This need perceived by Congress has only begun to be met, as funding began in 1985. Without this funding, Indian tribes will remain unserved and, therefore, denied access to education and recreation opportunities enjoyed by other communities.

Title V - FOREIGN LANGUAGE MATERIALS ACQUISITION: According to the 1980 census, over four million people in the U.S. "speak English not well or not at all." Materials in languages other than English are needed to provide information which immigrants and other non-English-speaking individuals can understand. The Department of Education reports that a single well-developed collection of materials in foreign languages and English as a second language can provide effective services to a wide area. Title V grants will allow libraries to develop these needed collections by purchasing foreign language materials which would not otherwise be available in public libraries. There are no funds appropriated for title V.

Title VI - LIBRARY LITERACY PROGRAMS: While requesting an increase in adult education and literacy programs, the Administration has again proposed that funding for LSCA VI library literacy programs be eliminated. Libraries are logical focal points for literacy materials, for training volunteers, and as sites for tutoring adult illiterates who often feel inadequate and embarrassed about their handicap and may be more comfortable getting help in a library rather than a school. Examples of LSCA VI projects include:

- Alabama has funded a major two-day workshop in four areas of the state. The workshop, designed for representatives of 100 public libraries, teaches participants about the problems of illiteracy, literacy training methods, literacy program planning, and literacy awareness activities.

- In Bridgeport, Connecticut, the library, in collaboration with the public school system and the local Literacy Volunteers of America, is sponsoring a program targeted toward low-income, minority, single-parent households, with the goal of raising the literacy level of the participants so they can enroll in GED or adult education programs.

- Perry County, Kentucky, is conducting a library program to reach as many as possible of the estimated 8,600 adults in the county who are unable to read and write or who need to improve those skills. The program cooperates with the Learning Lab at Hazard Community College, the IBM Literacy Program at Hazard State Vocational School, and ABE and GED programs.

- In Michigan, $649,000 in LSCA VI funds have been used in 30 projects, allowing public libraries to reach out to thousands of illiterates.

- For FY '89, Wyoming is requesting LSCA VI funds for computers and software for literacy training and for high-interest, low-level reading materials for adult new readers.
The National Endowment for the Humanities has several program areas which involve libraries in achieving NEH goals. For the first time in eight years, the Administration has not recommended cutting the total for NEH, but requested level funding of $140,435,000. Requests for individual NEH programs vary, however.

NEH Office of Preservation. The $4,495,000 budget request for this program is a slight decrease from the current $4,500,000. The needs this Office addresses are desperate. Acids used in paper since about 1850 are destroying major portions of the collections of research libraries. The number of library volumes so brittle that further use may result in loss of text is now estimated to be 76 million and expected to rise to 114 million in the next 20 years as collections age. Without treatment, all but about ten percent of the remainder of book collections are expected to reach the same brittle state.

A structure is rapidly being put in place to ensure that aid for "brittle books" is used in the most efficient fashion through such coordinative groups as the Commission on Preservation and Access, established in 1986 to address such issues. The Commission is recommending that the current $2-3 million for NEH preservation efforts (in addition to the NEH newspaper project) be increased by $2 million per year until a level of $10 million annually is reached. Funding in FY 1989 of $6.5 million for the NEH Office of Preservation would represent a modest but significant federal investment which would lend impetus and credibility to other fund-raising efforts.

NEH Humanities Projects in Libraries. This program is slated for a 26 percent cut in FY '89, from the current $2.9 million to $2.1 million. For a very modest cost, this program plays a significant role in the active involvement of thousands of citizens in humanities issues. Libraries are exceedingly democratic institutions, serving as lively and appropriate centers for humanities programming. Amounts requested by libraries are modest; annual awards range from $15,000 to $300,000 and average $90,000. A higher proportion of applications can be funded than in some other programs where only a few more expensive awards are made. Even so, applications exceed awards by almost three to one. A few examples of recent grants:

"Affairs of the Heart" was a series of programs, displays, bibliographies, and taped and printed proceedings in the fall of 1986 on the ethics of artificial heart implantation at the Louisville Free Public Library in Kentucky. About 40,000 people visited the Library during the display, which greeted them as they entered the door with an actual Jarvik heart, hands-on equipment, and links to literary works and ethical questions. Participants noted that expert panelists such as local medical luminaries Drs. William DeVries and Allan Lansing had as much to gain from each other and from the interaction with the public as the public had to gain from their presentations.

"The Book Group: Exploring Literature in Company," sponsored by the Utah Library Association and the Utah State Library, is a project designed to encourage reading and discussion of the humanities through "packaged" reading programs, including multiple copies of books, on such themes as "The Contemporary American Family," and "Being Ethnic, Becoming American." In 1987, 322 reading and discussion
sessions took place, many of them in communities which usually lack access to scholars or multiple copies of books, and where local public librarians had little experience in adult programming.

"Mississippi Mindscape" took advantage of state residents' great interest in local history, a tremendous sense of tradition, and a quandary over the state's image. This project, sponsored by the Mississippi Library Commission, meshed a study of the state's history and interrelationships of ideas, events, and individuals with the literature that reflects them. In September-October 1987, 60 reading/discussion programs were held at 17 public libraries, attracting 1,250 participants.

The request to cut this valuable program by 28 percent should be rejected. The current $2.9 million is the minimum needed in FY '89.

NEH Access Projects. Within NEH Research Materials programs, Access Projects assist in providing descriptions of important collections of research materials and making them widely available to scholars. Libraries, archival organizations, and scholars all feel this program is seriously underfunded at the current $2,550,000. The FY '89 budget request is for level funding.

NEH Challenge Grants. Many libraries have benefited from Challenge Grants which have involved library funding for buildings, preservation, and computerization, but most of all for acquisitions in the humanities. These grants require 3 in non-federal funds for every $1 in NEH funds, thus providing a needed stimulus for further support of hard-pressed public institutions such as libraries. The budget request for FY '89 would provide a slight increase for Challenge Grants, from $16,500,000 to $16,700,000.
Purpose: To consolidate 32 programs, including school library resources, into a block grant to be used "...in accordance with the educational needs and priorities of State and local educational agencies as determined by such agencies." Further, Congress intends to "...financially assist State and local educational agencies to improve elementary and secondary education (including preschool education) for children attending both public and private schools, and to do so in a manner designed to greatly reduce the enormous administrative and paperwork burden...."

Authorization: Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act established the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), of which Chapter 2 is a block grant authorized through fiscal year 1987. There is an automatic two year extension through 1989.

Funding: The block grant, like the antecedent programs, is advance funded. That is, to allow for long-range planning, the funding level decided upon during the FY 1989 appropriations process will actually be made available for the 1989-90 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Budget Recommendation</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 1989</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$575,000,000**</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1988</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$529,337,000</td>
<td>$508,439,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1987</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$528,909,000</td>
<td>$528,909,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1986</td>
<td>such sums</td>
<td>$531,909,000</td>
<td>$528,909,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $506,166,000 after March 1, 1986, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 4.3% sequester.
** Estimate based on pending legislation.

NOTE: The former instructional materials and equipment and school library resources program, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title IV-B, was last funded in FY 1981 at $161,000,000.

Allotments: One percent reserved for insular areas, six percent for the Secretary of Education’s discretionary fund, the remainder to states on a school-age population basis except that no state would receive less than 0.5 percent of the remainder. From the state allotment, each state educational agency (SEA) must distribute 80 percent to local educational agencies (LEAs) on an enrollment basis with higher allocations to LEAs with greatest concentrations of high cost children, such as those from low-income families, economically depressed urban and rural areas and from sparsely populated areas.

Description of Program: The nature of federal assistance to elementary and secondary education changed significantly with the passage of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). The ECIA has two titles or chapters, but the first part consists of only one program, the former ESEA I, aid for disadvantaged children. The second part of ECIA, the Chapter 2 block grant, lumps all the remaining programs together, so that school library media centers compete with other programs for funding.

Funds may be used for any or all of the purposes of the programs which were consolidated. Three subchapters of the Act contain authorized activities:

Basic Skills Development, Educational Improvement and Support Services, and Special Projects. The second subchapter identifies "Acquisition and utilization of school
library resources, textbooks, instructional equipment and other materials for instructional purposes" as an authorized activity.

Reauthorization: Both the House and the Senate have passed bills reauthorizing the major federal elementary and secondary education programs, including ECIA. Differences in the House and Senate bills have been reconciled in a House-Senate Conference, the details of which were unfortunately not available in time to be included in this factsheet. The reconciled bill resulting from the Conference must still be passed by both the House and the Senate.

The House and Senate versions have some provisions in common, which were expected to be retained in the Conference bill:

ECIA Chapter 1 assistance to disadvantaged students would be more closely targeted to the neediest areas and expanded to preschool and secondary school students, the latter through basic skills development and dropout prevention.

Both House and Senate bills have the following provisions: It is specifically stated that Chapter 1 funds may be used for the acquisition of equipment and instructional materials, books and school library resources, the training of librarians, and parental involvement. Basic projects and innovative projects are to be designed and implemented in consultation with teachers and with librarians when appropriate. In determining eligible Ch. 1 children, local educational agencies must make an assessment of education needs each year, including determining "the special educational needs (and library resource needs) of participating children with specificity sufficient to ensure concentration on such needs." The required plan for schoolwide projects must be developed with the involvement of those carrying out the plan, including librarians, and with appropriate training for those carrying out the plan, including librarians. The state agency operated program for handicapped children allows use of funds for acquisition of equipment and instructional materials.

ECIA Chapter 2. The House version substitutes five general areas for local use of funds for the 32 current eligible uses, while the Senate version reduces the current 32 eligible uses to 11 targeted areas. Both bills include funds for school library resources as one of the eligible uses. They also allow funding for training of educational personnel, including librarians.

In both bills the state share would remain at 20 percent, and state advisory committees would have to include librarian representation. Both authorize $580 million for Ch. 2 for FY 1989. The House has "such sums" in the out years; the Senate levels rise five percent per year to $706 million in FY 1993.

First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education, written by Secretary of Education William Bennett, recognizes repeatedly the importance of reading and libraries; some excerpts include: Among the recommendations: "Every school should have a library." From the section on reading: "One point cannot be repeated too emphatically: Children must have access to books....Every classroom should have its own mini-library or reading corner." From the section on libraries: "The librarian should be an integral part of the instructional staff....Good librarians can be great teachers...."
LC Growth Lagging. The Library of Congress, the largest library in the world, with numerous services on which all U.S. libraries rely, appears to be falling badly behind other U.S. institutions with which it might be usefully compared:

Rate of Growth for Selected Library and Cultural Institutions
Fiscal Years 1984-1988*
(in thousands of current dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY 1984 Appropriation</th>
<th>FY 1988 Appropriation</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution (salaries &amp; expenses only)</td>
<td>$156,683</td>
<td>$201,432</td>
<td>+28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Medicine</td>
<td>53,818</td>
<td>67,910</td>
<td>+26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
<td>90,805</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>+23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Library</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>12,194</td>
<td>+22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
<td>232,864</td>
<td>247,951</td>
<td>+ 6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*excluding major capital costs

This table indicates that over the past five years, Library of Congress appropriations have increased by only 6.5 percent in current dollars. This five-year period has, of course, been a time of severe budgetary pressures on all federal agencies. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction law and last fall's summit agreement imposed specific restrictions on Congress' ability to provide funds. Nevertheless, during the same FY 1984-88 period and under the same conditions, the other national libraries and comparable national institutions grew at rates ranging from 23 to 29 percent.

Such a stagnant budgetary situation does not allow for rising costs, increasing workloads or the need for additional automation and preservation. Our national library will not remain on the leading edge for long at a growth rate of little more than one percent per year in current dollars. Indeed, the Library has had to cut back staffing and services. As the new Librarian, James Billington, noted in his budget testimony, when adjusted for inflation, LC appropriations declined by about 14 percent between FY 1977 and FY 1986.

National Services. First and foremost, the Library of Congress provides specialized services to Congress, such as issue analyses by the subject specialists in the Congressional Research Service. However, the Library also provides a variety of services which benefit the public and libraries across the country. Examples include:

Research and Reader Services. The public is served through a series of reading rooms whose names give some idea of the scope of the collections: Main; Social Science; Microform; Local History and Genealogy; Newspaper and Current Periodical; Science; Law Library; Performing Arts; Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded
Sound; Archive of Folk Culture; Prints and Photographs; Manuscript; Rare Book and Special Collections; Geography and Map; Hispanic; European; Asian; and African and Middle Eastern.

**Purchase of Books.** Congress has given the Library the responsibility for acquiring "all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship." It collects in 468 languages; three-fourths of its printed materials are in languages other than English. The devaluation of the dollar has had a significant impact. Average cost increases for journal titles from international publishers are expected to be in the 25-30 percent range in 1988. The cumulative effect of such cost increases on the ability of a no-growth budget Library to support scholarship is devastating. In addition, other libraries depend on LC as a backup resource of last resort for access for their users to its unique materials.

**Cataloging and Classification.** Libraries throughout the nation and the world subscribe to LC cataloging data in card, book and machine-readable form. Libraries depend on LC expertise in linguistics, languages, and technical and scientific fields which cannot be duplicated locally. The records produced by LC catalogers also form the basis for local, regional, and national cooperative bibliographic databases.

**Automation and Preservation.** The Library of Congress leads the way for other libraries in the technology of automating library processes and preserving deteriorating materials. Major portions of its collections of about 80 million items require attention to survive--either through microfilming of brittle books, preventive treatment through mass deacidification, or restoration of major treasures. LC has requested funds to double its preservation microfilming activities in FY '89.

**National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.** This Service circulates millions of recorded and braille books and magazines to a readership of thousands. A network of about 160 state and regional libraries helps disseminate these special materials, but they cannot substitute for the centralized production of recordings, braille editions, and special equipment provided by the LC service.

**Copyright Office.** LC administers the registration of copyrights, catalog registrations to create a public record, and receives deposits of copyrighted materials, many of which are then added to its collections.

**Adequate Funding Needed.** The pattern of minimal growth for the Library of Congress over the past five years must be reversed. The vitality of our great national library and its ability to support Congress, the nation's library users, and U.S. research, scholarship, inventiveness, and competitive position are at stake. LC's budget request of $274,198,000 for FY 1989 (including authority to obligate $13,034,000 in receipts) represents a 10.6 percent increase and is badly needed, but will fall short of making up for the essentially flat budgets of the previous five years.

The Library's budget is part of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, usually viewed solely as funding for the operation of Congress. The Library of Congress is a congressional support agency, but also provides nationwide services which affect the efficiency of libraries and the public's access to needed information and resources.
ELECTRONIC INFORMATION TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

The dissemination of unclassified government information of public interest and educational value electronic formats is an issue currently before Congress. ALA testimony before the House Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee in March supported the Public Printer's FY 1989 budget request of $26,800,000 for the Superintendent of Documents, a sum which should sustain the current program of paper and microfiche distribution and support inclusion of electronic formats in the Depository Library Program in the Government Printing Office.

Increasing amounts of government information are available only in electronic form; the entire Depository Library Program will be undermined if this information is not made available as is government information in other formats. Indeed, the Depository Library Program will cease to be a viable source of government information if electronic formats are not part of depository collections. In an important first step in electronic distribution, GPO announced in March 1988 that 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. Coming ever closer is the 1990 Census, from which much information will be available only in electronic format. The depository libraries must be able to make that information accessible to the business and government community, as well as to students, scholars, and the general public.

Last year, both the House and Senate passed over without prejudice GPO's request to use $800,000 of its revolving fund to begin testing such distribution. The principal reason for this action was the expectation that an Office of Technology Assessment study of the dissemination of government information would be available by the end of 1987 to provide guidance in what is certainly a complex policy area. However, the OTA study is not expected to be published until fall 1988. Waiting for the final report would mean another year's delay, which GPO and the libraries cannot afford. Libraries urgently need the opportunity to assess the impact of new formats on their service. It is quite likely that there will be cost shifts between GPO and the libraries as electronic information comes into the system. In a joint venture with the federal government, depository libraries share the costs of the system by providing staffing, space, equipment and related commercial publications to facilitate use of government information.

The appropriation for the Depository Library Program, like that for the Library of Congress, is part of the Legislative Appropriations bill. Great pressure is on Congress to keep spending for the Legislative Branch down. Some Members may not realize that important services to the nation, like those provided by the Library of Congress and the Depository Library Program are funded from Legislative Branch appropriations.

NTIS PRIVATIZATION

An article in the March 24 The Washington Times, said that Commerce Secretary C. William Verity opposes plans by the Office of Management and Budget to contract out the functions of the National Technical Information Service as quickly as possible. Previously, Department of Commerce officials said that their plan was to privatize the NTIS functions under the Federal Employee Direct Corporate Stock
Ownership Plan (Fed Co-op) concept, under which federal employees would exchange their government jobs for salaried positions with a contractor and be provided stock in the new firm.

At a February 24 hearing of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, both Chairman Doug Walgren (D-PA) and ranking minority member Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY) expressed opposition to privatizing NTIS, as did various witnesses. Both the House and Senate have passed a prohibition against further contracting out by NTIS in separate legislation. However, final legislative action is tied to passage of the trade bill by Congress, and its signing by the President. The trade bill finally appears to be making progress and Congressional consideration of the proposal should be completed in April. Prospects for presidential approval are "anybody's guess."

Apparently, Chairman Walgren's bill (HR 2159) to recast NTIS as a government corporation may be used as a vehicle to oppose NTIS privatization.

CONTRACTING OUT FEDERAL LIBRARIES

As a result of OMB pressure on agencies to review their library operations as "commercial activities" under OMB Circular A-76, numerous libraries throughout the federal government are currently under review for potential contracting out to commercial firms. The requests for proposal which are issued to operate these libraries usually have minimal qualifications for the personnel to be hired to operate the library. A wholly owned subsidiary of a foreign company successfully won the bid for operation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Library with a proposal which assumed the increasing use of "volunteers" for library operations.

Currently under A-76 review are the libraries of the Departments of Interior, Labor, Education, the General Services Administration, and numerous libraries in the Defense Department. The Census Bureau library was contracted out last summer in what is called an 8A-type contract for a minority set-aside.

RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

A series of federal policy decisions in recent years have had the effect of restricting the amount of information collected or compiled by the federal government, the amount of such information published, and the amount disseminated. Various policy directives have caused agencies to cut back or discontinue such activities, making it more difficult for libraries to meet their users' needs.
April 19, 1988

Dear Budget Conferee:

The American Library Association, on behalf of its 45,000 librarians, trustees, educators and friends of libraries, urges you to adopt the House-passed total for Function 500 education, library, and human services programs in the upcoming House-Senate conference on H. Con. Res. 268, the fiscal year 1989 budget resolution.

The Senate version of Function 500 is nearly $1 billion below the House number. Although the assumptions for education are similar (a $1.4 billion increase in the House, and $1.2 billion in the Senate), experience has shown that unless the Function 500 total is adequate, the increases assumed for education and related programs will not be realized in the appropriations process.

Schools, colleges, and libraries form the bedrock of literacy and learning upon which the nation's other priorities depend. In conference on the budget resolution, ALA urges you to allow an increase of $2.4 billion in Function 500 programs as provided in the House-passed H. Con. Res. 268.

Sincerely,

Eileen D. Cooke
Director
ALA Washington Office
Greetings to everyone joining the American Library Association in observing the 31st annual National Library Week.

Celebration of this week reminds us of the truth that a well-educated citizenry is critical to the health of any republic. Offering an ever-increasing number of services, America's libraries play a vital role in the education of our people and both symbolize and facilitate the freedoms of inquiry and expression so dear to our country -- and to millions around the world who do not yet enjoy liberty.

Libraries' stores of knowledge include, of course, the great books of the ages; libraries help ensure that the wisdom of our ancestors continues to inspire people, young and old, with the intellectual legacy that is our heritage. During National Library Week and all year long we should set aside time to read; to use our school, university, community, and private libraries; and to help our children discover the treasures that await them in all our Nation's libraries.

Nancy and I send good wishes to America's librarians and patrons. God bless you, and God bless America.

Ronald Reagan