

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

November 2016

Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975): Correspondence 01

Livingston Biddle

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_11

Recommended Citation

Biddle, Livingston, "Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975): Correspondence 01" (2016). *Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975)*. Paper 17.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_11/17https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_11/17

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arts and Humanities: Pell Amendments (1975) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

TO: SENATOR

FROM: LB

March 8

6 p.m.

Have just talked with Greg Fusco re the Mark-up tomorrow and feel that Sen. Javits will fully support you on Education and Arts and Humanities.

Javits has had further conversations with Rockefeller re the Bicentennial Project -- likes it increasingly, but may not want to mention it tomorrow as a reason for full funding. Greg feels as I do that it is important to keep full options for our own mark-up -- which would mean saving the present authorized level from any reduction tomorrow. If it is reduced by the Committee and sent to the Budget Committee reduced, we would have to abide by that reduced figure in our mark-up, and would not therefore be able to maintain the current level of authorization into FY 1977... This would certainly be a setback.

I think you can say that you have no intention of increasing the FY '77 authorization, when the bill is marked up, over current levels. This ~~was~~ is the first time for such a leveling of authorization in the history of the legislation. But that these funds should be appropriated -- especially in light of the strengthening of the program you will soon be bringing to the full Committee when the reauthorization is prepared for consideration.

To put the matter in historic perspective the \$250 million recommended for program use is \$150 million less than the Senate approved for authorization three years ago, by a better than 2 to 1 vote (61-30) -- and the Arts recommendation of \$137 million is compared to the \$225 million the Subcommittee was told was essential today to meet most urgent needs.

In this perspective, the figures in the Committee material seem modest -- far from exorbitant.