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### MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE ARTS AND HUMANITIES BILLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Comment and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No mention of Northern Marianas</td>
<td>Adds Northern Marianas to list of territories eligible for NEA and NEH funding.</td>
<td>Take House position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of NEH renovation authority</td>
<td>Gives NEH authority to fund renovation projects</td>
<td>Take House position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeals NEH loan authority. Makes no change in current law regarding NEA which now has no authority to make loans.</td>
<td>Gives NEA loan authority so that both Endowments will have it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adds "programs for the arts at the local level" to the list of areas the NEA Chairman should support.

House authorizes NEA to use challenge grant money to fund programs at the community level.

---

I recommend that we take the House language.

You met with community arts people and agreed to add the Senate line which focuses attention on local agencies but does not mandate funding. I strongly urge that we press to keep our line in. You have frequently spoken out for more visibility and attention for local arts organizations. The House language which makes challenge grant monies available to state and local organizations complements the Senate line and I recommend taking it as well. The House language comes from Ted Weiss who has his large arts constituency on NYC's upper West Side in mind.
Senate

Defines territories eligible for full basic state operating grant to those with population over 200,000. Does not limit grants to less than $200,000 for those of smaller population.

Retains Senate confirmation for Council nominees.

Offers 2 options for the formation of a State Humanities Council, etc.

Senate retains current formula for distribution of funds to states in excess of basic state operating grant. (75% of excess is divided among states equally; 25% is divided at Chairman's discretion) We kept current formula because it benefits small states more than any of the options.

No Mention

House

Territories with less than 200,000 population will receive less than $200,000 which is the basic state operating grant.

Eliminates Senate confirmation for Council nominees.

No mention. House would retain current law.

New House formula divides the excess over the basic grant by:

- 34% at Chairman's discretion;
- 44% divided equally among states;
- 22% on a per capita basis.

Adds the Commissioner on Aging to the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities

Comment and Recommendation

House language is unduly restrictive in limiting the basic grant to less than $200,000 for the next 5 years. Senate language allows more flexibility in funding jurisdictions. House language may be a mistake. Broad support for Senate language.

This can be a bargaining chip if we need one. You suggested retaining for time being. Jack Goldner strongly in favor of retaining Senate confirmation.

Our number 1 priority.

Strong recommendation for Senate position. Proposed House formula is not as kind to small states since it includes a per capita allotment and allows too much for distribution at Chairman's discretion. A former Brademas staff person devised House formula. No one there now who can defend it.

Apparently Biaggi proposed this addition. The Federal Council opposes it saying that the Sec. of Health and Human Services is already a member and that membership would become too large if all unit heads were added. I don't feel strongly one way or the other. The Council is already too large to be truly effective. One more won't make much difference.
Senate
No mention

House
Calls for 2 studies to be done by the Federal Council; one on employment opportunities for artists, the second on the possible extension of the indemnification program to domestic exhibits.

No mention

Requires the Endowments to conduct a study of the effectiveness of Treasury Funds and to submit a report with any recommended changes within two years.

Limits use of administrative funds to $35,000 per year for representational expenses with no outside fund raising.

Makes no change in existing law which provides no authority for use of appropriated funds for entertainment expenses.

Makes no change in existing law which provides no authority for use of appropriated funds for entertainment expenses.

Authorizations of Appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEA</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Comment and Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$115.5</td>
<td>$132.5</td>
<td>$135.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175.0</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>231.0</td>
<td>266.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$114.5</td>
<td>$127.0</td>
<td>$132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$170.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment on authorization levels:

The arts community is understandably in favor of the House figures for FY81. They believe that a "such sums" authorization for the last four years will allow for figures higher than those in the Senate bill.

I expect that we will come up with a simple compromise which could be one of the following:

1. Provide figures for '81 and '82 starting at $200 million (NEA) and $190 (NEH) for '81 and increasing by 15% for '82. Provide "such sums" for the last 3 years.

2. Split the House and Senate levels for '81 and then rise by 15% for each year following. I tend to favor the lower compromise figures and hope we can have figures for at least 3 years.