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April 19, 1984

The Honorable Claiborne deB. Pell
The United States Senate
325 Russell Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Pell:

I want to thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to meet with Fay and myself on April 10. Your continued support of library programs is greatly appreciated by Rhode Islanders.

I would like to explain more fully our concern over the wording of Section 10 - Section 103 (4) as originally written in S-2490. In discussions with the Department of Education staff, we were told that we would have to commit funding for all of the programs enumerated (A) through (G). Of particular concern are (D) and (G). The hiring of elderly persons without any qualification other than a desire to work in libraries could present problems with some current civil service regulations and union contracts. Using LSCA funds in Rhode Island to furnish transportation for the elderly to have access to library services would be duplicative. The Rhode Island Department of Elderly Affairs currently funds transportation for the elderly. In addition many local communities also provide transportation to the elderly.

The amendment approved by the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities would give us the ability to develop strong library and information services for the elderly without duplicating existing services. The amendment strengthens the act by giving the states greater flexibility in developing services for needs not currently met by other programs.

The flexibility is needed in the legislation. Without it, the rules and regulations that will be developed by the Department of Education will be rigid. As a result there is a strong possibility that we will not be able to develop the services that the elderly need in Rhode Island.

If you have further questions I would be pleased to answer them.

Again, thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Bruce E. Daniels
Deputy Director