

Y 4  
.R 86/2  
B 69

1046

951/4  
R 86/2  
B 69

# NOMINATION OF JOHN J. BOYLE TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER

GOVERNMENT  
Storage

DOCUMENTS

NOV 10 1977

FARRELL LIBRARY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

### COMMITTEE ON

### RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

### UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

THE NOMINATION OF JOHN J. BOYLE  
TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER

OCTOBER 19 AND 26, 1977



Printed for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration  
United States Senate

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1977

97-772 O

DOCUMENTS

NOV 10 1977

FARRELL LIBRARY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey

DICK CLARK, Iowa

MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee

WILLIAM McWHORTER COCHRANE, *Staff Director*

CHESTER H. SMITH, *Chief Counsel*

LARRY E. SMITH, *Minority Staff Director*

W. A. DOWLESS, *Editorial Assistant (GPO)*

# CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1977

	Page
Opening statement of Hon. Howard W. Cannon, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration .....	1
Testimony of—	
John J. Boyle, nominee for Public Printer .....	11
Jord H. Jordan, chairman, Board of the Printing Industries of America, Inc., accompanied by John F. Grant, director of Government affairs .....	26
Paul G. Zurkowski, Information Industry Association .....	29
James R. MacRae, president, Coalition of Minority Workers, GPO; accompanied by Peter Holker, general counsel .....	43
John A. McCart, executive director, Public Employee Department, AFL-CIO .....	47
Robert E. Petersen, president, Greater Washington Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO), accompanied by George B. Driesen, general counsel .....	50
William F. Martin, legislative representative, International Printing and Graphic Communications Union .....	55
Edward V. Donahue, vice president, Graphic Arts International Union, accompanied by Fredrick P. Allen, president I.P. & G.C.U. Local 713, William J. Boarman, president ITU Local 101, Cornelius V. McIntyre, president, I.P. & G.C.U. Local 1, and Thomas B. Powers, Esq., counsel, GPO Council of Unions .....	58
Written statement of—	
Jord H. Jordan, chairman, Board of the Printing Industries of America, Inc. ....	28
Paul G. Zurkowski, Information Industry Association, with attachments ..	30
Additional statement of John J. Boyle in response to written statement of Mr. Paul G. Zurkowski, president, Information Industry Association .....	40
James R. MacRae, president, Coalition of Minority Workers, GPO, Inc. ....	46
John A. McCart, executive director, Public Employee Department AFL-CIO .....	47
Kenneth T. Blaylock, national president, American Federation of Government Employees .....	49
Robert E. Petersen, president, Greater Washington Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO) .....	51
Sol Fishko, president, International Printing and Graphic Communications Union .....	55
Edward V. Donahue, vice president, the Council of Unions, GPO .....	58
Miscellaneous:	
Letter to Mr. John J. Boyle, by Senator Howard W. Cannon, dated Sept. 28, 1977 .....	2
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon by Mr. John J. Boyle, dated Oct. 4, 1977 .....	2
Questionnaire—Committee on Rules and Administration, outline of information requested of nominee .....	2
Biographical summary of nominee .....	6
The Government Printing Office, the Office of Public Printer, and the Joint Committee on Printing .....	7
Heads of Public Printing: 1852-1977 .....	8
List of letters—	
In support of the nominee .....	9
Opposed to the nominee .....	9
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon by Congressman Walter E. Fauntroy, dated Oct. 11, 1977 .....	9

IV

	Page
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon by Senator Paul S. Sarbanes, dated Oct. 18, 1977 .....	10
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon by Senator Charles McC. Mathias dated Oct. 25, 1977 .....	10
Statement of John J. Boyle on contracting out .....	69
Statement on response to Coalition of Minority Workers recommendations .....	70
Statement of Mr. John J. Boyle in response to Senator Howard W. Cannon's questions regarding improvements in the Depository Library program .....	71
Statement on automation of congressional publications.....	71
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon, by Mr. Francis Buckley, Detroit Public Library, Detroit, Mich., dated Oct. 21, 1977.....	72
Letter to Senator Howard W. Cannon by Eileen D. Cooke, American Library Association, dated Oct. 24, 1977 .....	74
Questions submitted by the National Association of the Deaf and Mr. Boyle's response .....	74

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1977

Committee approval of nomination of John Joseph Boyle to be Public Printer..	75
--	----

## NOMINATION OF JOHN J. BOYLE OF MARYLAND TO BE THE PUBLIC PRINTER

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1977

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, commencing at 10:12 a.m., in room 301, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. Hon. Howard W. Cannon (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Cannon, Pell, Robert C. Byrd, Allen, Clark, Hatfield, and Griffin.

Staff present: William McWhorter Cochrane, staff director; Chester H. Smith, chief counsel; Larry E. Smith, minority staff director; Martin B. Gold, minority counsel; Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, professional staff member; Edwin K. Hall, counsel (elections); James F. Schoener, minority counsel (elections); John K. Swearingen, director of information services; Raymond N. Nelson, professional staff member; Jack L. Sapp, professional staff member; Peggy Parrish, assistant chief clerk and W. A. Dowless, editorial assistant (GPO).

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

I must apologize for being a little late, but I was at another hearing in which I was chairing earlier.

On September 28, 1977, the President nominated John Joseph Boyle of Maryland to be Public Printer of the United States and on the same day the nomination was referred to this committee for its consideration. On October 3, I gave notice in the Congressional Record to all persons interested in this nomination that they should file with the committee in writing any representations they might wish to make for or against the nomination, and on October 12, again in the Congressional Record, I gave notice that on October 19, today, the committee would hold a public hearing on the matter.

On September 28 I wrote to Mr. Boyle requesting that he give the committee his answers to a detailed questionnaire regarding his personal and public career to date, including biographical, educational, employment, political, financial, and other data, with the assurance that his personal financial data and income tax returns for the last 3 years would not be published in the record of this hearing but would be available for inspection by the public, if the committee should so direct.

Mr. Boyle has responded to this questionnaire and without objection his answers, except for the financial data, will be entered in the record at this point, along with his biographical summary.

[The following material was received for the record:]

U.S. SENATE,  
 COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,  
 Washington, D.C., September 28, 1977.

Mr. JOHN J. BOYLE,  
 Deputy Public Printer,  
 Government Printing Office,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOYLE: I congratulate you on your nomination by the President to be The Public Printer. In order to assist the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering your nomination, you are requested to provide 25 copies of the information outlined in the enclosed questionnaire to me at:

Committee on Rules and Administration,  
 U.S. Senate,  
 305 Russell Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C. 20510.

Attn: William M. Cochrane, Staff Director

If you have any questions regarding the information requested, please contact Mr. Cochrane at 224-0275.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

HOWARD W. CANNON,  
 Chairman.

Enclosure.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
 OFFICE OF PUBLIC PRINTER,  
 Washington, D.C., October 4, 1977.

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON,  
 Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,  
 U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.  
 Attention: William M. Cochrane, Staff Director

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed are 25 copies of the completed questionnaire for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, together with 2 copies of all speeches given in the last 2 years.

I appreciate your message of congratulation.

If the Committee needs any additional information or I can be of help in any way please feel free to ask.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. BOYLE,  
 Deputy Public Printer.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION  
 OUTLINE OF INFORMATION REQUESTED OF NOMINEE

A. *Biographical:*

1. Name: John Joseph Boyle (nickname: Jack).
2. Address: 2 Whittingham Terrace, Silver Spring, Maryland 20904.
3. Date and place of birth: January 25, 1919, Honesdale, Pennsylvania.
4. Marital status: Married to Mary Jeanne Murray Boyle, same address.
5. Names and ages of children: Dr. Robert John Boyle, age 30, Providence, Rhode Island; Sarah Boyle Sundstrom, age 26, Columbia, Maryland.
6. Education: Hawley High School 1936; no college degrees.
7. Employment Record:

From	To	Employer	Address	Position
June 1935 .....	March 1941 .....	Hawley Times .....	Hawley, Pa .....	Printer.
March 1941 .....	September 1945 ..	Military Service .....		
October 1945 .....	November 1945 ..	O'Bran Press .....	Scranton, Pa .....	Printer.
Nov. 3, 1945 .....	Nov. 17, 1945 ..	Scranton Tribune .....	do .....	Do.
November 1945 .....	February 1952 ..	Haddon Craftsman .....	do .....	Do.
Mar. 1, 1952 .....	Mar. 24, 1952 ..	McArdle Printing Co. ....	Washington, D.C .....	Do.
April 1952 .....	December 1960 ..	Govt. Printing Off .....	do .....	Proofreader.
December 1960 .....	April 1964 .....	do .....	do .....	Technical Asst.
April 1964 .....	September 1964 ..	do .....	do .....	Prin. Tech. Asst.
September 1964 .....	June 1966 .....	do .....	do .....	Superintendent.
June 1966 .....	February 1970 ..	do .....	do .....	Spec. Asst. to Production Mgr.
February 1970 .....	January 1971 .....	do .....	do .....	Asst. Prod. Mgr.
January 1971 .....	February 1972 ..	do .....	do .....	Dep. Prod. Mgr.
February 1972 .....	June 1973 .....	do .....	do .....	Production Mgr.
June 1973 .....	Present .....	do .....	do .....	Deputy Public Printer.

8. Government experience: In addition to the government experience listed above I have been a member of the Federal Electronic Printing Committee, an advisory committee to the Joint Committee on Printing, since 1964.

9. Memberships:

Washington Litho Club, Washington, D.C., 1960 to present, past member, Board of Governors.

Washington Craftsmen's Club, Washington, D.C., 1960 to present, past Vice President.

Franklin Technical Society, Washington, D.C., 1960 to present.

International Typographical Union, Indianapolis, Ind., 1945 to 1973.

American Legion, GPO Post 33, 1952 to 1955.

Wheaton Citizens Association, Wheaton, Md., 1952 to 1970.

Merlands Country Club, Wheaton, Md., 1955 to 1962, Secretary.

Graphic Arts Advisory Committee, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y., 1973 to present.

10. Political affiliation and activities: Have been a registered Democrat in the state of Maryland since 1952; 5th District, 9th precinct. Government employment precluded an active role.

11. Honors and Awards: Recipient of Horace Hart Award of the Education Council of the Graphic Arts Industry in recognition of distinguished public service in the field of printing and publishing, January 1977.

12. Published writings: "Automated Typesetting of Existing Computer Tabular Data, Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Proceedings of Symposium," 1968; "Typographic Equipment Considerations, Computer Graphics Utility," Thompson Book Co., Washington, D.C., 1967.

13. Speeches:

Apprentice Graduating Class, Harding Hall, GPO, July 8, 1977.

American Paper Institute, Shoreham Americana, Washington, D.C., June 16, 1977.

Philadelphia Litho Club, Philadelphia, Pa., May 23, 1977.

InPlant Printing Management Association, Arlington, Va., May 11, 1977.

Michigan Litho Clubs, Joint Meeting, Ann Arbor, Mich., April 20, 1977.

Greenville, South Carolina Club of Printing House Craftsmen, Greenville, S.C., February 17, 1977.

Printing Industries of the Pacific Annual Convention, Maui, Hawaii, Jan. 19, 1977.

Joint Graphic Communication Organizations of Metropolitan Washington, Washington Navy Yard, Nov. 9, 1976.

National Composition Association/PIA, Washington, D.C., Sept. 10, 1976.

Truesdell Elementary School PTA, Washington, D.C., June 3, 1976.

Metropolitan Washington School of Printing, Montgomery College, Rockville, Maryland, Jan. 16, 1976.

Third Federal Women's Day Program, GPO, Washington, D.C., Aug. 29, 1975.

International Association of Printing House Craftsmen, Inc., Annual Convention, Colorado Springs, Colorado, Aug. 5, 1975.

Apprentice Graduating Class, GPO, Washington, D.C., July 11, 1975.

InPlant Printing Management Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, California, June 21, 1974.

14. Qualifications: I believe that I am qualified to serve in the position of Public Printer, if confirmed by the Senate, and that I meet the criteria as defined in

section 301, 44 U.S.C. of being "a practical printer and versed in the art of bookbinding . . ."

I have been employed in the printing industry in various positions both technical and managerial for 41 years, less 4½ years in military service, 25 of those years in the Government Printing Office.

My practical experience in the GPO has provided me the opportunity to become completely familiar with all of the production operations, the purchasing and procurement of printing, machinery, paper and supplies. I have been closely associated with the administrative operations including the personnel and financial functions and am thoroughly familiar with all of the laws and regulations pertaining to public printing.

When the Joint Committee on Printing directed the Public Printer to investigate the feasibility of using computers in typesetting in 1962, I was selected to head up the project which has culminated in one of the most modern automated typesetting facilities in the industry. I am familiar with data processing capabilities and have been partly responsible for the successful use of computers throughout the GPO.

In addition to the printing production operations I have been responsible for overseeing the Customer Service, Printing Procurement, and Quality Control and Technical Departments for the past 4 years in my function as Deputy Public Printer. I have worked closely with the staff of the Joint Committee on Printing in the successful operation of the Federal Printing Program and the GPO regional printing procurement offices.

I have studied and read and attended many seminars in management concepts and have participated in every management decision for the past 4 years, and believe that my experience in actual management practices has been an effective practical substitute for a formal degree in business administration.

In accordance with Title 44, U.S. Code, section 304, I have performed the duties of the Public Printer in his absence and I believe my 4 years' experience as Deputy Public Printer fully qualifies me to be Public Printer.

#### *B. Future Employment Relationships:*

1. Will you sever all connections with your present employer, business firm, association or organization if you are confirmed by the Senate?

Answer: Not necessary. Presently employed by GPO.

2. Do you have any plans after completing government service to resume employment, affiliation or practice with your previous employer, business firm, association or organization?

Answer: None.

3. Has anybody made a commitment to employ your services in any capacity after you leave government service?

Answer: No.

4. If confirmed, will you serve your full term of office?

Answer: Yes.

5. If confirmed, will you be engaged in any business, vocation, employment or outside activities other than related to your duties?

Answer: No.

#### *C. Potential Conflicts of Interest:*

1. Describe all financial arrangements, deferred compensation agreements, and other continuing dealings with business associates, clients or customers.

Answer: None.

2. Indicate any investments, obligations, liabilities, or other relationships which could involve potential conflicts of interest in the position to which you have been nominated.

Answer: No potential conflicts of interests.

3. Describe any business relationship, dealing or financial transaction which you have had during the last ten years, whether for yourself, on behalf of a client, or acting as an agent, that could in any way constitute or result in a possible conflict of interest in the position to which you have been nominated.

Answer: None.

4. Describe any activity during the past 10 years in which you have engaged for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing the passage, defeat or modification of any legislation or affecting the administration and execution of law or public policy.

Answer: Appearance before Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations of Senate and House fiscal years 1975-78.

5. Explain how you will resolve any potential conflict of interest, including any that may be disclosed by your responses to the above items. (Please provide a copy of any trust or other agreements.)

Answer: See no potential conflict of interest to be resolved. Have made no trust or other agreements.

*D. Testifying Before Congress:*

1. Are you willing to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Congress on such occasions as you may be reasonably requested to do so?

Answer: Yes.

2. Are you willing to provide such information as is requested by such committees?

Answer: Yes.

*E. Personal:*

1. Have your federal or state tax returns been the subject of any audit or investigation or inquiry at any time?

Answer: Yes, my Federal return for 1972 was audited and the amount of real estate taxes and the amount claimed for union dues was questioned. Receipts were furnished and no change was made in the original tax return.

2. Has a tax lien or other collection procedure ever been instituted against you by federal, state or local authorities?

Answer: No.

3. Have you ever been arrested, charged or held by federal, state, or other law enforcement authorities for violation of any federal, state, county or municipal law, regulation or ordinance? If so, please give full details (do not include traffic violations for which a fine of \$25 or less was imposed).

Answer: No.

4. Are you currently under federal, state, or local investigation for a possible violation of a criminal statute? If so, please give full details.

Answer: No.

5. Have you ever been disciplined or cited for a breach of ethics or unprofessional conduct by, or been the subject of a complaint to, any court, administrative agency, professional association, disciplinary committee, or other professional group? If so, please give full details.

Answer: No.

6. Have you ever been convicted (including pleas of guilty or nolo contendere) of any criminal violation other than a minor traffic offense?

Answer: No.

*F. Financial Data*—(The information supplied under this heading will not be published in the record of the hearing on your nomination, but it will be retained in the Committee's files, and will be available for public inspection):

1. Provide a complete, current financial net worth statement which itemizes in detail all assets (including, but not limited to, bank accounts, real estate, securities, trusts, investments, and other financial holdings) and all liabilities (including, but not limited to debts, mortgages, loans, and other financial obligations) of yourself, your spouse, and other immediate members of your household. All assets and liabilities should be separately itemized and fully described.

Answer: Net worth statement attached.

2. List sources and amounts of all items of value received during each of the last three years, (including, but not limited to, salaries, wages, fees, dividends, capital gains or losses, interest, gifts, royalties, patents and honoraria) of yourself, your spouse, and other immediate members of your household. (In lieu of the above, you may submit copies of your federal income tax returns for these years).

Answer: Federal income tax returns for 1976, 1975, and 1974 attached.

3. List sources, amounts and dates of all anticipated receipts from deferred income arrangements, stock options, executory contracts and other future benefits which you expect to derive from current or previous business relationships, professional services and firm memberships, employers, clients, and customers.

Answer: None.

Please advise the Committee of any additional information, favorable or unfavorable, which you feel should be considered by the Committee in connection with your nomination.

There may be some opposition to my nomination from union employee groups as a result of my participation in the wage negotiations this past year.

JOHN J. BOYLE.

## JOHN J. BOYLE—BIOGRAPHY

John Joseph Boyle was born January 25, 1919, in Honesdale, Pennsylvania. Following his apprenticeship and several years in the private printing industry in Scranton, Pennsylvania, he was appointed to the Government Printing Office as a Proofreader in 1952.

In 1960 he became Principal Technical Assistant in the Office of the Production Manager and Production Manager's representative on the Scheduling Committee.

In 1964 he was appointed Special Assistant to the Production Manager for Electronic Printing. He was responsible for the establishment of the Electronic Photocomposition Division which consolidated all of the photocomposition activities into a single organization and which has evolved into the largest and most modern phototypesetting facility in the printing industry. His efforts in familiarizing government agencies with the benefits of computer-assisted photocomposition aided the smooth introduction of the first cathode-ray-tube typesetting system into the Government Printing Office.

In 1971 he was promoted to Deputy Production Manager (Electronics). He was detailed as Production Manager in February 1972, the position he filled until his appointment as Deputy Public Printer in June 1973.

As Deputy Public Printer he has been responsible for the direction of planning and production of all printing and binding produced in the Central Office and the GPO Departmental and Field Service Offices and procured from commercial sources. He coordinates the activities of the Customer Service Department, the Printing Procurement Department, the Production Department, and the Quality Control and Technical Department. He performed other duties as assigned by the Public Printer and acted as Public Printer in the absence of the Public Printer in accordance with Title 44 of the United States Code and other applicable laws.

He has lectured throughout the United States and in England on new processes in printing and is considered to be a leading authority on the use of computers in composition, and is well known in the commercial printing industry. He is one of the original members of the Federal Electronic Printing Committee, an advisory committee to the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing.

He is a longtime member of the Washington Club of Printing House Craftsmen, the Washington Litho Club, and the Franklin Technical Society. Mr. Boyle is also a member of the Graphic Arts Advisory Committee of the Rochester Institute of Technology College of Graphic Arts and Photography, Rochester, New York.

On January 18, 1977, Mr. Boyle received the Horace Hart Award of the Education Council of the Graphic Arts Industry in recognition of distinguished public service in the field of printing and publishing.

He served in the U.S. Army from 1941 to 1945 and was with the First Armored Division in the North African Campaign. He was captured in North Africa and spent two and one-half years in German prison camps.

Mr. Boyle is married to the former Mary Jeanne Murray of Hawley, Pennsylvania, and they have resided in Silver Spring, Maryland, for the past 25 years. They have a married daughter, Sarah R. Sundstrom, 26, who lives in Columbia, Maryland, and a son, Dr. Robert J. Boyle, 30, a Fellow at Brown University School of Medicine in Providence, Rhode Island, and a granddaughter and grandson.

The CHAIRMAN. The President submitted this nomination to the Senate under authority of section 301, title 44, of the United States Code, which reads as follows:

The President of the United States shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a suitable person, who must be a practical printer and versed in the art of bookbinding, to take charge of and manage the Government Printing Office. His title shall be Public Printer.

The annual salary of the Public Printer is currently set by law at \$50,000, the equivalent of pay level IV in the Executive Schedule.

Without objection, I will place in the record at this point a brief statement regarding the Public Printer, the Government Printing Office, and the Joint Committee on Printing, of which I am chairman for the 95th Congress.

[The following was submitted for the record:]

THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC PRINTER, AND THE  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The Public Printer is responsible for management of the Government Printing Office, which produces and/or procures all the printing, binding and stationery requirements of the Congress and virtually the entire Federal Government establishment. The operations and activities of the GPO (and Public Printer) are overseen by the Joint Committee on Printing, comprised of three members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and three members of the Committee on House (of Representatives) Administration. The Joint Committee is, in effect, the board of directors of the Government Printing Office.

Created June 23, 1860, by Congressional Joint Resolution 25, the Government Printing Office has grown from a relatively small print shop (purchased in 1861 for \$135,000) to a nation-wide printing and distribution enterprise whose total "business" in fiscal 1976 was \$582.5 million.

The functions of the GPO (outlined and specified in the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended—28 Stat. 603; USC Title 44) include not only production and distribution but also cataloging of government documents, and responsibility for a national network of some 1,200 Depository Libraries and related matters.

The documents produced and handled range from congressional bills, committee hearings and the daily Congressional Record to Presidential Documents, departmental pamphlets, military manuals and the massive Code of Federal Regulations.

In addition to the Main Plant near the Capitol in Washington, D.C.—which is the largest and most technologically advanced printing facility of its kind in the world—the Government Printing Office has field plants in New York, Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington; 14 regional printing procurement offices; 25 book stores throughout the country for the sale of government material; and warehouses and depository library and documents distribution centers in Washington, Virginia, Maryland, and Colorado.

During the past decade or so the printing industry has advanced more, technologically, than it had in the previous five centuries since Gutenberg invented type mold that made possible movable type. The Government Printing Office has been in the forefront of significant aspects of that progress. For instance, with the approval and encouragement of the Joint Committee on Printing, the GPO jointly with private enterprise developed and perfected the Linotron, which is the world's first (computerized) operational cathode-ray-tube photo typesetter. The first Linotron became operative in 1967. A second was installed in 1969. (It has been estimated that this modern device, alone, reduced the cost of composition to such an extent that the multi-million dollar machines paid for themselves in their first full year of use.) The GPO has continued to take the fullest feasible advantage of technological advances in composition as well as printing and binding equipment. For fiscal 1976 and 1977 the Joint Committee on Printing has approved the purchase by GPO of three Videocomp 500 Phototypesetters. A direct entry photocomposer, 14 new up-to-date presses, automatic platemakers, et cetera, that will cost a total of more than \$13 million.

The Public Printer (chief executive officer of the GPO) is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. (Title 44, Sec. 301.) He, in turn, appoints the deputy public printers and other executives and employees of GPO and its associated entities. (Title 44, Secs. 302, 305, 306, 308.) The personnel total was approximately 8,400 in fiscal 1976.

The operations and activities of the GPO are financed by Congressional appropriations and a revolving fund. (Title 44, Secs. 309, 310, etc.)

Because of the Joint Committee on Printing's direct and virtually day-to-day oversight authority and obligations, the Congress has a unique relationship with the GPO.

The chairmanship and vice-chairmanship of the JCP rotate between the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. Thus for the 95th Congress, Senator Howard W. Cannon, of Nevada, is chairman of the JCP, and Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, is vice chairman. Also members in the 95th Congress are Senator James B. Allen, of Alabama, and Senator Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, both members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; and Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, of California, and Representative William L. Dickinson, of Alabama, both members of the Committee on House Administration.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** If the Senate confirms Mr. Boyle, he would be the 17th person to hold the office of Public Printer, since the first one, Mr. Almon W. Clapp assumed his duties on August 1, 1876. If

confirmed, Mr. Boyle would be the first Public Printer who worked his way through the ranks in the Government Printing Office to the top job, from proofreader to Public Printer, over a period of more than 25 years. It is my understanding that the incumbent Public Printer, Mr. Thomas F. McCormick of Connecticut, who has served since 1973, has submitted his resignation effective on or about November 1 of this year. Without objection, a list of persons who have served as Superintendents of Public Printing, Congressional Printer, and Public Printer from 1852 to date will be included in the record at this point.

[The following was received for the record:]

#### HEADS OF PUBLIC PRINTING: 1852-1977

##### SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC PRINTING: 1852-61

John T. Towers, September 1, 1852-December 6, 1853.  
A. G. Seaman, December 7, 1853-December 1857.  
George W. Bowman, December 1857-May 12, 1859.  
John Heart, May 13, 1859-March 4, 1861.

##### GPO SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC PRINTING

John D. Defrees, March 23, 1861-August 31, 1866.  
Cornelius Wendell, September 1, 1866-February 28, 1867.  
John D. Defrees, March 1, 1867-April 14, 1869.

##### CONGRESSIONAL PRINTER

Almon W. Clapp, April 15, 1869-July 31, 1876.

##### PUBLIC PRINTERS

Almon W. Clapp, August 1, 1876-May 30, 1877.  
John D. Defrees, June 1, 1877-April 14, 1882.  
Sterling P. Rounds, April 15, 1882-September 12, 1886.  
Thomas Benedict, September 13, 1886-May 6, 1889.  
Frank W. Palmer, May 7, 1889-May 2, 1894.  
Thomas Benedict, May 3, 1894-March 30, 1897.  
Frank W. Palmer, March 31, 1897-September 8, 1905.  
O. J. Ricketts (Acting), September 9, 1905-November 27, 1905.  
Charles A. Stillings, November 28, 1905-February 5, 1908.  
William S. Rossiter (Acting), February 6, 1908-June 7, 1908.  
Capt. Henry T. Brian (Acting), June 8, 1908.  
John S. Leech, June 9, 1908-November 30, 1908.  
Samuel B. Donnelly, December 1, 1908-June 20, 1913.  
Cornelius Ford, June 20, 1913-April 4, 1921.  
George H. Carter, April 5, 1921-July 1, 1934.  
Augustus E. Giegengack, July 2, 1934-March 15, 1948.  
John J. Deviny (Acting), March 16, 1948-May 5, 1948.  
John J. Deviny, May 6, 1948-February 28, 1953.  
Philip L. Cole (Acting), March 1, 1953-April 27, 1953.  
Raymond Blattenberger, April 28, 1953-January 31, 1961.  
John M. Wilson (Acting), February 1, 1961-March 4, 1961.  
Felix E. Cristofane (Acting), March 7, 1961-March 17, 1961.  
James L. Harrison, March 17, 1961-March 31, 1970.  
Adolphus Nichols Spence II, April 1, 1970-January 11, 1972.  
Harry J. Humphrey (Acting), January 11, 1972-January 31, 1973.  
Thomas F. McCormick, March 1, 1973-November 1, 1977.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairmanship and vice chairmanship rotate by agreement between the Senate and House members of the Joint Committee, three each from the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Administration Committee. The vice chairman for the 95th Congress is Chairman Frank Thompson, Jr., of the House Administration Committee.

The committee has received a number of letters and other communications from citizens and organizations interested in this nomination, and without objection all of them will be made a part of the committee's file, available for public inspection, and listed only, rather than being printed in full, in the record. Where a position is taken for or against the nominee, that fact will be stated; and where questions are asked of the nominee, those questions will be stated.

[The following was received for the record:]

LETTERS IN SUPPORT OF NOMINEE

National Association of Printers and Lithographers, Henry F. Schiele, chairman of the board, New York, N.Y., dated October 4, 1977.

American Paper Institute, Inc., Louis F. Laun, New York, N.Y., dated October 5, 1977.

Graphic Arts Technical Foundation, Gilbert W. Bassett, executive director, Pittsburgh, Pa., Dated October 5, 1977.

International Typographic Composition Association, Charles W. Mulliken, executive director, Wash., D.C., dated October 5, 1977.

National Association of Litho Clubs, Inc., Paul R. Dennis, president, New York, N.Y., dated October 5, 1977.

Printing Industry of Metropolitan Washington, H. Wayne Warner, president, Wash., D.C., dated October 5, 1977.

Research and Engineering Council of the Graphic Arts Industry, Inc., Gordon O. F. Johnson, president, McLean, Va., dated October 5, 1977.

Washington Litho Club, Inc., James R. King II, president, Wash., D.C., dated October 5, 1977.

D.C. Commission on the Status of Women, Mrs. Imagene Stewart, member, Wash., D.C., dated October 6, 1977.

Graphic Arts Association of Delaware Valley, Walter E. Zerweck, Executive director, Philadelphia, Pa., dated October 6, 1977.

National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers, James E. Renson, executive director, Harrison, N.Y., dated October 6, 1977.

Printing Industries Association, Inc., Henry Henneberg, CAE, executive director, Los Angeles, Calif., dated October 6, 1977.

Printing Industries of Metropolitan New York, Inc., Paul L. Noble, president, New York, N.Y., dated October 6, 1977.

Hennage Creative Printers, Joseph H. Hennage, Wash., D.C., dated October 11, 1977.

National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers, Inc., James E. Renson, executive director, Harrison, N.Y., dated October 11, 1977.

Washington Club of Printing House Craftsmen, Inc., Alexander J. Matosian, president, Wash., D.C., dated October 11, 1977.

Franklin Technical Society, John F. Flood, Jr., president, Wash., D.C., dated October 17, 1977.

Printing Industries of Maryland, Inc., Arthur R. Stowe, executive director, Baltimore, Md., October 18, 1977.

LETTERS IN OPPOSITION TO NOMINEE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1977.

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON,  
*Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write you in opposition to the appointment of Mr. John J. Boyle as Public Printer of the Government Printing Office. In so doing, I join a number of civil rights and labor organizations, who have gone on record in opposition to Mr. Boyle's appointment.

Mr. Boyle presently serves as the Deputy Public Printer to Mr. Thomas F. McCormick. Under the McCormick/Boyle Administration, my office has received large volumes of complaints from constituents, labor unions, employee relations organizations, and employees of the Government Printing Office, in all divisions.

The track record of the McCormick/Boyle Administration is one of the poorest of any Federal Agency in the area of Affirmative Action and administrative personnel policies and practices. Their poor record has been cited by the Civil Service Commission, as well as the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

I believe a serious disservice to equal and fair job opportunity for all will result if Mr. Boyle is confirmed as The Public Printer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. FAUNTROY,  
*Member of Congress.*

Other letters received by the committee in opposition to the nomination, such letters retained in the committee files, are:

Federally Employed Women, Inc., Mae M. Walterhouse, national president, Wash., D.C., dated October 8, 1977.

American Federation of Government Employees, Kenneth T. Blaylock, national president, Wash., D.C., dated October 10, 1977.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a number of witnesses seeking to testify today, and for that reason I ask each of them to be as brief as possible, submitting their statements for printing in the record. All will be carefully considered by the committee when it makes its recommendation to the Senate.

Both Senator Mathias and Senator Sarbanes of the nominee's home State of Maryland have sent word to me regarding their endorsement and support of Mr. Boyle's nomination, but neither could be present with him this morning because of conflicting engagements.

We will submit their letters for the record.

[The following letter was received for the record:]

U.S. SENATE,  
*Washington, D.C., October 25, 1977.*

Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am delighted to support the nomination of John J. Boyle of Silver Spring, Maryland, to be United States Public Printer.

Mr. Boyle, who in earlier years served his apprenticeship in the private printing industry, brings to this position 25 years of valuable experience and increasing responsibility with the Government Printing Office. He has been Deputy Public Printer since June 1973.

His long career at GPO has enabled him to acquire special knowledge of its operations and insight into the vital process of coordination with federal agencies. This expertise will make John Boyle an especially effective Public Printer. It is a credit to his ability and dedication that John Boyle, the proofreader appointed to the Government Printing Office in 1952, now comes before this distinguished committee as the nominee for United States Public Printer. I enthusiastically endorse Mr. Boyle's nomination to be United States Public Printer.

Sincerely,

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,  
*U.S. Senator,*

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, D.C., October 13, 1977.*

Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON,  
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry that due to a conflict, I am unable to be present at your confirmation hearing for Mr. John J. Boyle, who has been nominated for the position of Public Printer at the Government Printing Office. Mr. Boyle is a resident of Maryland and has over twenty-five years of experience at the GPO. He is a recognized expert on modern techniques in printing, and he has been highly recommended to me for the position of Public Printer. I am impressed with his back-

ground and his extensive experience in the printing area and would urge your Committee to confirm his nomination.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

PAUL S. SARBANES,  
U.S. Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Griffin?

Senator GRIFFIN. I have no statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen?

Senator ALLEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Clark?

Senator CLARK. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Boyle, if you will step up to the stand, please.

The committee will be very happy to hear from you, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF JOHN J. BOYLE, NOMINEE FOR THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC PRINTER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a short statement that I offer for the record, and in the interest of time, with the chairman's permission, I will briefly highlight my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement will be made a part of the record in full and you may proceed.

[The following was received for the record:]

#### WRITTEN STATEMENT OF JOHN J. BOYLE, NOMINEE FOR THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC PRINTER OF THE UNITED STATES

It has been my privilege to have been associated with the printing industry nearly all of my working life. I started out in a small job shop and country weekly newspaper working after school and, with the exception of my service in the Army, have never been far from the smell of printer's ink. Before coming to the Government Printing Office I was fortunate to work in the commercial sector in a large job shop, in the composing room of a metropolitan daily newspaper, and in one of the largest printing plants in the country.

My career in the Government Printing Office progressed from proofreader to Technical Assistant to Superintendent of Composition; valuable experience as the Production Manager's representative on the Scheduling Committee where a broader picture of the production capabilities of the Office was obtained; original Superintendent of the Photocomposition facilities; Deputy Production Manager with responsibility for assisting in the management of the total plant production operations; and Production Manager with total responsibility for the management of the production operations; to my present position as Deputy Public Printer.

My four years as Deputy Public Printer have provided the opportunity to become deeply involved in the management of the total Office and I have participated in the management of the Production Department, together with the Customer Service, Printing Procurement, and the Quality Control and Technical Departments, and have worked closely with the department heads in the Financial, Personnel, Data Processing, and other administrative departments in addition to being involved in the operations of the Superintendent of Documents.

I have also played a major role in the planning of our budget and in the presentation of our appropriation to the Senate and House legislative appropriation subcommittees.

I have been deeply involved, since 1964, in the application of new technologies in the printing industry. I am extremely proud of the progress made by the Government Printing Office in the automation of typesetting. With the full support of the Joint Committee on Printing we have remained in the forefront of the printing industry and are acknowledged leaders in the use of computers in phototypesetting.

During the past four years the Government Printing Office has embarked on an equipment modernization program, with the full support of the Joint Committee on Printing, which has seen many improvements in our press and bindery operations

and which has contributed to a reduction in printing costs to Congress and the agencies. I believe that we have taken the steps to increase the quality of procured printing and we see noticeable improvement in our contract compliance.

I have been a part of improved management concepts including the implementation of zero based budgeting, management by objectives, and a modern electronic cost and production time collecting system.

We are all proud of the improved service to the public and Congress by our Documents Department which is the result of improvements in management practices and the use of modern automated data processing practices. The Depository Library program has been improved considerably in recent years and I believe in complete support of this program because of its importance to the government and the public in the dissemination of information.

I realize the importance of a viable labor/management program and will strive to continue to improve relations with the employees and their labor representatives consistent with the merit system of the civil service.

We presently have an affirmative action plan for improving the promotional opportunities of our minority employees and women which I support and will strive to improve. The GPO has made many advances in the improvement of the position of minorities and women as well as our handicapped employees but work remains to be done and we will not rest on past performance.

The Federal Printing Program of the Joint Committee on Printing has been and will continue to be supported vigorously with particular emphasis on long range reduction in field printing activities of the departments and agencies and procurement of that work which is commercially procurable from commercial sources by competitive bid throughout the region where the work originates.

If confirmed by the Senate, I plan to devote a major portion of my management effort of the GPO to reducing the cost of Federal printing by applying new technologies and increasing the productivity through better work methods, better tools, better training, and decreased administrative costs. I plan a concerted effort to reduce the exorbitant amount of overtime in certain production areas of the plant by smoothing the workflow and smoothing the present peaks and valleys by better control of the inplant, outside procurement decision.

A more cost effective, competitive GPO will insure the job security for our employees and at the same time permit us to procure on the commercial market that work which we are not equipped to do or on which we cannot meet the requested schedule.

I believe my 12 years in the private printing industry, together with my 26 years in the Government Printing Office, much of it in the management area, has qualified me to be Public Printer. My experience for the last 13 years in promoting the adoption of new technology in the GPO further qualifies me to equip the GPO for the future. I believe I have good rapport with the majority of the employees and I believe that I understand their concerns and recognize their problems better than anyone who has not worked with them for 26 years.

It is possible, and necessary, for the management of the Government Printing Office to operate the plant and its programs effectively while maintaining good working relations with the private printing industry, participating in their educational and research programs, and yet insuring full employment and excellent working conditions for our loyal employees.

This I pledge myself to do.

Mr. BOYLE. I have worked in the printing industry for 40 years, minus nearly 5 years of military service. Twelve of those years were spent in the private sector before coming to GPO. Twenty-five years have been spent in the GPO working in many areas throughout the Office in journeyman status and the last 4 years as Deputy Public Printer.

I have firsthand knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of the GPO.

I understand the concerns of the labor force as I had been an active member of the International Typographical Union for 27 years before being appointed Deputy Public Printer.

I have sympathy with the equal opportunity goals of the minorities and women and will, if confirmed, play an active role in

improving the opportunities for promotion, training, and advancement. I believe in the application of new technologies and will continue to make the Government Printing Office a leader in the use of new technologies in the Printing Office.

The Federal printing program will continue to be endorsed and supported by me.

I believe in a strong, modern, cost-effective Government Printing Office and will strive for resolving the labor problems and improving the working conditions for all employees by improving our communications and dispelling fears of being out of a job because of technological improvements.

I believe I meet the criteria of section 301, 44 U.S.C. of a suitable person, who must be a practical printer and versed in the art of bookbinding to take charge of and manage the Government Printing Office.

I am ready to answer any questions the members of the committee may have and I want to assure the chairman that I will always be available to testify before any committee of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are called upon to testify before any committee of the Congress, you will give that committee your honest opinion irrespective of the position that any incumbent administration might have at that time?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator Griffin, do you have some questions?

Senator GRIFFIN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that if Mr. Boyle is going to stand by during the remainder of the hearing, that I will defer questions until after we hear from other witnesses and then I may or may not have questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. Mr. Boyle, I have been somewhat familiar with your work over the last 8 or 9 years, kind of having been on the Joint Committee on Printing, and I have been impressed with your work, in the Printing Office.

Apparently, you have arisen from a proofreader up to Deputy, and the entire work being done there at the Government Printing Office is familiar to you, is it not?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

Senator ALLEN. You have been as Deputy Printer, you have participated in the management decisions of the Printing Office?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

Senator ALLEN. I am always impressed with the fine work that GPO does on printing the Congressional Record. We have midnight sessions and the next morning, 9 o'clock, 10 o'clock, you have a copy of the Record on every Senator's desk.

I am sure that the same is true over in the House, and I think in the printing of bills and committee reports, you do an outstanding job.

One complaint that I have heard from constituents is in the ordering of publications from the GPO, the long delay that sometimes takes place, delay of months, possibly, of some documents.

Do you have any plans to cut down on the lag time on your orders for Government publications?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, Senator, the long delay was really a fact 4 or 5 years ago.

Through better management methods and through quite a bit of automation, we have improved our turnaround time on the public sale of documents.

We have reduced the turnaround time down to 3 to 5 days on 90 percent of the publication orders.

The order is filled within 5 days and it has been a tremendous improvement.

This has been done by new warehouse facilities approved by the Joint Committee on Printing and a complete reorganization and automation of the order filling process.

We are at the norm of a mail-order house in complaints which is about 4 percent.

We have made great strides in the last few years. We are going to continue to work in that area because we have further automation projects in planning.

We have a problem remaining in subscriptions. We have not resolved all the problems of renewing subscriptions accurately and promptly but it is improving and it will continue to improve as we install new systems and procedures.

Senator ALLEN. You do realize the importance of that from the standpoint of—the public, satisfying their requirement for the extensive list of Government publications that are available for purchase?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

We believe that that is our public image and when we have a bad image before the public, we can do a lot of good things in the printing area that will be completely overlooked.

Senator ALLEN. You think that lag time has been cut down to 5 days to 1 week now?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

I have checked it yesterday to make sure and it is down. Ninety percent of the orders are filled within 4 or 5 days.

Senator ALLEN. What about the other 10 percent?

Mr. BOYLE. Some orders take more time because the orders themselves are improperly made out. The publications cannot be identified and they sometimes take quite a bit of research before they can be filled or the customer notified the publication is not available.

Senator ALLEN. When the Superintendent of Documents gets low on a publication, do you reprint those documents?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

If the publications are selling, or we are able to predict that the publication will continue to sell, we go back to press and restock for additional sales. There are times when we run out of stock and it is not economically feasible to go back to press to fill two or three orders. We then try to get those publications from the issuing agency, and most of the time we are able to do so.

Senator ALLEN. Have you not, throughout the country, established Government Printing Office stores in some of the larger cities?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir; we have as of now 24 bookstores located throughout the entire United States.

Senator ALLEN. I think that has been very helpful.

Mr. BOYLE. They are proving to be a success.

We are locating our bookstores in better locations and we are getting better response from the public because they are becoming aware that there are Government publications available in their particular city.

Senator ALLEN. What is the percentage of minority employment?

I believe minority employment is your majority employment.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir. Of the round figure of 8,000 employees in the entire Government Printing Office, including our field installations, about 56 percent are minorities.

Senator GRIFFIN. What does minority mean?

Mr. BOYLE. Fifty-two percent, I will say, are black minorities. We have other minorities.

Senator GRIFFIN. That is what I was wondering.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, I am not counting female employees in that sense.

Senator ALLEN. What about your promotion system?

Mr. BOYLE. We have an excellent promotion system that follows the Federal merit promotion plan. We have procedures that when there is a job vacancy, each employee applicant is first rated by his immediate supervisor on his past performances.

He then is rated by a rating panel on his past experience and qualifications for the position. We select what we believe to be and what we hope are the five highest ranked eligible candidates for the position. The selecting official then selects from one of those eligible candidates to fill the vacancy.

We feel that by following this procedure we are selecting the best qualified person for the job.

Senator ALLEN. You have many blacks in supervisory positions, do you not?

Mr. BOYLE. We have a number in the production area, in the plant itself. I do not think the minorities are satisfied. I, myself, am not satisfied with the number of minorities we have in supervisory positions.

We are working on improving these numbers. It takes a long time to turn over old trade union practices and craft practices where there were few women and very few minorities to select from.

We have increased the number of minorities in craft positions through our apprentice program. In the past, for a great number of years about 50 percent of the apprentices were minorities selected from within the office. They were given an opportunity to learn a trade and become a journeyman and from that journeyman position they now had a chance to be selected as a supervisor.

The numbers themselves are not impressive. I believe the impressive part, and I think the way we can show that we have been making progress is to compare where we are now with where we were 7 or 8 years ago.

No one is completely satisfied.

Senator ALLEN. You have made progress?

Mr. BOYLE. We have made progress.

Senator ALLEN. Now, the pay scale there in GPO, is probably the highest in the world, is it not?

Mr. BOYLE. Well, Mr. Allen, it is quite high. It is based upon—let us say in the past it was at one time based upon a formula which was an average of the wage scale prevailing in 25 large cities in the United States.

Of course, this formula changed a couple of times but the employees, the journeyman employees and the supporting employees, I believe, are paid well in comparison to the U.S. printing industry.

We are in a fairly high wage area in this Washington eastern corridor of the United States.

Senator ALLEN. The wage scale is not the highest in the country, then?

Mr. BOYLE. There are cities and areas in the country where certain crafts may be paid more per hour than in the Washington, D.C. area.

Senator ALLEN. But by and large, though?

Mr. BOYLE. By and large, I would say we compare favorably and on the high side with the average of the entire United States.

Senator ALLEN. You deal with some 18 and 19 unions?

Mr. BOYLE. A total of 19, yes, sir.

Senator ALLEN. That would make the work pretty difficult to negotiate with 19 different unions.

Mr. BOYLE. Surprisingly through our whole period of automation as it relates to printing and our attempts to automate the Government Printing Office, we have had full cooperation from every group. Not a single union has tried to hold back the automation, even though they had fears that this automation would eventually result in fewer jobs.

We have difficulties. I think the built-in adversary position of management and labor is always going to be there. We are not always going to agree on everything.

But I think most of our problems stem from not communicating and appearing as if we are trying to cover up something, when really it has not been done.

Senator ALLEN. How is the morale of the employees?

Mr. BOYLE. Generally, I would say the morale of the employees is high. We have some areas that are low. We have some areas now where there are certain crafts and certain supporting workers that have to be worried.

They know what is happening in the printing industry. The printing industry is under a terrific amount of turmoil. New equipment is being put in, new processes are being introduced whereby a great amount of work can be done with fewer employees. That has hurt morale.

We have two groups in particular that have quite a bit of concern. Other groups, the technologies are going to increase the amount of printing. That is the major difficulty that I see.

Senator ALLEN. I remember several years ago, I believe, in reading about where the GPO conducted bookmaking operations, things of that sort.

Is that still going on?

Mr. BOYLE. No, sir, I believe it is easier to go out to the store and get a Maryland lottery ticket than to bet the numbers in GPO.

Senator ALLEN. Now, being a Presidential appointee does not make this position a political position.

You operate a nonpolitical operation in GPO?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, we have a set of rules that we operate by.

We are completely governed by title 44 of the United States Code. We follow, and agree with the Joint Committee on Printing and Binding Regulations, so our hands are pretty well tied.

We are not political, and we are nonpolicy making. We are a service to the Congress and the executive agencies.

Senator ALLEN. What is the turnover rate at GPO?

Mr. BOYLE. The turnover rate, you have to look at it two ways. The turnover rate in the journeyman area is very, very low. The turnover rate in some of the nonskilled and clerical areas is probably about the same as the rest of the Government.

Across the board, we have some retirements, deaths, and people changing jobs, so our turnover rate is about 17 percent which includes part time, summer, and temporary employees.

Senator ALLEN. Per year?

Mr. BOYLE. Per year, but that is the total work force.

It is lower in some areas and higher in others.

Senator ALLEN. On the compensation for starting printers, what does an apprentice make and what would one of your top operators make?

Mr. BOYLE. The journeyman scales vary according to the craft. In numbers, the largest craft would be the composing craft, setting the type. Their basic wage right now, after the most recent wage adjustment, is \$10.78 per hour for a 40-hour week.

Senator ALLEN. How much per hour?

Mr. BOYLE. \$10.78 per hour.

Senator ALLEN. That is to begin with?

Mr. BOYLE. That is a journeyman.

The apprentice starting his first year of apprenticeship would be 55 percent of that, and he receives increases in increments of 10 percent until he completes his 4-year apprenticeship.

He earns a little over half of a journeyman's scale in the beginning.

Senator ALLEN. In nonsupervisory——

Mr. BOYLE. In nonsupervisory, in the journeyman area, \$10.78 per hour is the rate for a nonsupervisor compositor. The first level of supervision or any skilled work beyond the journeyman status would increase by a set percentage. We have a 3 percent increase level, a 5, a 10, a 15, and an assistant foreman gets 120 percent of the journeyman rate, the foreman gets 130 percent.

Above the foreman, supervisors go into a different pay system and it is equivalent to the pay schedule of the general services.

Senator ALLEN. Is there an opportunity to work overtime?

Mr. BOYLE. With the Congress in session there are many opportunities for overtime. Many of our people, during a heavy congressional session, will work 2 hours overtime nearly every afternoon and evening, and nearly every Saturday, and during the heavy preadjournment rushes of the Congress we have had people working 10, 11 hours a day for 13 consecutive days.

Senator ALLEN. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Clark.

Senator CLARK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Particularly, I am not on the Joint Committee on Printing, as several members are, but I am particularly favorably impressed with the idea of promoting somebody out of the ranks rather than having another political appointee for this position.

I did not realize, but Senator Allen indicated that you worked your way up all the way from a proofreader to your present nomination.

I think it is a good trend.

I wanted to ask you some questions, really further questions along the line that Senator Allen was asking.

As you know, there has been a good deal of controversy over the last few years and some resentment over management relations at the Government Printing Office—Senator Allen mentioned some of those, and I would like to ask you about some others.

It appeared much of the controversy centers around the Kiess Act and the interpretation of it.

Now, the Kiess Act provides wages for certain GPO crafts would be determined by "a conference between the Public Printer and a committee selected by the trades affected."

How do you generally interpret that provision—maybe before starting this job it would be well at least to get your own feelings about that impression.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, Senator Clark.

My interpretation has been influenced by the past history of the way the Kiess Act has operated.

The employee representatives were elected from each employee group and each one of the craft areas elected their own representatives.

Each representative had to be an employee in the Government Printing Office, working in that craft. There have been some previous Public Printers, who have had one meeting of the Public Printer and the employee committee and informed the committee what the wages were going to be.

In other times there have been two or three scheduled meetings.

I know the position of the labor unions and the craft is that—their interpretation of the Kiess Act is that this conference should be a collective-bargaining process. There should not be just a meeting with the Public Printer saying this is what the wage is going to be.

They believe the wages should be negotiated.

I think we have a problem with terminology in interpretation of the words. What is the interpretation of the word "conference"?

We have interpreted it different ways. What is the interpretation of compensation itself?

I know the stand taken by labor is that compensation is more than dollars and cents in a weekly or in a biweekly check. It is certain additional fringe benefits which can include health benefits, it can be social benefits, it can be death benefits, any kind of additional compensation that may be found in a union contract.

Senator CLARK. This is your interpretation of it?

Mr. BOYLE. My interpretation of the word "conference" allows for bargaining.

I have no problem with the words "collective bargaining."

We bargain collectively on nearly everything else but wages and one of the first things that I will do is look at the whole wage-setting process through the Kiess Act. It cannot continue to operate the way it is.

There is too much turmoil, and the final decision is eventually thrown on a very busy Senate and Congress through the Joint Committee on Printing.

We have to find a better way to set wages.

The first thing I will do is get together with all the unions and start to negotiate an interpretation that we can agree on of the Kiess Act. I think this is a reasonable approach.

Senator CLARK. Your predecessor, Public Printer McCormick, wrote as follows to the Joint Committee on Printing last July: "The Public Printer is not required by statute nor compelled by past practice to negotiate wages."

I gather from your immediate statement, preceding statement, that you have a different interpretation of the Kiess Act than that?

Mr. BOYLE. That is a strict interpretation that could literally come out of the words in the Kiess Act. In the past, wages have not been negotiated.

I have no trouble with the concept of negotiating or collective bargaining in my interpretation of the word "conference."

Senator CLARK. You believe that the Kiess Act requires the Public Printer to bargain in good faith with the craft representatives as a private employer would have to bargain with its employees, at least that is what I hear you saying.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, I do not believe that we can continue to set wages without appearing to operate in the dark or arbitrarily without some form of collective bargaining.

Senator CLARK. Let me ask another area: I have a couple of other areas.

One is discussion with the GPO about subcontracting.

What percentage of the GPO's work is actually performed by private contractors?

Mr. BOYLE. If we look at the total dollar—and the only thing I have, that I can easily put my finger on, is the dollar amount.

Senator CLARK. I think that is the best.

Mr. BOYLE. That is what we are talking about, not volume.

It is too hard to put a finger on volume. In round figures the total dollar income of the GPO this past fiscal year was approximately \$500 million. Of that total figure, part of the work is done in plant, part of the work is done in our field printing offices of which we have five, and the balance is contracted for by competitive bid contracts throughout the entire printing industry.

Senator CLARK. What percentage?

Mr. BOYLE. It looks like about 65 or 67 percent, somewhere in that area. That would be 35/65; 35 inside and 65 percent will be contracted outside.

Senator CLARK. Two-thirds of all Government printing?

Mr. BOYLE. About \$300 million, a little over \$300 million will be purchased from the commercial market on competitive bids.

Senator CLARK. That surprises me.

I did not realize that two-thirds of the Government printing is not done by the GPO.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes.

Senator CLARK. Is that increasing or decreasing?

Mr. BOYLE. Since the establishment of the Federal printing program which goes back about 7 or 8 years ago, we established with the approval and direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 14 regional printing procurement offices located throughout the entire United States. These regional printing procurement offices were established to buy printing for Federal agencies that originated within that region, and which was to be delivered in that region, and purchased from printers within that region.

This work had never before been performed in the Government Printing Office. It was work that was done in the authorized agency field plants or contracted for by the individual agencies.

Now, we picked up that work. Last year it would amount to about \$147 million of the \$300 million of work purchased. This work was never in the Government Printing Office and would never have come in there if we had not established the regional purchasing offices.

Senator CLARK. My question is, whether that percentage is increasing or decreasing over the last few years, the percentage of outside work?

Mr. BOYLE. The volume stays about the same, the dollar amount varies. I will tell you why.

It varies mostly because of fluctuations in the price that we pay for the printing.

In a low—let us say, low-price year, the ratio of outside work will go down.

Senator CLARK. So you would not have—it is not a trend involved.

In other words, 20 or 30 years ago you would have been printing just as much?

Mr. BOYLE. We would only be printing about a third of the work, leaving out the increase in the amount of Federal printing through the RPPO's the ratio would have been the same.

We have been——

Senator CLARK. Percentage of outside work would have been the same?

Mr. BOYLE. Percentage of outside would have been the same, particularly if you rule out the RPPO's.

Senator CLARK. The last question in that area: Can the Government print its own documents cheaper than having them farmed out?

Mr. BOYLE. You have to look at a particular job.

It is not accurate to say broadly that the printing industry is producing printing at less cost than a particular job can be done in the GPO.

It varies according to circumstances. It varies according to availability of equipment at the time we bid the job.

It will also be affected when there is an abundance of press time in the private printing industry when the printers actually bid at almost cost, or even below cost to keep from sending their people home from work.

On the norm, when we look at it, we see that the Government Printing Office, on our scale of prices, would fall in the midrange of the high-low bid on the average Government job.

Senator CLARK. Do you think that the trend is a fairly good one?

You tend to agree with the amount of work that is being done inside-outside?

Mr. BOYLE. Well, the majority of it, Senator, is not controllable. Let me give you examples.

We are not equipped to do any four-color, five-color work. We do not have any of these type of presses. All of that work must be produced commercially.

We are not equipped to do any multiform work which is purchased from the business forms type, specialty type industry. We are not able to do any marginally punch—

Senator CLARK. You really farm out those things that you are not equipped to do?

Mr. BOYLE. We farm out everything that we are not equipped to do plus what we cannot do in-house and meet the schedule.

Senator CLARK. Fine.

Well, I see there is an OMB circular A-76. Are you aware of that?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir.

Senator CLARK. It calls for a decrease in the use of private firms for Government work?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir. By adjusting some of the costing factors.

Senator CLARK. Does that make sense to you?

Mr. BOYLE. It does, but the problem with the GPO is that we cannot even now buy all of the work that we should be buying because of no capacity.

We are in an overtime situation when Congress is in session. Our printers in the composing room in fiscal 1976 worked 600,000 hours of overtime.

In the total plant that year we had nearly 900,000 hours of overtime. Why so much overtime?

We cannot find the commercial printing firm that can meet these schedules. We cannot even do all the work that has to be done in-house without overtime.

Senator CLARK. Let me ask you about another area that Senator Allen discussed briefly.

He mentioned the fact or asked questions about the fact that the number of minorities that are being hired by the Government Printing Office, and I think your answer to that was 54 percent is black?

Mr. BOYLE. 54 percent of our total employment.

Senator CLARK. You are aware, I am sure, that there have been allegations that the GPO has failed to provide equal employment opportunities; specifically women and minorities, and handicapped are mentioned.

I notice in the testimony that is being presented today, two different testimonies, Ed Donahue, the vice president of the Graphic Arts International Union, states in his testimony and I quote—I will just ask you to answer this—he says:

"At the present time the overall work force of GPO is composed of approximately 53 percent minority employees while the supervisory force at GPO is virtually all white male."

Before answering that, the committee also received a letter from May Whetthouse, who is national president of the Federally Employed Women, Inc., and she stated that the GPO "has a history of discriminating against women and minorities."

Do you think this kind of discrimination exists?

Mr. BOYLE. No, I do not think the allegation is fair. We have a good number, an increasing number of black supervisors in the production areas.

In fact, we just recently promoted, just a few weeks ago, a black assistant superintendent in the Electronic Photocomposition Division. We have a foreman in the offset negative section. We have 26 black supervisors in craft supervisory positions compared with 4 in 1970.

The numbers do not look good because of the comparison of a total of 8,000—

Senator CLARK. I cannot hear you.

Mr. BOYLE. I say, the numbers of black supervisors do not look good when you compare them with 54 percent of minorities in the total work force of approximately 8,000.

I do not know that the day will ever come when we are going to have 54 percent of the supervisors in the plant that are minority.

I will not sit here and say that it is going to happen under my administration.

Senator CLARK. What would you guess it is now, 32 percent?

Mr. BOYLE. I would hate to take a guess because it varies from area to area.

There are areas without a single black person. There are areas that are predominantly black without a black supervisor.

Senator CLARK. Maybe you could provide those for the record.

Mr. BOYLE. I could provide the figures for the record.

[The following was received for the record:]

GPO BLACK EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS, ALL PAY PLANS—1977

	Number	Percent
Total employment .....	7,793	100.0
Black employees .....	3,992	51.2
Other employees .....	3,801	48.8

GPO BLACK SUPERVISOR<sup>1</sup> STATISTICS, ALL PAY PLANS—1977

	Number	Percent
Total supervisors .....	388	100
Black supervisors .....	129	33
Other supervisors .....	259	67

<sup>1</sup> Includes all supervisory and supervisory-managerial positions except 15 department and service heads.

Senator CLARK. You mention, in answer to Senator Allen, that you were not totally satisfied. I must say that I am not back in my own office, with the situation with regard to minorities.

What kind of affirmative action programs do you have?

Mr. BOYLE. We have an affirmative action program, Senator, that has been sent to the Civil Service Commission and approved by the Civil Service Commission. It does not have numbers. It has goals that in some areas we hope we can meet.

In some areas we have been successful but we cannot meet the goal of promoting somebody when the anticipated job vacancy does not occur.

Senator CLARK. Have you been involved in that program as Deputy?

Mr. BOYLE. Every supervisor in the Office is involved in that program, Senator.

Senator CLARK. Is there anything that you would do differently that you are now doing as the Public Printer?

Mr. BOYLE. I would, and I think it has to be done, I would take a more personal active role in it, and I am not saying an active role has not been taken by management in the past.

I think the two major problems that have to be overcome in the years ahead is better labor relations and a better minority employee advancement opportunity.

Senator CLARK. I think that is a very forthright statement and I appreciate you for it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BOYLE. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Boyle, to follow up on that point.

What is the situation with respect to handicapped employees and do you have an affirmative action program with respect to handicapped?

Mr. BOYLE. Well, we are developing, Senator Cannon, a formal affirmative action program for the handicapped. We have approximately, right now, 110 deaf employees.

Most of them are in the composing division. We have other handicapped scattered throughout the Office. We recently received a letter of commendation from the Civil Service Commission for our employment of the handicapped.

I think the deaf in the composing division are the majority now.

They recognize a problem right now and that is with our automation programs. The areas that they are working in would be mostly on linotype machines—we have 60 deaf keyboard operators. They are going to have to be retrained. We are going to have to train them in some other skills and there are some areas, particularly in the proofreading area, where retraining is difficult, if not impractical.

The inability to speak and hear almost rules that retraining area out. That is a very large area.

We have a program that we will do everything possible to retrain all of the handicapped people so that nobody will be hurt in the automation program.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Hatfield?

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have extended an hour this morning so that the committee is going to be able to meet until 12 o'clock, and I count seven other people who have come to be witnesses this morning, and we have a little over an hour left.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Pell.

Senator PELL. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of specific questions that I would like to ask and I support the nomination of Mr. Boyle.

I am sure that he will do a fine job, but I also am concerned with the issues that have been raised, the questions of minority, handicapped, women.

I am wondering if your view is that when you bargain with the employee unions, that you should not only include wages but should the fringe benefits be included in the package or should they be separate?

As you know, most wage negotiations is all one ball of wax.

Mr. BOYLE. Senator, we are restricted somewhat. The wages are set under the Kiess Act, a section in title 44.

The balance of the negotiations on working conditions and agreements are negotiated by what we call memorandums of understanding. These are negotiated under a different internal instruction and we would have to have a change in language or a different interpretation of title 44, in order to do what private industry does and that is negotiate an entire package, a give-and-take package of rules, working conditions, fringe benefits, and money.

We have to separate them now so we really have two different negotiations.

Senator PELL. But this is a matter of interpretation and it would be possible for you to interpret the laws so as to negotiate under two different acts, negotiate simultaneously?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, it may be possible.

Senator PELL. And my own view is that it would be a good idea. What is your view?

Mr. BOYLE. If confirmed, I am going to take a look at the entire area of the negotiations.

I do not like it the way it is.

Senator PELL. I agree with you on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Might I say to the Senator, if he feels that the negotiations, whatever is negotiated comes back to the Joint Committee on Printing, the Joint Committee may or may not approve the negotiations.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

In connection with the negotiations, do you consider yourself, the council of unions, to be an appropriate agent for the negotiations or can you imagine some other group developing?

Mr. BOYLE. No, I think it is better for the council of unions and the Government Printing Office to have one acceptable group for the major negotiations.

It is much better than negotiating with 19 different groups.

Senator PELL. Also, do you consider the technological improvement should be subject to negotiation?

Mr. BOYLE. Again, we come back to a definition of negotiation.

We try to keep the unions informed but we may not always do it through oversight, lack of communications.

We have agreed to keep the unions informed in advance of the acquisition of any new equipment and new processes.

We try to get their input and even at some times get agreement over the way that people will be trained on that equipment. This is usually incorporated into labor-management agreements that we have.

There is a certain stopping point, I think, that we have to all agree that management has got to stop at the point that they are going to be able to manage, and it cannot be put in the hands of a committee.

Somebody has to take the final responsibility. We give and take, but somebody has to make the final decision.

A decision has to be made that is fair to the employees and in the best interests of the Government.

Senator PELL. Finally, we touched on the question of minorities by race, blacks, and also the handicapped.

What is the situation in regard to women?

Do you happen to recall what percentage of women and female employees is—how many female supervisors are there, and so forth?

Mr. BOYLE. Senator, in the production area, it is very low.

One of the reasons it is very low is that there has not been many women to select from.

They are in competition with males that have been in the printing industry for 30 and 40 years. It is difficult.

There is an improvement in other areas of the Office.

But the numbers right now, I do not have the numbers. I can present them for the record, but they do not look good.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

I would appreciate your putting it in the record.

[The following material was submitted by Mr. Boyle:]

GPO EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS BY SEX—ALL PAY PLANS—1977

	Number	Percent
Total employment .....	7,793	100.0
Female employees .....	2,208	28.4
Male employees .....	5,585	71.6

GPO SUPERVISOR<sup>1</sup> STATISTICS BY SEX—ALL PAY PLANS—1977

	Number	Percent
Total supervisors .....	388	100.0
Female supervisors .....	60	15.4
Male supervisors .....	328	84.6

<sup>1</sup> Includes all supervisory and supervisory-managerial positions except 15 department and service heads.

Senator PELL. Do you have any thoughts with regard to the facts in this regard?

Can there be improvement in these numbers?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, there can be improvement.

None of us are going to be satisfied with the numbers that we have right now.

We are going to have to continually strive to get the people in the lower paying areas, in the nonskilled area, and try to break them into the higher skilled areas and it takes training. It takes cooperation, because a lot of times we may be violating our own union agreements and we get into a jurisdictional problem of train-

ing people in one area and crossing into an area that a different union claims jurisdiction.

There are problems but it can be improved and I expect to make improvements.

I am going to make myself very active in this area of affirmative action.

Senator PELL. And, finally, when you bind books, documents in leather, which you do occasionally, are they done in your own shop or are those contracted out?

Mr. BOYLE. All of the very beautiful archival books, the case bound books that we see bound for the Senate and the House and for the Members and for the Archives, are done by very highly skilled bookbinders that work today as they worked 150, 200 years ago. Very highly skilled.

Senator PELL. In-house?

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir, in-house.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Boyle.

If you will just step aside——

Senator GRIFFIN. Could I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator GRIFFIN. Mr. Boyle, is there any mandatory retirement requirement in GPO at the present time? Mandatory retirement?

Mr. BOYLE. Mandatory retirement, only the Civil Service mandatory retirement at 70 years, which can be extended by the President for specific reasons on a year-to-year basis.

Senator GRIFFIN. Would that apply to executives as well?

Mr. BOYLE. It applies throughout the entire Government Printing Office. There is a mandatory retirement of 70 years. I believe we have two people right now that are on a Presidential extension year by year, working beyond 70 years.

Senator GRIFFIN. The problem of getting more blacks into supervisory positions is part of the problem. You cannot do anything about it until you have an opening, isn't that correct?

Mr. BOYLE. First of all, you have to have an opening and then the person that you are going to promote has got to be qualified for that opening and he has to compete with other qualified people.

Senator GRIFFIN. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Jord H. Jordan, Jr., chairman of the board, Printing Industries of America, Inc.

**TESTIMONY OF JORD H. JORDAN, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA, INC.; ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN F. GRANT, DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

Mr. JORDAN. In the interest of time, I will only take about 4 or 5 minutes. But I would like to introduce my colleague, Mr. John Grant, director of Government affairs of the Printing Industries of America, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jord H. Jordan, Jr. I am the president of the Jordan Business Forms Co. in Charlotte, N.C. I also serve as chairman of the board for the Printing Industries of America.

As you know, PIA is the largest graphic arts trade association in the world. Its over 8,000 members are organized into a federation of regional, State, and city affiliates comprising every aspect of graphic arts production.

Our industry is unique. Let me explain. The aggregate sales volume of the commercial printing industry totals approximately \$38 billion. Of this figure, PIA members account for over 75 percent of the sales throughout the United States and employ approximately 350,000 highly skilled craftsmen. A significant portion of Government material is produced by our members in the industry under contract.

While the industry ranks first in the number of individual printing establishments (over 42,000) among the leading 20 manufacturing industries in the United States, and seventh in the total dollar volume payroll, it is important to remember that the printing industry is essentially an industry of small businesses. Over 33,000 of all the printing companies in the United States consist of 20 or fewer employees.

Consequently, it is important to remember that when one thinks of the printing industry, one is not talking about giant corporations with multibillion dollar payrolls, but of essentially small family-owned and operated companies, stretched across the length and breadth of the United States.

Unique to both our industry and the Government as well is the Government Printing Office which is undoubtedly the largest printing and service plant in the world. The Government Printing Office is a large and complex operation. It will bill approximately \$500 million for printing and binding services in this fiscal year, and realize another \$45 million through the sale of Government publications.

In addition to its central office facility, which is by far the largest printing production plant in our Nation, the GPO operates 6 satellite printing plants, 14 regional procurement offices, and 24 bookstores throughout the country. Its payroll for 8,500 employees exceeds \$150 million annually. The magnitude of its internal production is phenomenal. This year it will process an estimated 440,000 printing and binding orders, 5 million sales orders and sell 85 million individual publications. In addition to distributing 12 million publications to the Depository Libraries, it will distribute 70 million publications for other agencies and departments.

I have given this little background on the industry and the GPO to put in perspective the important nomination that is before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today to strongly recommend that your committee take favorable action on the nomination of John J. Boyle to be the next Public Printer of the United States and urge that this committee recommend that the Senate advise and consent to his appointment.

Mr. Boyle has been well known to our association for many years. He is a nationally recognized expert in the field of electronic composition. Because he has been primarily responsible for the implementation of new technology at the GPO, our members have sought him out at seminars and symposia so that he could impart his knowledge to industry at large. Mr. Boyle's background is

indeed an exemplary one including service with distinction in the military during World War II.

Mr. Boyle began his career as a linotype operator with private printing companies in his native Pennsylvania. He entered Government service at the GPO over 25 years ago and rose quickly through the ranks to attain the position of Special Assistant to the Production Manager for Electronic Printing in 1964. It was in this capacity that Mr. Boyle brought the GPO into the 20th century. He was appointed Deputy Public Printer in 1973 and has been responsible for the establishment of the Electronic Photocomposition Division and for the implementation of the GPO's linotron system.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to remind this committee of the difficulties that were experienced by the constituent agencies and the consuming public in their dealings with the Government Printing Office until just a few years ago, which was brought out by Senator Allen earlier.

Since becoming Deputy Public Printer, Mr. Boyle has worked on a daily basis to correct these deficiencies. Through his efforts, backlogs are now at their lowest point in 50 years, and shipments once subject to long delays are now on a current basis.

While devoting most of his waking hours to improve governmental efficiency and modernization, Mr. Boyle has found the time to retain his active membership in several organizations that are dedicated to increased craftsmanship and the implementation of new technology.

The law specifies that the Public Printer of the United States shall be a "practical printer." Mr. Boyle fills that requirement in every regard. On behalf of the Printing Industries of America, I strongly urge the approval of his nomination.

Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Jordan, for a very fine statement.

Senator Hatfield?

Senator HATFIELD. I have no questions.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen?

Senator ALLEN. I pass.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Clark?

Senator CLARK. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, gentlemen, we appreciate your being here.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, sir.

[The written statement of Mr. Jordan follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF JORD H. JORDAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE  
PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jord H. Jordan, Jr. I am the President of the Jordan Business Forms Company in Charlotte, North Carolina. I also serve as Chairman of the Board for the Printing Industries of America. As you know, PIA is the largest graphic arts trade association in the world. Its over 8,000 members are organized into a federation of regional, state and city affiliates comprising every aspect of graphic arts production.

Our industry is unique. Let me explain. The aggregate sales volume of the commercial printing industry totals approximately 38 billion dollars. Of this figure, PIA members account for over 75 percent of the sales throughout the United States and employ approximately 350,000 highly-skilled craftsmen. A significant portion of

government material is produced by our members in the industry under contract. While the industry ranks first in the number of individual printing establishments (over 42,000) among the leading twenty manufacturing industries in the United States, and seventh in total dollar volume payroll, it is important to remember that the printing industry is essentially an industry of small businesses. Over 33,000 of all the printing companies in the United States consist of 20 or fewer employees. Consequently, it is important to remember that when one thinks of the printing industry, one is not talking about giant corporations with multi-billion dollar payrolls, but of essentially small family-owned and operated companies, stretched across the length and breadth of the United States.

Unique to both our industry and the government as well is the Government Printing Office which is undoubtedly the largest printing and service plant in the world. The Government Printing Office is a large and complex operation. It will bill approximately \$500 million for printing and binding services in this fiscal year and realize another \$45 million through the sale of government publications. In addition to its central office facility, which is by far the largest printing production plant in our nation, the GPO operates six satellite printing plants, fourteen regional procurement offices and 24 book stores throughout the country. Its payroll for 8,500 employees exceeds \$150 million annually. The magnitude of its internal production is phenomenal. This year it will process an estimated 440,000 printing and binding orders, 5 million sales orders and sell 85 million individual publications. In addition to distributing 12 million publications to the Depository Libraries, it will distribute 70 million publications for other agencies and departments.

I have given this little background on the industry and the GPO to put in perspective the important nomination that is before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today to strongly recommend that your committee take favorable action on the nomination of John J. Boyle to be the next Public Printer of the United States and urge that this committee recommend that the Senate advise and consent to his appointment.

Mr. Boyle has been well known to our association for many years. He is a nationally recognized expert in the field of electronic composition. Because he has been primarily responsible for the implementation of new technology at the GPO, our members have sought him out at seminars and symposia so that he could impart his knowledge to industry at large. Mr. Boyle's background is indeed an exemplary one including service with distinction in the military during World War II.

Mr. Boyle began his career as a linotype operator with private printing companies in his native Pennsylvania. He entered government service at the GPO over 25 years ago and quickly rose through the ranks to attain the position of Special Assistant to the Production Manager for Electronic Printing in 1964. It was in this capacity that Mr. Boyle brought the GPO into the 20th Century. He was appointed Deputy Public Printer in 1973 and has been responsible for the establishment of the Electronic Photocomposition Division and for the implementation of the GPO's Linotron System.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to remind this committee of the difficulties that were experienced by the constituent agencies and the consuming public in their dealings with the Government Printing Office until just a few years ago. Since becoming Deputy Public Printer, Mr. Boyle has worked on a daily basis to correct these deficiencies. Through his efforts, backlogs are now at their lowest point in 50 years and shipments once subject to long delays are now on a current basis.

While devoting most of his waking hours to improving governmental efficiency and modernization, Mr. Boyle has found the time to retain his active membership in several organizations that are dedicated to increased craftsmanship and the implementation of new technology.

The law specifies that the Public Printer of the United States shall be a "practical printer." Mr. Boyle fills that requirement in every regard. On behalf of the Printing Industries of America, I strongly urge the approval of his nomination.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. Paul G. Zurkowski, Information Industry Association.

#### TESTIMONY OF PAUL G. ZURKOWSKI, INFORMATION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION, BETHESDA, MD.

Mr. ZURKOWSKI. Good morning. It is a pleasure to be here. I have a statement that I submitted to the committee, which I would like to have included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of the record, Mr. Zurkowski.

[The written statement of Mr. Zurkowski follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PAUL G. ZURKOWSKI, PRESIDENT, INFORMATION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

My name is Paul G. Zurkowski, President of the Information Industry Association, 4720 Montgomery Lane, Bethesda, Md. The Information Industry Association is a trade association of commercial firms engaged in the creation and marketing of information products, services and systems at the production, distribution and retail levels. We appear for three purposes:

First, to support the nomination of Mr. John J. Boyle to be Public Printer of the United States.

Second, to seek your assistance—and Mr. Boyle's—in assuring the development of a badly-needed partnership between government and the information industry in this, the information age.

Third, to ask that Mr. Boyle make it a priority item to correct the mismanagement of a major GPO program—mismanagement which is working a hardship in our industry, the public at large, and the GPO itself.

On the first point, Mr. Boyle's record speaks for itself. His experience particularly qualifies him for the position of Public Printer.

On the second point, we are most interested in involving Mr. Boyle and in identifying his ideas relevant to the development of a new partnership between government and industry in the information age. We believe the months and years ahead will bring with them significant new developments in information technologies and in the operation of the national and international markets for information. These developments will seriously impact the Government Printing Office and the role of the Public Printer. We feel it is important that the Committee, the Congress and the American people learn through these hearings the views and attitudes of the person who will have to respond to these developments.

We believe a partnership is needed since the task of making government information suitably and widely available to the public transcends the resources of government or industry alone. Yet the need for the people in a democracy to obtain access to the documents of the government on which their governance is based is central to the success of our form of government.

That partnership depends on a clear understanding of the relationship and a certainty as to the rules to be followed in each sector's performance of those functions best suited to it.

It is the Public Printer's responsibility to initially print government materials. The vast increase in these resources has caused many private companies to develop services to help citizens penetrate the large mass of materials: Infordata International has published an index to government periodicals; U.S. Historical Documents Institute has published a cumulative index to the monthly catalog; Congressional Information Service has indexed and microfilmed the publications of the U.S. Congress.

Many other firms are engaged in every subject field in assisting citizens to gain access to printed materials produced by government agencies.

This has resulted in a de facto partnership with GPO printing and making initial distribution of materials for other government agencies and with private firms complementing those activities by organizing, abstracting, indexing, republishing in print or microform, and distributing government materials in logical arrangements and editions. Not only is the government information more widely distributed, but it also is made more useful to businessmen, librarians, scientists, administrators and others.

This partnership, based on 1st Amendment freedom of the press provisions, is almost unique in the world and provides Americans unparalleled sources of information about their government and its relation to them.

On the third point, the integrity of this partnership has been severely undermined by the approach the GPO has taken to the application of microfilm to its responsibilities to initially print government materials.

We recognize that the GPO micropublishing program is subject to the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing and it is not to question the program authorized by JCP that we appear.

Nor do we oppose the government getting into micropublishing. We are opposed, however, to mismanagement of government micropublishing. We hope that as you are informed of the way in which the program has been managed you too will be

dissatisfied and that you, on behalf of the Congress and the American people, will wish to have specific assurances that careful and proper management procedures are installed by the new Public Printer.

Let us deal first with the question of computer output microfilm. As the General Accounting Office report detailed, there are great advantages to be derived from, in effect, by-passing the traditional ink-on-paper process and substituting for that an alternative printing medium—microfilm generated directly from machine-readable information files. The benefits of this program are largely internal to the government and have only a minor secondary impact on libraries or other non-federal government activities. The same cannot be said for micropublishing based on the filming of ink-on-paper materials previously printed by GPO.

There is not the duplication of effort, not a substitution. The microfilm product duplicates rather than replaces the ink-on-paper printing effort. It compounds the record keeping problem because there are now two documents to keep track of, one on paper and one on film.

Micropublishing of previously printed materials is not primarily for internal government benefit, but is designed to provide additional, new services for the non-government sector.

Furthermore, where the government is producing materials via COM primarily for internal government purposes, there is no possible conflict with private companies since none are in position to provide government such services from the outside. The use of private service-bureau capabilities to produce the microfilm is indeed a desirable reliance on the private sector.

Such is not the case when ink-on-paper materials are microrepublished similarly for non-government purposes, however. In this case, the decision of government to micropublish materials that are already being microrepublished in the private sector is directly competitive with the companies already providing such service to the non-government sector. The use of private service-bureau capabilities to do the filming does not change the fact of competition.

These rudimentary facts must be taken into account if the government/private sector partnership is to prove workable. Unless some credence is given to private sector efforts in determining what government will and will not do, the risk for private sector involvement becomes too great and the full burden of disseminating essential government information will fall to government. A democracy dependent on a sole source of information will face serious problems.

Sound micropublishing programs, similar to the MINICATS program for the Federal Catalog Systems publications in microforms, require (1) careful planning, (2) the participation of all affected interests and (3) close, knowledgeable supervision.

It is the burden of these remarks that the GPO Micropublishing program has lacked these three essential management ingredients and, as a result, has been grossly mismanaged—Congress, libraries, microprinting contractors and private micropublishing firms have been misled and poorly served as a result.

*Item I: Micropublishing of the Code of Federal Regulations, the subject of the pilot project on which expanded micropublishing authority was sought, has been suspended.*

For almost half a decade the library community has been told the CFR and other publications like it will be provided in microform by GPO. Publication has now been suspended. At the completion of the pilot project, the results were submitted to the four government members of then dormant Micropublishing Advisory Council for comment. At least two of these four submitted comments were critical of the CFR pilot project. No weight was given these comments nor were they shared with the JCP. The subsequent decision to suspend publication of the CFR in microform raises the inference that the comments deserved consideration or that the sustained publication in microform of a large complex file like CFR exceeds the abilities of the GPO in this area.

In either event, it illustrates questionable management practices; practices calling for much more careful planning, the full involvement of the interested communities and closer and more knowledgeable supervision of the program.

*Item II: The Request for Proposals to microfilm the CFR grossly exceeded the pilot project's requirements and misled all bidders as to the level of microfilming to be done.*

The following graph illustrates how grossly the Request for Proposals overstated the pilot program requirements.

	Amount needed for pilot program	Amount contracted for by GPO
Number of pages to be filmed.....	63,000	490,000
Number of masters to be made.....	650	5,000
Number of duplicates to be distributed.....	14,000	10,990,000
Estimated costs.....	\$25,000	\$664,000

To the best of our knowledge no microfilming other than the CFR was performed under this contract.

The terms of the contract unduly raised the expectations of the contractor as to the volume of work it could expect and distorted the base the contractor had for determining his unit price. It also suggested to the library community that a vastly expanded program was in the immediate offing.

It is further evidence of loose management in the program.

*Item III: Express conditions set forth by the Public Printer in letters to the Joint Committee on Printing requesting authority to proceed with the pilot project have been abrogated repeatedly in the management of the program.*

On the first page of his November 14, 1974, letter to the JCP, the Public Printer acknowledged "the legitimate concerns of the Information Industry Association."<sup>1</sup>

At page 14 of the proposal the Public Printer outlined "broad criterion with respect to future microform conversions."

At page 15 the proposal assures "Early notification of the intentions of GPO to the Information Industry Association and other interested parties," and also at page 15, the proposal states the Micropublishing Advisory Council will be expanded "to include appropriate membership from the Depository Library community and the Information Industry Association."

On the basis of these assurances that the expertise and knowledge of the industry would be available to assist in thinking the program through, IIA added its support to the pilot project.

None of these conditions has been observed in the management of the program.

The Advisory Council has not been expanded nor has "appropriate representation" for either the Depository Library community or the information industry been provided. Instead we have received a request for the names of three candidates. A similar letter has gone to the National Micrographics Association. We have now learned it is the intention of the Public Printer to choose one industry member from among those six to be nominated. Since the manager of the micropublishing activity within GPO until recently was treasurer of NMA, it is quite unlikely the one industry representative will be an information industry representative. The decision to select "one" representative is patently not "appropriate" representation in view of the fact that government would continue to have four representatives. (It was our understanding the "appropriate representation" meant equal representation for industry and libraries on the Advisory Committee; equal to the representation of the government. Such an advisory committee has a responsibility to the Congress as well as to the Public Printer. If the Advisory Committee continues to be made up primarily of government representatives, its ability to fulfill its responsibilities to the Congress will continue to be limited by self-imposed restrictions borne out of a fear of being criticized for lobbying.)

The broad criterion set forth to guide future microform conversions were completely ignored in the July, 1977, request for new authority based on the "successful" completion of the pilot study.

The "Early notification" assurance likewise has not been forthcoming. The outline of the requested new authority was submitted to the Joint Committee in July, 1977, and an IIA request for a copy was denied. The new request for authority completely ignored these earlier commitments.

In summary, Congress was told when it approved the pilot project that: the industry would be notified as the program developed; "appropriate" representation would be included in the Advisory Council; and a channel to the Joint Committee would be provided for the resolution of differences over the program.

<sup>1</sup> At page 3 of his June 20, 1974, report to the Joint Committee on the pilot project the Public Printer stated, "The intention of the GPO is to minimize the duplication of offerings made by commercial micropublishers."

On the basis of these assurances, in the absence of complaints coming through such channels, Congress could assume the program was being managed fairly and soundly.

In fact, however, the program has not operated in this fashion. The result is that great uncertainty has been raised about what the government will do in this and what it is economically feasible for the private sector to do.

The essential partnership between government and the private sector has been badly disrupted by the management of the micropublishing program.

We, accordingly, urge the committee to obtain specific assurances from the nominee as to his plans for the management of this and related printing-qua-publishing activities at GPO. Only where the ground rules are known and adhered to can the private sector make the investments necessary to a full and vibrant partnership so essential to our system of government.

Attachments.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
*Washington, D.C., November 14, 1974.*

CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,  
*U.S. Senate Post Office,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government Printing Office has completed planning and investigative efforts necessary to undertake a microform pilot program in support of the Depository Library community. It is requested authority be granted to undertake such a pilot program to explore the advisability and practicality of further Government Printing Office microform activity. It is estimated the program will cost \$25,000 and is to be funded through the Depository Library Program of the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses Appropriation.

As the test vehicle in the pilot project, it is planned to convert the Code of Federal Regulations to a standard 98 frame nominal 24:1 reduction ratio microfiche format for distribution to some twenty Depository Libraries for a period of four months.

Purpose of the pilot program will be to explore the adequacy of indexing and bibliographic controls, quality of film manufacture through commercial procurement sources, speed of production and distribution, and the advisability of continued film conversion efforts. The program will include an economic analysis which will be provided the Joint Committee on Printing with the overall results of the project.

The preliminary planning for this program has been reviewed and concurred in by a diversified group of librarians, industry representatives and Federal authorities. The Depository Library Advisory Council to this Office has unanimously endorsed the proposed pilot program, finding the technical and bibliographic content of the summary correct.

The legitimate concerns of the Information Industry Association about certain aspects of the proposed pilot program have been recognized by this Office through several meetings with Information Industry representatives. They have been assured that we do not intend to develop an in-house capability, but will contract for the services needed in the program. Though the Information Industry does regard the conversion of the Code of Federal Regulations as a viable test vehicle, they have advised me that the successful conversion of that single series of publications should not be regarded as the sole measurement for possible future conversion efforts. Every consideration and courtesy will be afforded Information Industry representatives both in the evaluation of the pilot project and the possible conversion of future titles.

Full details of the requested pilot project have been included as an enclosure to this letter request.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. McCORMICK,  
*Public Printer.*

Enclosure.

PROPOSED GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE MICROFORM PILOT PROJECT  
INDUSTRY AND LIBRARY COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

A review of work accomplished in the microform program in the past four years indicated strong concern by the Information Industry Association about the Government Printing Office entry into the microform field. The primary source of criticism

appeared to come from Mr. Paul Zurkowski, President, Information Industry Association, and Mr. James Adler of Congressional Information Service.

Three visits were made to Mr. Adler's office by the Program Manager in May and June of 1974. A complete review of the proposed program was presented to Mr. Adler to determine his specific concerns about GPO's entry into microform conversion. The disagreement appears to come from the potential competition GPO may offer in the conversion of public domain documentation to a film format. Although GPO material would be commercially procured, Mr. Zurkowski and Mr. Adler still expressed concern that GPO entry into this field would in some instances be contrary to the public interest. This concern stems from the possibility that with GPO offering microform documentation already offered by private firms, the Government might be construed as competing with the private sector thus harming the relatively new Information Industry. Obviously this is not the intent of the Government Printing Office.

In the past, these gentlemen have expressed concern about the Government Printing Office entry into the microform field on the basis that the then proposed project did not include adequate bibliographic control elements and competent indexing techniques, that sufficient library community participation was lacking, that the proposed project would infringe on the commercial microform markets and that members of the industry would be forced out of business. The current proposal takes cognizance of these matters. The products will be commercially procured, extensive bibliographic control and indexing considerations have been made and the widest and fullest participation of the library community is expected.

Comments, ideas, suggestions and guidance in the development of this program have been actively solicited by the Government Printing Office from as wide a group of sources as possible. The scope and direction of the program has been presented to the American Library Association Micropublishing Committee, to the Government Documents Roundtable members, to the Depository Library Advisory Council to the Public Printer, to Federal organizations, to library workshops and other interested parties. There has been only encouragement and a desire to assist from all these organizations. No objections have been raised.

In an attempt to resolve some of the previous misunderstandings, the following briefings and addresses were given: Briefed industry representatives, at their request, on the proposed program. These included: Xerox, Kodak, Stromberg-Datagraphix, Gould, 3M, Scott-Graphics, IBM, National Capitol Systems, Computer Micrographics International, and Xerox University Microfilms (March-June 1974); addressed the American Library Association Micropublishing Committee, the Government Documents Roundtable Micropublishing Task Force, the Advisory Council to the Public Printer (Library), and the Regional Depository Librarian's Workshop (July 1974); provided internal GPO microform program briefings to the Public Printer's expanded staff and to the Procurement, Planning and Purchase Divisions (March 1974); arranged Microform training seminar for senior GPO executives. Provided by Kodak (August 1974); participated as micrographics seminar leader at the Southeastern Library Association meeting in Richmond (October 1974); briefed members of the Electronic/Micropublishing Committee of the Joint Committee on Printing (September 1974); scheduled to provide similar briefings and seminars at five locations in the next five months.

In addition to the meetings with the Program Manager and Messrs. Zurkowski and Adler, the Public Printer and the Assistant Public Printer (Superintendent of Documents) have subsequently met on three occasions with these gentlemen in order to work out areas of possible conflict. As a result of these meetings, the following broad criterion have been agreed upon with respect to future GPO microform conversions assuming a successful pilot program:

1. The basic objectives of the proposed Government Printing Office microform program are to provide microform documentation in an effective, efficient and economical manner to the Depository Libraries and to the general public. The Government Printing Office cannot pursue any microform project which is contrary to the public interest or contrary to Title 44, U.S.C., or the regulations issued thereunder.

2. Items considered for microform conversion would be based upon the accepted principle that material generally best suited to a microform are collections of a certain size range, reference value and degree of similarity. It must be borne in mind that agency decisions on the conversion of documentation to a microformat must be taken into consideration by the Government Printing Office as required by law.

3. Because of the need for appropriate bibliographic control, particularly where microforms are concerned, conversion efforts would be limited to those collections

for which adequate external control is provided by means of an existing Government-produced index in hard copy.

4. It is the intention of the Government Printing Office to provide microform documentation in an orderly phased manner spanning an undetermined length of time. Collections to be considered for conversion would be subjected to a technical review process. Early notification of the intentions of the Government Printing Office would be provided to the Information Industry Association and other interested parties to permit the raising of potential objections should the view of public interest be in conflict. Such objections would be submitted to the Micropublishing Advisory Council for review and recommendations. Final decision on matters involving apparent conflict of public interest and a proposed GPO microform project not resolved through this review process would, of course, rest with the Joint Committee on Printing. In developing specifics to implement these broad criterion, it is the Government Printing Office plan to expand the Micropublishing Advisory Council to include appropriate membership from the Depository Library Community and the Information Industry Association.

A copy of this letter request and program summary have been mailed to the President of the Information Industry Association for his information.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
June 20, 1974.

CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,  
U.S. Senate Post Office,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In early March 1974, 1,139 survey questionnaires were mailed to the Depository Libraries to determine their specific interests in receiving microfiche (24:1 reduction, the National Microfilm Association standard), rather than printed copy editions for approximately 2,800 publication categories printed or procured by the Government Printing Office. A copy of a completed Regional and a copy of a regular Depository Library response have been enclosed for your information.

To date, 931 responses to the questionnaire have been received. Seven hundred and thirty libraries indicate a preference for microfiche in at least one category of material. The average preference response from the Regional Libraries is for 657 categories in microfiche. A copy of the Regional Library survey questionnaire abstract has been enclosed for information purposes.

The majority of correspondence accompanying survey responses cite space conservation as a primary reason for selection of a category in fiche form. This is borne out in the frequency of selections checked for fiche copies of such voluminous material as bound annual reports, census information, Department of Defense material, trade reports and speeches.

To further explore the acceptability and advisability of the Government Printing Office distributing microfiche to the Depository Library community, it is requested authority be granted to undertake a four-month pilot test involving distribution of microfiche products to eighteen Libraries. Those libraries will be:

Regional Depository Libraries: North Dakota State University Library, University of North Carolina Library, University of Alabama, Michigan State Library, Ohio State Library, University of Idaho, University of Virginia, State Library of Pennsylvania, University of Minnesota, University of Iowa Library, University of Montana, University of Arizona Library.

Regular Depository Libraries: University of California, Los Angeles, University of Northern Colorado, University of Colorado Libraries, Indiana-Purdue Universities Regional Campus Library, Pennsylvania State University, Northeastern University, Boston.

If Committee approval to undertake the pilot test is granted, formal letters will be forwarded to the libraries seeking their participation.

Material to be converted to a microfiche format will be those items most frequently cited in the survey questionnaire by librarians. It is expected the effort will embrace approximately 300 publication titles during the test period at a reproduction and distribution cost of approximately \$25,000.00. This compares with an estimated cost of \$32,500.00 for hard copy distribution. Funding for the conversion will be through the Depository Library Program of the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses appropriation funding.

The fiche product will be commercially procured on a competitive bid basis through Government Printing Office sources. The distribution product will be fully indexed and in consonance with existing quality standards. The pilot test will be

monitored closely, providing examination of adequacy of bibliographic controls, attempt to measure user response, examine the adequacy of interface equipment, the means of storage and retrieval, and the quality of manufacture and distribution of the microfiche product. Samples of such fiche products will be provided the Committee for evaluation.

At the conclusion of the test an economic analysis and full recommendations will be made to your office.

This recent survey indicates a high interest in microfiche by the Depository Libraries and it is my opinion that this interest can best be served with a pilot project.

The intention of the Government Printing Office is to minimize the duplication of offerings made by commercial micropublishers. However, assuming we carry the program beyond the pilot test, in fulfilling our legal requirement to the 1,151 Depository Libraries, it is inevitable that we will distribute some Government publications in microfiche which may be available through a commercial supplier. Generally, publications provided by commercial micropublishers are priced higher than our anticipated costs. We would like to emphasize that we intend to purchase the distribution fiche from commercial sources. However, micropublishers do not generally offer just the reproduction capability, but deal more in bibliographic controls and subscription services.

If additional information is desired, I will provide a detailed briefing at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. McCORMICK,  
Public Printer.

REGIONAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Library	Film selections	Paper selections
University of Alabama (12) .....	373	2,439
Arizona Department of Library and Archives (22) .....	1,080	1,732
University of Arizona Library (23) .....	1,010	1,802
California State Library (40) .....	328	2,484
Denver Public Library (71) .....	718	2,094
Connecticut State Library (75) .....	60	2,752
University of Florida Libraries (103) .....	192	2,620
University of Idaho Library (135) .....	1,849	963
Illinois State Library (140) .....	26	2,786
Indiana State Library (170) .....	0	2,812
University of Iowa Library (189A) .....	1,311	1,501
University of Kentucky (King) Library (208) .....	661	2,151
Louisiana State University Library (222) .....	222	2,590
Louisiana Technical University Library (230) .....	0	2,812
University of Maryland, McKeldin Library (242) .....	88	2,724
Boston Public Library (268A) .....	0	2,812
Michigan State Library (273) .....	1,273	1,539
Detroit Public Library (275) .....	26	2,786
University of Minnesota, Wilson Library (295) .....	1,246	1,566
University of Montana Library (341) .....	1,124	1,688
University of Nevada Library (353) .....	9	2,803
Newark Public Library (376) .....	936	1,876
University of New Mexico (383) .....	1,176	1,636
New Mexico State Library (386) .....	682	2,130
University of North Carolina Library (447) .....	1,036	1,776
North Dakota State University Library (455) .....	1,591	1,221
Ohio State Library (460) .....	734	2,078
State Library of Pennsylvania (508) .....	1,182	1,630
Texas State Library (591) .....	233	2,579
Texas Tech University Library (614) .....	646	2,166
University of Virginia, Alderman Library (640) .....	1,486	1,326
Wisconsin State Historical Library (668) .....	67	2,745
Milwaukee Public Library (670) .....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )

<sup>1</sup> Nonresponsive.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1976.

CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,  
U.S. Senate Post Office,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This Office has completed a pilot microform test project authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing January 9, 1975. The test involved the conversion of the Code of Federal Regulations to a standard 98 frame nominal 24:1 reduction ratio microfiche format for distribution and evaluation by selected depository libraries. The test has resulted in a variety of suggestions for further improvement in the system as well as specific suggestion for improvement in the Code of Federal Regulations in the film format.

Responses from the libraries indicate support for further microform conversions of depository library materials as can be seen by the attached copies of library letters.

On the basis of the test results and the responses from the depository libraries, it is requested authorization be provided this Office for the continued filming and distribution of the Code of Federal Regulations to depository libraries on a request basis. All pertinent suggestions for improvement in the file will be carried out. A survey of subscribers and Federal Government users will be conducted to determine interest in use of the film file, and, ultimately, offer the film file of the Code of Federal Regulations for sale through the Superintendent of Documents sales program.

It is further requested authorization be provided this Office for the selected conversion of that category of publications known as "non-GPO" documentation. This is material printed in authorized agency printing plants in limited quantities that is not now being offered depository libraries. Copies of that documentation would be subjected to a technical screening criteria to determine suitability for microform conversion. If the document is susceptible to the filming process indexing would be undertaken and distribution microform duplicates provided depository libraries in lieu of hardcopy. All such filming and generation of distribution duplicates will be accomplished through commercial procurement contract.

Such a proposal would relieve agency printing plants of the added financial burden of producing sufficient hard copies for distribution to the depository libraries. Acquisition of such material would result in greatly improved bibliographic control of Government documentation and would also make that documentation available to the public through the Depository Library Program as well as potential public sales. Funding for the selected microform conversion would be accomplished through appropriations provided the Superintendent of Documents for depository library printing.

Support for this proposal has been received from the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer in a resolution endorsing the Government Printing Office microform activity at a meeting on April 23, 1976.

It is further proposed that this Office continue to support additional microform conversions on request by issuing agencies to further reduce Federal printing and distribution costs.

The findings of the pilot microform test project are enclosed for information purposes. Should there be any further questions my Office is prepared to provide any assistance or information necessary.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. McCORMICK,  
Public Printer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING,  
March 25, 1977.

Hon. THOMAS F. McCORMICK,  
Public Printer,  
U.S. Government Printing Office,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCORMICK: In accordance with and in furtherance of previous authorizations of the Joint Committee on Printing, relative to the response of the Superintendent of Documents to the designated depository libraries pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 19, title 44, United States Code—Depository Library Program, this is to advise that you are authorized as follows:

(1) To convert to microfiche, as necessary and as requested by individual depository libraries, that category of publications identified as "non-GPO documentation."

(2) To convert to microfiche, as necessary and as requested by individual depository libraries and when savings in costs are clearly demonstrable, that category of publications identified as "GPO documentation."

It is our understanding that GPO's Micropublishing Advisory Council, including appropriate membership from the depository library community and private industry, will be activated.

It is the Joint Committee's understanding that the continuing initiation of these steps will be vested in the Superintendent of Documents, with your concurrence, rather than being left to the discretion, partially or wholly, of individual departments or agencies.

Finally, nothing in this authorization shall be construed as establishing any form of a microfiche sales concept.

Sincerely,

HOWARD W. CANNON,  
*Chairman.*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
*Washington, D.C., August 24, 1977.*

MR. PAUL G. ZURKOWSKI,  
*President, Information Industry Association,  
Bethesda, Md.*

DEAR MR. ZURKOWSKI: As the Government Printing Office begins micropublishing activity in support of the Depository Library Program, the Government Printing Office Micropublishing Council will be activated and expanded to include industry representation. The Council is charged with the responsibility of enumerating potential or actual problems, evaluating contributed views, reviewing micropublishing plans, and making recommendations for my guidance.

To be certain that adequate industry views are incorporated into the micrographics planning and implementation, I am requesting that you provide me with the names of three industry representatives for consideration as possible Council members. The Council will be called upon to meet approximately twice each year to review micropublishing plans, before implementation, and to serve as a technical resource group. This is to ensure that our micropublishing plans are economically sound and would meet the overall requirements of the library user community.

Your assistance in this matter is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

T. F. McCORMICK,  
*Public Printer.*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,  
*Washington, D.C., August 29, 1977.*

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,  
*Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing, U.S. Capitol,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This is in response to your letter of August 15, 1977, in which you request (1) a status report on GPO's micropublishing program and (2) a status report on GPO's Micropublishing Advisory Council.

The Joint Committee on Printing letter of March 25, 1977, provided two basic authorizations.

The first is to obtain and convert to microform that body of material known as "non-GPO/non-depository" publications. GPO has been frequently criticized for not placing in depository distribution those publications which are procured or produced by the Federal agencies either in their own printing facilities or sources other than GPO. Since receiving JCP authorization on March 25, 1977, we have been making progress in implementing that part of the program. The first category of "non-GPO/non-depository" material selected for conversion to microforms and for distribution to the depository libraries is a collection of 225 General Accounting Office Reports which the depository libraries have always wanted but heretofore, could not receive. The GAO Reports are now in the hands of a commercial contractor for production.

Our staff will then undertake quality control checks to insure proper densities, resolution, and archival quality. The first distribution of the GAO Reports will be made in early September. After the GAO Reports have been converted, we will

commence filming the Joint Publications Research Service publications, a series of approximately 300 titles to be converted.

The second authorization contained in the Joint Committee on Printing letter of March 25, 1977, relates to the conversion of existing hard-copy material to a microfiche format replacing depository library material now being distributed solely in hard-copy. However, there are two provisions that must be met before such conversions can take place. The first is to meet the desires of the depository library community. To determine these desires, a list of what can be considered the top fifty candidates for microfiche conversion is being prepared by our library staff. In the next few months, the list of the 50 candidates for conversion will be forwarded to the depository libraries. The libraries will be asked to rank those fifty candidates numerically from one to fifty. These rankings will be consolidated by GPO. The final candidate selections will then be presented to the members of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer for review and recommendations. Upon completion of that review, the list will be subjected to an economic analysis and will then be submitted to GPO's Micropublishing Council for review and recommendations. After that review process, action will be taken to proceed with filming, if all prescribed conditions have been met.

Your letter of August 15, 1977, also requests the status of the GPO Micropublishing Council. By letter of August 23, 1977, I requested the five existing members of the Council to reconfirm their availability to continue serving. Also, by letters of August 23, 1977, I invited the President of the Information Industry Association and the President of the National Micrographics Association to each submit to me the names of three industry representatives for consideration as possible Council members. From the list of six, I will select one industry representative to serve on the Council. The Council will be requested to review GPO documentation now furnished to the depository libraries in hard-copy.

All of the work and all of the planning undertaken since we received the authorizations contained in the Joint Committee on Printing letter of March 25, 1977, relate strictly to microfiche conversions for depository libraries. In no instance has our planning extended to our sales program beyond those policy guidelines previously authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing or by Title 44, U.S. Code.

Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Sincerely,

T. F. McCORMICK,  
Public Printer.

Mr. ZURKOWSKI. Our purpose for appearing here is to talk about what, in view of the magnitude of the GPO operations, is perhaps a small part. We think it is a significant part, because it is opening the door to GPO's involvement in a number of new technologies.

At the outset, I would state that our organization supports the nomination of Mr. Boyle. We have found him to be a knowledgeable and understanding person, and one who, as his testimony this morning demonstrates, has an open mind, and should be confirmed.

We appear to seek your assistance through clarifying the situation with regard to the micropublishing program within GPO. Under the previous Public Printer, Mr. McCormick, we in 1974 worked out agreement as to the establishment of an advisory committee and some guidelines that would govern the program.

I think those were landmark agreements, and they were incorporated in the request for authority to the Joint Committee on Printing and the program was authorized based on those agreements.

In the subsequent implementation of the program, perhaps at lower levels within GPO, these agreements have just been set aside. There have been agreements to provide early notification of plans. There have been agreements to establish the micropublishing advisory council. There have been agreements to include appropriate representation for the information industry in that advisory council. It was on the basis of those agreements, assuring us that the experience of the Information Industry Association would be

taken into account in the management of this program, that we endorsed and supported the program. We still do.

We do not oppose the micropublishing program. We think that there are many things that can be accomplished in this area. We do believe, however, that the massive amount of material that the Government is producing, and we heard testimony about that this morning, requires a partnership between the Government and the private sector. We hope and look to Mr. Boyle to renew that partnership, and to renew the reliance on the function of the commercial sector, as well as the micropublishing program to accomplish the desired level of distribution and use of Government information. We seek your help in clarifying Mr. Boyle's views on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. You, in your statement, you say you are opposed to mismanagement of Government micropublishing.

Specifically, what do you have in mind?

Mr. ZURKOWSKI. You will see elsewhere in the statement the information that the micropublishing program was initiated with a pilot project based on the Code of Federal Regulations. It is now our understanding that that program has been suspended. It is not clear why, or for how long, but it is some kind of an adjustment in the program.

When the initial pilot project was put out to bid, the requirement was for about 25,000 masters, and the bid itself called for the creation of 11 million masters. To our knowledge, nothing but the Code of Federal Regulations was ever processed through that contract. This gave rise to a misconception as to what the program was to include at that stage, both among potential bidders, who were bidding on an 11 million master job, and ended up with 25,000, and on the part of the industry which is also in this business, and is impacted whenever the Government decides to enter any part of this business. In the absence of certainty as to what government will and will not do, risk money goes out of the business.

The third category is this list of activities which the Public Printer itemized in 1974, in his letter requesting authority for the pilot project. The authorization was conditioned on various steps and assurances and these have been abrogated in subsequent activities of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. We will ask Mr. Boyle to comment in response to that for the record.

Mr. ZURKOWSKI. I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. ZURKOWSKI. Thank you.

[The following material was submitted by Mr. Boyle:]

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF JOHN J. BOYLE IN RESPONSE TO WRITTEN STATEMENT OF MR. PAUL G. ZURKOWSKI, PRESIDENT, INFORMATION INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

I wish to respond to the statement of Mr. Paul G. Zurkowski, President, Information Industry Association, at the confirmation hearing of October 19, 1977, on my nomination to be Public Printer of the United States before the Committee on Rules and Administration of the U.S. Senate.

First of all, I appreciate Mr. Zurkowski's appearance to support my nomination. However, in his prepared statement, Mr. Zurkowski is raising, again, old issues which have already received appropriate attention from responsible sources, including direct responses to him, and through inquiries made by Mr. Zurkowski, his

association, and other members of his association to various Senators, Congressmen, and Congressional Committees.

Parts of Mr. Zurkowski's prepared submission dated October 19, 1977, need amplification or correction.

Mr. Zurkowski has stated that ". . . it is the Public Printer's responsibility to *initially* (italics supplied) print Government materials" implying and later stating that private firms have the exclusive right to organize, abstract, index, republish in print or microform, and distribute Government materials in logical arrangements and editions.

There are no provisions of law which limit the Public Printer to the *initial* printing of government documents. Conversely, paragraph 103 of Title 44, U.S. Code authorizes the Joint Committee on Printing to "use any measures it considers necessary to remedy neglect, delay, duplication or waste in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications." In implementation of the above-cited responsibilities, the Joint Committee on Printing, in its *Government Printing and Binding Regulations* defines "printing" to include platemaking, presswork, binding, and *microform* (italics provided). The Joint Committee on Printing in the same regulation defines the term "microform" to apply to any product, procured in miniaturized format, for mass or general distribution and as a substitute for conventionally printed material, but not including microfilming of administrative records, accounting reports, or similar items."

Mr. Zurkowski's statement suggesting ". . . a de facto partnership with GPO printing and making initial distribution of materials for other Government agencies and with private firms complementing those activities by organizing, abstracting, indexing, republishing in print or microform, and distributing Government materials in logical arrangements and editions" needs clarification.

a. Paragraph 1710, Title 44, U.S. Code, directs the Superintendent of Documents to prepare and publish a comprehensive index of public documents.

b. Paragraph 1707, Title 44, U.S. Code, states that the Superintendent of Documents may order reprinted from time to time, public documents required for sale . . . ."

Mr. Zurkowski's statement that "micropublishing of previously printed materials is not primarily for internal Government benefit, but is designed to provide additional, new services for the nongovernment sector "does not seem to be in consonance with Congressional pronouncements on the subject. For example, the Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing, in a memorandum of September 12, 1977, to the heads of all Government departments and agencies urged ". . . all departments and agencies to evaluate their own publications for possible conversion to microform in an effort to reduce conventional printing costs." The Chairman's memorandum also included the statement "to illustrate the commitment that the Congress has made to the technology on micropublishing on March 25, 1977, the Joint Committee authorized the Public Printer to convert to microform certain 'non-GPO documentation' along with selected 'GPO documentation' for distribution to the Depository Libraries at the request of those libraries." Finally, the Chairman's letter states that ". . . it is estimated 3,000 publications will be converted the first year of the program providing a savings in excess of one and one-half million dollars." Thus, Mr. Zurkowski's charge that "the integrity of this partnership has been severely undermined by the approach the GPO has taken to the application of microfilm to its responsibilities to initially print government materials" is totally incorrect. Contrariwise, the Government Printing Office has followed to the letter the provisions of law and the directives of the Joint Committee on Printing in its approach to the application of microfilm to its printing and distribution programs.

Mr. Zurkowski states that "for almost half a decade the library community has been told the CFR and other publications like it will be provided in microfilm by GPO." In point of fact, delays in implementation have largely been generated by Mr. Zurkowski. By letter of February 7, 1973, presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, during the confirmation hearing of the current Public Printer, Thomas F. McCormick, Mr. Zurkowski makes the following statements:

a. "We do not feel that microform technology has a great deal to offer the government in the dissemination of government information."

b. "We encourage the Public Printer to begin experimenting with applications appropriate to specific areas of government materials. But we do not believe he should enter the secondary publishing business."

c. "We do not believe the Government Printing Office should micropublish anything it has already published in paper, nor do we believe it should republish in paper anything it has already published on film."

Mr. Zurkowski's thinking seems to have changed between the time of the above quotation from his February 7, 1973, letter and his recent statement on October 19, 1977, when he said:

"We recognize that the GPO micropublishing program is subject to the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing and it is not to question the program authorized by JCP that we appear."

"Nor do we oppose the government getting into micropublishing. We are opposed, however, to mismanagement of government micropublishing."

My comment to that statement is "so is the Government Printing Office and that is why great care has been exercised in careful management of the program."

Mr. Zurkowski also states that "publication (of the CFR in microform) has now been suspended." Mr. Zurkowski is wrong. The distribution of the Code of Federal Regulations in microform has been an active program. It was discussed at the April 25, 1977 and October 16-18, 1977, meetings of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer and a resolution was passed at the latter meeting. The JCP authority to proceed with conversion of the Code of Federal Regulations was received on October 13, 1976. Program adjustments, contract amendments, printing schedules, all must be planned in advance to coincide with the annual revision of the publication in question, the Code of Federal Regulations. By letter of October 25, 1977, the Superintendent of Documents has requested each Depository Library to make a decision, prior to December 1, 1977, as to whether the library desires the 1978 edition of the Code of Federal Regulations in microfiche or hardcopy. The 1978 edition will be distributed to depository libraries in whichever format the library specifies.

Mr. Zurkowski also makes the statement "the request for proposals to microfilm the CFR grossly exceeded the pilot project's requirements and misled all bidders as to the level of microfilming to be done." The commercial procurement contract specifications for the pilot project were made available to any Federal agency seeking such support. Also, the specifications for the pilot program were circulated to dozens of professional librarians, industry representatives, library micropublishing committees for review and comment. Open-ended contracts such as the program in question (GPO Program 154-S—Source Document Microfilm) are designed to meet the expressed needs of the Federal agencies which are being pressured through economics to find a way to reduce the costs of manufacturing and distribution of information. Development of such open programs has long been the practice of the Government Printing Office to reduce administrative costs and to be assured of continuing quality work under the terms of the contract. Any Federal agency, therefore, may use such a contract for internal administration recordkeeping, or archives management. GPO's efforts were in consideration of any Federal agency contemplating a film program and to provide them with a proven product. That was the purpose of Program 154-S.

With respect to Mr. Zurkowski's statement that ". . . to the best of our knowledge no microfilming other than the CFR was performed under this contract," the following workload data are submitted.

In addition to the work performed by the contractor for the pilot program (Code of Federal Regulations) the following microfilming was performed by the same contractor under the same open program:

- a. Converted 40,000 pages to 463 microfiche, in less than 10 days, of Postal Service Rate Hearings, at a savings of \$374,000.
- b. Converted 36,000 pages (200 dockets) of Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission material to 507 microfiche at a savings of \$158,000.
- c. Generated 1,200,000 microfiche, in a 5-day turnaround time, for an urgent requirement of the New Cumberland Army Depot.
- d. Additional testing under Program 154-S was done for the U.S. Navy, the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Patent Office, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Civil Service Commission.

Altogether, approximately 11 million fiche, involving 99 million pages, at a cost of \$706,484 were processed through Program 154-S. Clearly, then, the Request for Proposals for the program were not overstated as charged by Mr. Zurkowski, and many other publications (other than the Code of Federal Regulations) were processed through the contract.

Throughout Mr. Zurkowski's statement he charges GPO with "questionable management practices." Yet in a letter to Mr. Zurkowski dated March 4, 1976, the then Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing stated, "We have read with interest the February 20, 1976, letter of the Public Printer replying to your questions in a manner which we believe is accurate, comprehensive, and responsive." The Chairman's letter to Mr. Zurkowski then stated that "Inasmuch as he (the Public Printer) supplied you with a copy of the Joint Committee on Printing letter of April 16, 1975,

to the heads of all departments and agencies, we will not send another copy of that unless you request it. However, there is enclosed a copy of the report (B-115369) of the Comptroller General of the United States, entitled, 'Increased Use of Computer-Output-Microfilm by Federal Agencies Could Result in Savings,' which you may find interesting."

Mr. Zurkowski charged that express conditions set forth by the Public Printer in letters to the Joint Committee on Printing requesting authority to proceed with the pilot project have been abrogated repeatedly in the management of the program. On the contrary, all of the work, and all of the planning on the program have been in consonance with policy guidelines authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing or by Title 44, U.S. Code.

Mr. Zurkowski charges that the Micropublishing Advisory Council has not been expanded to include appropriate membership from the Depository Library community and industry. He is wrong. The Depository Library community is represented on the Micropublishing Advisory Council by Ms. Nancy Cline, Coordinator of the Government documents roundtable (CODORT) of the American Library Association, who is also the Documents Librarian of Penn State University. On August 26, 1977, the Information Industry Association was invited to provide the Public Printer with the names of three industry candidates for membership. No response has been received to the above-referenced letter to Mr. Zurkowski. Yet, he complains about no industry representation on the Advisory Council. He then explains that he did not respond because the Public Printer also invited the National Microfilm Association to submit the names of three of their members. Mr. Zurkowski's concern that a member of his association would not have been selected is without foundation or fact. Nor is his unwarranted reference to the "selection being made by the Microform Program Manager of the Government Printing Office." That selection will be made by the Public Printer. The 1,217 depository libraries are represented by one member.

The Council is advisory to the Public Printer. The Council will be requested to review GPO documentation now furnished to the depository libraries in hard copy after recommendations are received from the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer. All of these documents are Government publications. All of it will be converted only for the use of depository libraries. It would seem, therefore, that Council membership as proposed in this statement is equitable.

What seems to be forgotten, and a point that I wish to strongly reaffirm, is that all microfilm conversions in this program have been processed by commercial "information industry" enterprises in accordance with Federal Procurement Regulations.

The Government Printing Office Depository Library Microform Program will extend the availability of public domain information to the American public as required by Public Law. It is a highly visible program with oversight by the Joint Committee on Printing and the Depository Library community.

I personally pledge that, if confirmed, I will maintain an active communications link with any organization interested in the emerging microform program. I must add that I am bound by Public Law through the provisions of Title 44, U.S.C., and the decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing, in meeting the responsibilities of the Office. I will further seek the guidance of qualified organizations and individuals in meeting those responsibilities. To that end I urge the Information Industry Association to respond to the request of the Public Printer in his letter of August 23, 1977.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. James R. MacRae, president, Coalition of Minority Workers-GPO.

**TESTIMONY OF JAMES R. MacRAE, PRESIDENT, COALITION OF MINORITY WORKERS-GPO, ACCOMPANIED BY PETER KOLKER, GENERAL COUNSEL**

Mr. MACRAE. I have with me Mr. Peter Kolker, who is general counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. Peter what?

Mr. MACRAE. Kolker, K-o-l-k-e-r.

My name is James R. MacRae, and I am the president of the Coalition of Minority Workers. I have a statement here I would like to read.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACRAE. The Coalition of Minority Workers-GPO, Inc. appreciates this opportunity to express to the Committee on Rules and Administration its views regarding the confirmation of a Public Printer for the Government Printing Office. By way of introduction, the Coalition of Minority Workers—CMW—is a not-for-profit organization composed of employees of the Government Printing Office which has as its objective assuring that the equal employment statutes, rules, Executive orders, and Government policies are adhered to in the GPO. Our organization has approximately 200 members and is open to all GPO employees in the Washington, D.C., area.

The CMW wishes to call the committee's attention to the serious problems of racial discrimination which exist at the GPO and to request the committee to obtain from the nominee to the position of Public Printer a firm and unequivocal commitment to eradicate the pattern of discrimination which can be plainly seen at the GPO. Let me call the committee's attention to some statistics which graphically portray the problems at the GPO.

As of September 30, 1976, blacks comprised 50.3 percent of the GPO work force in the Washington metropolitan area (where the vast majority of GPO business is carried out). Yet, in the higher paying positions of GG-14 and above—roughly equivalent to the GS-14 level in other agencies—blacks occupied only 4.1 percent of the positions, less than one-twelfth of the positions which could be representative of total black employment at the Agency. With regard to the wage board positions, blacks likewise occupied a disproportionately small share of the well-paying wage board positions—21.7 percent of the higher paying categories instead of the 51.6 percent which constitutes the share of blacks throughout the wage board positions at the GPO and none of the highest category.

The statistics in regard to employment of women at the higher levels of the GPO is to the same effect. For instance, as of May 31, 1976, although there were over 2,200 women employed by the GPO in the Washington, D.C., area, there were only 4 women at the GG-13 level, and all four of these individuals were white. There were no women above the level of GG-14. The wage board pay scale picture is equivalent, with no women being employed at the top wage board levels, as of May 31, 1976, and with black women being discriminated against at an even higher level.

The employment picture for other minorities, such as Spanish-speaking persons and/or American Indians is just as bleak, and the statistics are available to clearly demonstrate this pattern. In short, even though this is a Government agency, one finds even now almost complete stratification of employment, with blacks and women in the typically low-paying positions.

The CMW has been seeking to improve this dismal picture, and recent litigation which the CMW has participated in in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (*McKenzie v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 947-73) resulted in a determination that discrimination in employment, hiring, and promotion practices was widespread within the offset press section of the GPO. Judge Parker ruled that the class of black employees in that division has been adversely affected by the long-standing practices.

Similar lawsuits are before the court in connection with claims of sex discrimination in the Bindery Division—*Thompson v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 74-1101—and claims of race discrimination in the Composing Division—*MacRae v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 76-1911.

To add to these problems, the GPO is now in the midst of a technological conversion which has its most telling impact on the blacks who constitute the largest percentage of employees at the lower paying positions. Many skilled and semiskilled workers who are familiar with the hot-type processes will find themselves without jobs if they are not retrained in the electronic photocomposition techniques which the GPO will be utilizing shortly.

The CMW does not, of course, oppose this technological progress; nevertheless, the CMW believes that the GPO has an obligation to assure that all employees be offered training opportunities that will enable them to maintain meaningful employment. This the GPO has not done. Many employees in the GPO are being provided no training programs in spite of the inevitability of the technological change.

As you might expect, blacks and other minorities are most adversely affected. We believe that the GPO has a responsibility to its employees which it is neglecting. We think that this committee should inquire of the nominee to the position of Public Printer as to the specific steps which his administration would take to assure job training for all levels at the GPO.

In summary, the CMW is of the view that the Public Printer should make specific commitments at these hearings commensurate with his subject matter familiarity as to how, if confirmed, he would solve the problem of discrimination which so plague the GPO.

Additionally, the Public Printer should outline for the committee how he proposes to provide the indispensable job training which is necessary to assure the implementation of equal employment at this Agency. Congress has a special concern for the GPO. This branch of the Government has problems more closely identified with the private sector than any other branch of the Government, because of the craft nature of GPO work. This committee can assist in fulfilling the congressional responsibility by exacting the commitments mentioned above from the nominee at these hearings.

Thank you very much, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You say in your statement there, your organization has approximately 200 members. Is that all?

Mr. MACRAE. They have 200 members, but I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that we expressed sentiment of 56 percent of blacks and other minorities at the GPO.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a rather constant membership, over the years?

Mr. MACRAE. No, at one time we had a membership of more than 600, but because of discouragement, and other adverse actions, not getting results from GPO, membership dropped off.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard Mr. Boyle respond to some of the questions that we have raised here today. Does that satisfy your question there, insofar as to what he has had to say, or do you feel that he should respond further; what is your view?

Mr. MACRAE. I have some suggestions that I would like to make, and those are that we get commitment from the nominee for retraining of all employees requesting training, violations have drastically changed because of their discriminatory use, as found by the courts, increased apprenticeship, to open up promotion opportunities, and four, prevent selection to uprate positions on current discriminatory bases. This is where it is at.

The CHAIRMAN. You can hand that to Mr. Boyle. I will ask him to respond to that a little later in the hearing, so far as those points are concerned.

Thank you very much.

Just a minute, Senator Griffin has a question.

Senator GRIFFIN. Your organization is entitled Coalition of Minority Workers. What minority groups, other than blacks, are included in your organization?

Mr. MACRAE. We have Spanish persons, and also whites in our organization, white women.

Senator GRIFFIN. Women?

Mr. MACRAE. White women. Thompson is a woman, the case that I cited.

Senator GRIFFIN. How many Chicanos?

Mr. MACRAE. I think it is one. It is one Chicano, as I recall.

Senator GRIFFIN. OK, thank you.

Mr. MACRAE. The membership is open to anyone who cares to join at the GPO, regardless of race.

Senator GRIFFIN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. MACRAE. Thank you.

[The written statement of Mr. MacRae follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF MR. JAMES R. MACRAE, PRESIDENT, COALITION OF MINORITY WORKERS—GPO, INC.

The Coalition of Minority Workers—GPO, Inc. appreciates this opportunity to express to the Committee on Rules and Administration its views regarding the confirmation of a Public Printer for the Government Printing Office. By way of introduction, the Coalition of Minority Workers (CMW) is a not-for-profit organization composed of employees of the Government Printing Office which has its objective assuring that the equal employment statutes, rules, executive orders and government policies are adhered to in the GPO. Our organization has approximately 200 members and is open to all GPO employees in the Washington, D.C. area.

The CMW wishes to call the Committee's attention to the serious problems of racial discrimination which exist at the GPO and to request the Committee to obtain from the nominee to the position of Public Printer a firm and unequivocal commitment to eradicate the pattern of discrimination which can be plainly seen at the GPO. Let me call the Committee's attention to some statistics which graphically portray the problems at the GPO.

As of September 30, 1976, blacks comprised 50.3 percent of the GPO work force in the Washington Metropolitan area (where the vast majority of GPO business is carried out). Yet, in the higher paying positions of GG-14 and above (roughly equivalent to the GS-14 level in other agencies), blacks occupied only 4.1 percent of the positions, less than one-twelfth of the positions which would be representative of total black employment at the agency. With regard to the wage-board positions, blacks likewise occupied a disproportionately small share of the well-paying wage board positions (21.7 percent of the higher paying categories instead of the 51.6 percent which constitutes the share of blacks throughout the wage board positions at the GPO and none of the highest category).

The statistics in regard to employment of women at the higher levels of the GPO is to the same effect. For instance, as of May 31, 1976, although there were over 2,200 women employed by the GPO in the Washington, D.C. area, there were only four women at the GG-13 level, and all four of these individuals were white. There

were no women above the level of GG-14. The wage board pay scale picture is equivalent, with no women being employed at the top wage board levels, as of May 31, 1976, and with black women being discriminated against at an even higher level.

The employment picture for other minorities, such as Spanish-speaking persons and/or American Indians is just as bleak, and the statistics are available to clearly demonstrate this pattern. In short, even though this is a government agency, one finds even now almost complete stratification of employment, with blacks and women in the typically low paying positions.

The CMW has been seeking to improve this dismal picture, and recent litigation which the CMW participated in in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (*McKenzie v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 947-73) resulted in a determination that discrimination in employment, hiring and promotion practices was widespread within the Offset Press Section of the GPO. Judge Parker ruled that the class of black employees in that Division has been adversely affected by the long-standing practices. Similar lawsuits are before the Court in connection with claims of sex discrimination in the Bindery Division (*Thompson v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 74-1101) and claims of race discrimination in the Composing Division (*MacRae v. McCormick*, Civil Action No. 76-1911).

To add these problems, the GPO is now in the midst of a technological conversion which has its most telling impact on the blacks who constitute the largest percentage of employees at the lower paying positions. Many skilled and semi-skilled workers who are familiar with the hot-type processes will find themselves without jobs if they are not retrained in the electronic photocomposition techniques which the GPO will be utilizing shortly. The CMW does not, of course, oppose this technological progress; nevertheless, the CMW believes that the GPO has an obligation to assure that all employees be offered training opportunities that will enable them to maintain meaningful employment. This the GPO has not done. Many employees in the GPO are being provided no training programs in spite of the inevitability of the technological change. As you might expect, blacks and other minorities are most adversely affected. We believe that the GPO has a responsibility to its employees which it is neglecting. We think that this Committee should inquire of the nominee to the position of Public Printer as to the specific steps which his administration would take to assure job training for all levels at the GPO.

In summary, the CMW is of the view that the Public Printer should make specific commitments at these hearings commensurate with his subject matter familiarity as to how, if confirmed, he would solve the problems of discrimination which so plague the GPO. Additionally, the Public Printer should outline for the Committee how he proposes to provide the indispensable job training which is necessary to assure the implementation of equal employment at this agency. Congress has a special concern for the GPO. This branch of the government has problems more closely identified with the private sector than any other branch of the government, because of the craft nature of GPO work. This Committee can assist in fulfilling the Congressional responsibility by exacting the commitments mentioned above from the nominee at these hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness, Mr. John A. McCart, executive director, Public Employee Department, AFL-CIO.

**TESTIMONY OF JOHN A. McCART, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,  
PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO**

Mr. McCART. Mr. Chairman, since we supplied the committee with copies of our formal statement, I will comply with your request to summarize that statement.

[The written statement of Mr. McCart follows:]

**WRITTEN STATEMENT OF JOHN A. McCART, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PUBLIC  
EMPLOYEE DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO**

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. On behalf of the 29 national AFL-CIO unions representing over 1.5 million public employees which they have affiliated with our Department, we wish to comment on the Public Printer, the nomination for which position is before you.

Members of a number of our unions, in the printing trades, maintenance trades and other blue collar and white collar occupations, work in the Government Printing Office. They and we have, frankly, been appalled at recent developments in the

GPO. We think these matters should be brought to your attention as you consider the nominee for Public Printer.

The legislation, in 1865, to establish the U.S. Government Printing Office had as its intent that GPO would do all government printing and remove it from the "political spoils" that had been the practice before. Accordingly workers were recruited from across the nation and the Office has performed exceedingly well, overall. The recent position of GPO, increasing the contracting-out of government printing to private firms, we believe violates the intent of the original legislation and threatens the employment of skilled workers there. They are even now being advised of "furloughs" or reductions-in-force which threaten their careers and the well-being of their families. The problem created by "contracting-out" is exacerbated by automation which, in our judgment, should be handled in a fashion to mitigate unemployment and the attendant human suffering. AFL-CIO amendments to the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A-76, which governs contracting-out in the Executive Branch, would be a move toward decreasing that practice and one which we favor as helping this problem of job insecurity.

The Kiess Act of 1924, as you know, was a landmark piece of labor-management legislation antedating the National Labor Relations Act by 11 years. Unfortunately in the recent past the Public Printer has refused to recognize the intent of the Congress in that legislation and his statutory responsibility to bargain collectively with the representatives of the GPO's employees. The Joint Committee on Printing has just recently had to call to the attention of the Public Printer the responsibility to bargain with the unions about wage adjustments. Unhappily, the Public Printer and his staff have failed to comply with these guidelines and have appealed the Congressional decision to the Comptroller General.

The Joint Council of Unions, GPO, is made up of nine international unions with 14 locals representing more than 7,000 employees. They oppose any candidate for Public Printer who would continue the present unfair practices. We heartily and sincerely endorse this position and give it our unqualified support.

We hope this Committee will see fit to ask the nominee for Public Printer whether he subscribes to the intent of the Kiess Act, 44 USC 305, as expressed in House Report 412, dated March 31, 1924, which summarizes the Congressional intent as follows: "The wages and compensation of these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees."

As you are aware, the \$93 million annual appropriation for GPO is the basis for its handling over \$400 million worth of business each year. Accordingly we are dealing with a government operation of significant proportions.

Our unions, and the AFL-CIO itself, look to the federal government to provide a model for our country in good, cooperative labor-management relations and in the maintenance of humane labor standards. We believe you will agree that this is in the public interest and that any nominee for the position of Public Printer should subscribe to this ideal both in principle and in practice.

Thank you.

Mr. McCART. The public employee department is a component of the AFL-CIO, whose name tells you its activities. Many of the local unions at the Government Printing Office are affiliated with national unions, which are in turn associated with the public department, which is the reason for our appearance here today.

Mr. Boyle's responses to various questions raised by the members are reassuring, particularly with respect to labor relations bargaining, equal employment opportunity, and affirmative action. His interpretation of the term conference in the Kiess Act, as meaning negotiating a system for determining wages and fringe benefits is well founded, because while the Kiess Act itself uses the word conference, the House committee report accompanying the statute carries this language:

"The wages and compensation of these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern, negotiated with its employees."

There is another matter raised by committee questions, and treated in our statement. It is the problem of subcontracting. The figures were given to you.

The basic problem is that at the same time this huge amount of work, which transits through the Government Printing Office, to contractors is being completed, the Printing Office itself faces technological changes, and there is discussion underway about possible reduction or force of furloughs. This is quite upsetting to employees, who on one hand see the possibility of loss of their jobs, and on the other hand see increasing amounts of work that they can perform being completed outside the plant. So we hope that this matter can be addressed by the Public Printer in a way to give assurance to employees that their job security will be maintained, and that they will have an opportunity to continue to the completion of their careers.

In the same context, the 1865 statute establishing the Government Printing Office was intended to accomplish all Government printing in that facility in order to eliminate previous political spoils that had occurred with the Government printing.

In keeping with that philosophy, we think that it would be wise for the GPO to retrieve some of the work that is now being done under contract, so that the career employees in-house will have job security.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my comments. If any of the committee members have questions, I will be happy to try to respond.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Boyle's response concerning the Kiess Act, did that satisfy the questions that you raised in your statement here today?

Mr. McCART. Yes, his commitment to negotiate with the unions at the Government Printing Office, a suitable method of arriving at wage and fringe benefit adjustments is satisfactory.

I wish him full success.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you feel that the question of contracting out, do you feel that that should be explored with Mr. Boyle? You heard the discussion that we had?

Mr. McCART. I certainly think so, in this context, Mr. Chairman. It should be discussed with him in terms of the possible adverse effects of technological change in GPO, the possible relationship to the affirmative action program and the possibility of invoking furloughs, or reductions in force in that Agency. So it warrants additional consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Griffin?

Senator GRIFFIN. I have no questions, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. McCart.

Mr. McCART. Mr. Chairman, I almost forgot this point. The American Federation of Government Employees, one of the unions represented at the Government Printing Office, prepared a statement and asked me to request that you include it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very happy to have it included in the record.

[The written statement of Mr. Blaylock, national president, American Federation of Government Employees follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KENNETH T. BLAYLOCK, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, AMERICAN  
FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The record of the top management of the Government Printing Office, including Mr. Boyle as Deputy Public Printer for the past several years, causes us serious concern.

The GPO has long pursued a course of contracting-out which we believe is neither in the public interest nor conducive to effective management, to say nothing of the adverse effects on employees. The Public Employees Department, AFL-CIO with which we are affiliated is testifying on this point today. We have discussed the matter with them and wish to associate ourselves with that testimony.

There are also serious deficiencies in the area of equal employment opportunities. The Government Printing Office work force is approximately fifty percent composed of minority group employees. Instead of GPO recognizing its great responsibility and real opportunity to establish and operate an effective equal employment opportunity affirmative action program, it has taken just the opposite course. The weakness of its EEO program, the failure to show acceptable results, and the continuance of discriminatory practices have generated enormous controversy in the larger Washington, D.C. community.

Furthermore, past and present management at the GPO has shown a callous disregard for the labor organizations elected to represent GPO employees.

Although the GPO is required by statute (44 USC 305) to collectively bargain with its employees "... in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees", GPO top management has continuously placed unnecessary obstacles in the path of good faith collective bargaining.

The AFGE Printing Crafts Joint Council, for example, was finally forced, after a year of delay, to undertake a public campaign before it was able to bring GPO management to the bargaining table. As of this date, however, no contract has been negotiated covering the 2,000 employees represented by the Joint Council. Negotiations have again been stalled.

This matter will also be the subject of testimony by the Public Employees Department, AFL-CIO, and other employee representatives here today. We associate ourselves with that testimony. Such long-standing practices on the part of GPO management officials bring the Federal government's labor-management relations program, as well as its EEO program, into disrepute. The sincerity of such programs must be seriously questioned if the Government Printing Office is permitted to continue its notorious behavior in these two areas. This is particularly true when one considers the special prominence of the GPO as a Federal government employer of the local labor force in the Washington, D.C. community.

We, therefore, urge that this Committee act in such a way as to bring these undesirable practices to an end and to substitute for them both an effective EEO program and an effective labor-management program, as mandated by the laws and the public policy of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Robert E. Petersen, President of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

**TESTIMONY OF ROBERT E. PETERSEN, PRESIDENT, GREATER  
WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL (AFL-CIO); ACCOMPANIED BY GEORGE B. DRIESEN, COUNSEL**

Mr. PETERSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is George Driesen, legal counsel for the labor council. I am Robert E. Petersen of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO. That is a local arm of the AFL-CIO, and it unites the local unions and it is comprised of 150 unions with membership of about 200,000 members. Many of those members work in the Government Printing Office, and that is the reason for me being here today.

First, I want to congratulate Mr. Jack Boyle for his accomplishments over the years as a member of the International Typographical Union, because I happen to be a member of the International Typographical Union, and he has done well to start as an apprentice and work himself to the high position of Deputy Public Printer

and, if confirmed, would be the next Public Printer of the United States.

However, we have some very serious concerns about the policies that have occurred in the past and this year, in particular, we had a very difficult time with the incumbent Public Printer, Mr. McCormick, because, unknown to the unions, the Public Printer deviated from normal procedures and contract negotiations, as we call them, but they have other terms for them, by eliminating fringe benefits from the wage form which was historically based on the—as you know, Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing—based on the 25 cities, largest cities in the wages and fringe benefits in those areas. It changed a couple of times with the years but it is back to 25 cities now. And the unions, after feeling that the Public Printer did not enter in the negotiations but walked into the room and gave them a final offer, in fact that he presented them with the final offer, what it was going to be, that the unions were concerned about it, upset about it, disappointed with his attitude, and appealed that decision to the Joint Committee on Printing.

The Joint Committee, in their decision of August 4, 1977, rendered a decision in that appeal, and the incumbent Public Printer not only refused to comply with that decision but appealed that decision to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Now, we find such actions as that on the part of Mr. McCormick appalling. The Government Printing Office is an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government and under the exclusive control of Congress. Congress has designated the Joint Committee on Printing to oversee, with a board of directors in private enterprise. We feel that the private printer must comply with the board of directors' decision. In this case, Congress and his failure to do that in this case, we think, is reprehensible. The unions—and I am encouraged by some of the answers that Mr. Boyle gave to the questions that you presented to him, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the committee. But I do not think it went far enough, and if I had 2 or 3 hours, I could go into it in great detail, and I realize we are limited in our time.

But one point that we want to stress, the unions are not opposed to automation, and I think he indicated that, that we have worked with the management at the Government Printing Office to make sure we have a cost-conscious efficient operation. However, our members want to be a part of that. They want to have employment. They do not want to be furloughed and they do not want to lose their jobs because of layoffs.

We think that if you are going to start an escalation of the contracting out of Government printing, and that is one of the points that I disagree with Mr. Boyle on, perhaps in the last 7 or 8 years it has not escalated, but over the last 20 or 30 years it has escalated, and I do not have the document with me, but we can present figures to the committee that will indicate a continuing escalation of contracting of Government printing. We have to be worried about the efficiency of the Government operations, and we also—we are taxpayers, we are concerned about that as well.

But if you want to carry out another step, and I said in my testimony, which I hope will be entered in the record, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of the record in full. [The written statement of Mr. Petersen follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. PETERSEN, PRESIDENT, GREATER WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL (AFL-CIO)

Mr. Chairman, I am Robert E. Petersen, President of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council (AFL-CIO). I am appearing here today on behalf of the 150 unions in the metropolitan Washington area affiliated with our Labor Council, several of whom represent employees at the U.S. Government Printing Office.

During recent years the Labor Council has been contacted on several occasions by union officers from the Government Printing Office for assistance with their problems with management.

We feel there has been an overall deterioration in labor relations at the Printing Office during recent years, and an overall attitude of anti-unionism. Such attitude appears to us to have increased in intensity during the past year. We are therefore very concerned as to whom will direct the operations of that agency.

We don't know just what degree of responsibility for such anti-unionism can be attributed to the nominee, if any at all. However, the nominee has served for over four years as Deputy Public Printer and we are concerned about his policies and have many questions in our minds about future policies of the Government Printing Office.

Congress, in enacting legislation in 1865 to establish the U.S. Government Printing Office, was of the opinion government printing should be removed from the realm of "political spoils." It was generally considered at that time government should establish a plant to do all the government printing. For many years thereafter the provisions of that legislation were carried out without any great difficulty, according to the records of Columbia Typographical Union, which as America's oldest labor union had members in the Government Printing Office from the first day it began operations until today.

In 1924 Congress again demonstrated its wisdom by enacting the Kiess Act, which set up certain procedures to resolve wage disputes and to establish wage scales for employees. Those procedures have been modified from time to time with agreement of the Unions and the Joint Committee on Printing of the U.S. Congress.

This year unknown to the unions the Public Printer deviated from normal procedures by eliminating fringe benefits from the wage formula, which has historically been based on the wages and fringe benefits of the largest cities in our Nation. In fact the Public Printer without the knowledge of the Unions did not even request the fringe benefit figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In addition, he presented his final wage proposal to the unions just a week before the expiration of the wage agreement, which prevented any real negotiations to occur.

The unions appealed to the Joint Committee on Printing and that Committee rendered a decision dated August 4, 1977. The Public Printer not only refused to comply with the decision, but in addition appealed the ruling to the Comptroller General of the United States. We find such actions appalling. The Government Printing Office is an agency of the Legislative branch of our government, and under the exclusive control of the Congress. Congress has designated the Joint Committee on Printing to oversee the operations of the Government Printing Office, to set policy for that agency and generally serve as a board of directors would in private enterprise.

We know Congress does not support the type of arrogant disregard towards collective bargaining and the unions that has been demonstrated by the Public Printer and his staff. We know too that this distinguished committee would not confirm a nominee who it discovered would not comply with the decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing.

We therefore are suggesting to this committee that several questions be put to the nominee for Public Printer and if those questions are answered in the affirmative we fully support his confirmation.

First, will the nominee comply with the decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing?

Will the nominee pursue further expansion of the contracting out of government printing even though it may cause layoffs or furloughs of employees?

Will the nominee agree as Public Printer he will negotiate with representatives of the unions whether or not they are employees of the Government Printing Office?

Is there a contract compliance officer at the Government Printing Office? If there is one does he insure that all contracting employers conform with Federal policies on equal opportunity, human and union rights, and decent wage levels?

It is our opinion a nominee for the high office of Public Printer of the United States must comply with all laws of this nation and the established policies or else not be confirmed. He should be not only willing to comply with all decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing but in addition should be willing to advise that committee of any problems or needed changes in policies or laws which need to be corrected so that his hands will not be tied when he meets with representatives of the unions concerning grievances or negotiations.

We also feel any nominee for the office of Public Printer should agree to cease as quickly as possible the present policy of contracting out government printing with the idea that no one will lose his or her job or be furloughed as a result thereof. We find the present policy of contracting printing to low wage print shops reprehensible. If we should carry out the present policy to a few more steps, we would be sending printing to Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong or some other nation that does not have the same level of wages as this country. We support fiscal responsibility, but when printing is contracted out to firms simply on a low bid basis without regard for many other considerations, it simply is wrong.

In our opinion the person charged with the responsibility of labor relations at the Government Printing Office should be on a level of Assistant Public Printer, so that he could report either directly to the Public Printer or to the Deputy Public Printer. At the present the occupant of that position is four levels removed from the Public Printer and that in itself has created many problems.

In conclusion, we respectfully request your assistance in insuring that the nominee to the office of Public Printer of the United States responds favorably to the points we have raised or else not be confirmed. If the nominee responds favorably and commits himself to correcting the deficiencies we have mentioned then we wholeheartedly endorse and support his confirmation by the Senate of the United States and pledge ourselves to assist in any way possible to establish the Government Printing Office as a model agency of this government.

Mr. PETERSEN [continuing]. That if you carry out another step, you would be farming out printing to Taiwan and Hong Kong and so forth. Well, it just so happened yesterday afternoon one of our members gave us forms that he had asked the Federal Communications Commission for, an application for class C station license. Right on these forms it says "Printed in Japan." Now, I find that appalling. How can we have Government printing?

Senator GRIFFIN. Can we see those?

Mr. PETERSEN. Yes; I will be happy to give them to the committee.

I realize that the Government Printing Office may not have control over this, but I am concerned if we can do this for one agency, then other agencies will do this. I just feel that we have to curtail this type of activity.

We are suggesting to this committee that several questions be put to the nominee, and one, as a result of this last conflict with the Joint Committee on Printing, is an unequivocal answer, is will the Public Printer, if confirmed, comply with the decision of the Joint Committee on Printing? That is a very simple yes or no answer, I think. Will the nominee agree to negotiate with representatives of the unions? He has stated that he will negotiate with the unions to work out an agreement on negotiations.

I hope that we can reach that type of agreement.

Another is that on this contracting out, we are not even sure that there is a contract compliance officer at the Printing Office and, if there is, we are wondering whether he insures that all contracting employers conform with Federal policies on equal opportunity, human and union rights, and decent wage levels. I do

not think that is too much to ask, Mr. Chairman. We are not here to oppose Mr. Boyle's confirmation.

As I indicated at the beginning, we are proud of Mr. Boyle and his accomplishment as a member. He is no longer a member of the union because of his nomination. We were proud for the 27 years that he was a member. We are concerned about the policies in the future for the members of the Government Printing Office, and I know we have many of our deaf members, several of our deaf members in the back of the hearing room, Mr. Chairman, and they gave me a couple of questions which I would like to read into the record.

Will the appointee improve the employment for the deaf, such as proofreading, offset work, press or stripping or camera work, planning department, or copy preparation?

Will the nominee utilize affirmative action to broaden the horizon for deaf employees to be trained other than in electronic printing?

That is two of their questions, and they are concerned because, historically, the deaf members of our union, speaking as a member of the ITU, have been linotype operators, an overwhelming number. They are capable and intelligent people that can be trained in many other parts of the printing industry, and they would hope that would be given favorable recommendation by the nominee.

The CHAIRMAN. I can assure you that the committee shares your concern in that area, and I think it is commendable that there are a number of those people employed presently, and I think they should be given every possible opportunity for retraining for other kinds of jobs that they can handle in spite of their handicap.

Mr. PETERSEN. That concludes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Griffin.

Senator GRIFFIN. Just as a matter of information.

In the ITU and in other unions associated with the Government Printing Office, what is the procedure for getting into apprenticeship training program?

Mr. PETERSEN. It comes under the Government Printing Office program.

You mean within the Government or outside?

Senator GRIFFIN. I am thinking more within the GPO.

Mr. PETERSEN. Yes, they have a lot—

Senator GRIFFIN. Who is they?

Mr. PETERSEN. They, management of the Government Printing Office.

Senator GRIFFIN. They have sole control who comes in, and you do not have anything to say about it?

Mr. PETERSEN. No, the unions have no control of who they hire as apprentices.

Senator GRIFFIN. And management controls it?

Mr. PETERSEN. We try to talk the apprentices into joining the union.

Senator GRIFFIN. Yes, of course, I understand that.

So it is strictly a management function?

Mr. PETERSEN. Yes.

Senator GRIFFIN. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator ALLEN. As I understand, we can only meet until 12 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, we only have consent to meet until 12 o'clock.

Mr. Sol Fishko, president, International Printing and Graphic Communications Union.

**TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM F. MARTIN, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, INTERNATIONAL PRINTING AND GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS UNION**

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am William F. Martin, legislative representative for the International Printing and Graphic Communications Union. Sol Fishko, president of our International Union, has submitted a statement for the record of this hearing but, unfortunately, was unable to appear due to another commitment. He has asked that I appear and summarize his statement for you, and I request that it be recorded in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be made a part of the record in full. [Mr. Fishko's statement follows:]

**WRITTEN STATEMENT OF SOL FISHKO, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL PRINTING AND GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS UNION**

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I appear here today not to challenge the appointment of Mr. Boyle, but to seek his commitment to correct previous policies at the Government Printing Office which resulted in disregard of the collective bargaining process called for under the Kiess Act, serious discriminatory practices which resulted in subsequent court action and finally, but not the least of problems, an insensitivity toward the effect upon Government Printing Office employees of technological changes.

Our International Union has three subordinate local unions representing over two thousand members employed at the Government Printing Office. Obviously, for those unions, the basis of any relationship with a Public Printer must be his/her commitment to the collective bargaining process.

**1. THE KIESS ACT AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING**

In the recent past, the Public Printer under which the present nominee worked, showed a consistent disregard both for the spirit and letter of the Kiess Act and for collective bargaining itself. His tactics of eleventh hour bargaining and a penchant for defeating the union, rather than arriving at an agreeable settlement, most recently resulted in the unions filing an appeal with the Joint Committee on Printing which caused the Chairman of that Committee to write to the Public Printer pointing out his failure in the bargaining process and noting the committee's belief the primary responsibility was in his refusal to recognize his statutory duty to negotiate wages, salaries and compensation with representatives of the crafts.

The Chairman further noted that:

"The intent of the Kiess Act as provided in 44 U.S.C. 305, is clearly established in House Report 412 dated March 31, 1924, which states as follows: 'The wages and compensation for these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees.'"

We are certain that Congress wants a real working relationship between the Public Printer and the Union, since further conflict and needless provocation can only lead to resentment and confusion.

It is indeed sad that the legislation of the Kiess Act, which originated as landmark government legislation, finally recognizing the role of unions in public employment, should be so circumvented by the actions of a Public Printer as to render the law virtually worthless. As Congress moves to reform of the National Labor

Relations Act, a good law which likewise has been rendered ineffective through deliberate non-compliance by employers, so also it must view with real concern efforts by its own nominees to render an act of Congress null and void through administrative misregulation.

We think that these issues must be faced and resolved before Congress approves a new Public Printer. Certainly it is not Congress' desire to have further labor management problems; nor is it in Congress' interest that the turmoil which has plagued the Government Printing Office in the past be continued and even worsened. Therefore, in short, we urge the new Public Printer to commit him/herself to a policy of frank, open, honest and even hard-nosed bargaining with the union. Hard-nosed collective bargaining, after all, we can deal with. But what we cannot tolerate—and what Congress should not tolerate—is collective bargaining aimed not at a settlement but at breaking the union and frustrating the Congressional objective of wage and compensation negotiations.

## 2. TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Technological change is coming to the Government Printing Office. We are by no means opposed to such change. But what we are concerned about is that when this technological change comes, the human element be taken into account. In this, we are sure that Congress shares our concern. For when workers are laid off, or have to be retrained, because of technological change, then it seems to us to be the obligation of the employer to soften the real human blow that these changes cause.

Because of this concern, which we are sure that you in Congress share, we have attempted to negotiate a number of humanizing programs. These include such things as job buy-outs, job guarantees, early retirement programs, and retraining and cross-training of employees who lose their jobs due to technological change, etc.

It is imperative that the Public Printer take human and social costs into account when deciding on how to implement an automation program.

Indeed, it is ironic that at the same time these automation changes increase the capacity of the Government Printing Office to produce documents, the Government Printing Office continues its destructive policy of sub-contracting work. What we are concerned about, however, is that such programs be implemented in an humane way and that the effects of automation be negotiated with representatives of the workers. This is hardly a radical or far-reaching request; it is the procedure used in almost every major industrial concern.

## 3. SUBCONTRACTING AND CONTRACTING OUT

As the Government Printing Office prepares to furlough and possibly lay off many Government Printing Office workers, it has stepped up its campaign of sub-contracting to private printing firms throughout the United States. This not-so-gradual dismantling of the Government printing operation has serious repercussions, both for the quality of Government Printing Office material and for the working conditions and job security of the employees.

First of all, as the amount of sub-contracting work exceeds sixty percent of the total revenues of the Government Printing Office, it seems appropriate to question whether or not the contracting-out is in fact saving any taxpayers' money. The truth of the matter is that millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars are being lost by this sudden flood of sub-contracting on the part of the Government Printing Office. The work is being done by small, often unorganized, and almost invariably patronage ridden sub-contracting operations. What is happening is that taxpayers' money is going to underwrite the private profits of low cost and usually anti-labor printing operations throughout the United States.

Secondly, as Congress commits itself to human rights throughout the world, and to labor law reform at home, it seems incredible that it permits to continue a policy in its very own printing plant which supports low wage, anti-union printing operations at the expense of its own printing plant at which union workers, working in dignity with decent wages, are employed.

What Congress is getting is an artificially sterile view of its printing operations. While more and more Government Printing Office employees here in Washington may be losing their jobs under the guise of "saving money", men and women in the states which you Congressmen represent are working in sweatshops to produce what must be inferior material. This is a sad comment on the commitment by a Public Printer who is, after all, a creature of Congress, to the principle of equity and justice for working people.

The third objection to the sub-contracting is that the jobs done are simply of an inferior quality. The job which the Government Printing Office has to do is unique in quality as well as in quantity. It is a kind of cross between a daily newspaper, a

magazine, a book publishing house, and a telegraph service. Government Printing Office clients—Congress people, government agencies, and the like—often need door-to-door delivery and immediate (in some cases overnight) service. Government Printing Office employees can be on a 24-hour call, and the quality of their work must be superlative. By the cumbersome and expensive method of contracting-out, much of the quality that has heretofore so distinguished the Government's printing operation is being lost. We would expect that any Public Printer immediately cut down on the amount of work contracted-out; indeed, we would hope he or she would begin to bring in new jobs, rather than lay off present workers, to preserve the integrity and high efficiency of the Government Printing Office's operation.

We note that this position is supported by the Carter administration, OMB circular A-76, which has called for a decrease in contracting of Government work to private firms in favor of in-house work by federal employees. In the Government Printing Office, the agency in which the enactment of the Kiess Act was supposed to prevent the spoil system, we would hope that the Carter administration and Congress' policy of eliminating the spoils system in Federal employment, dictate that sub-contracting cease immediately.

#### 4. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Finally in the area of equal opportunity for minorities, we would expect that any new Public Printer take a new and enlightened approach to the Printing Office's responsibilities in this regard. Discrimination in the Government Printing Office continues with regard to women, the handicapped, Blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities. Just this year, the U.S. District Court, in a recent decision, cited the Government Printing Office for blatant discriminatory promotion policies.

We would expect that any new Public Printer would affirmatively take action to remedy discrimination in all its forms in the Government Printing Office, and in particular would accept responsibility for seeing to it that the victims of discrimination are given remedies which do not themselves act to impede the progress of present Government Printing Office workers.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we feel that we have a right to know what any future Public Printer's policy will be on all of these matters, before he or she is confirmed. It would be sad indeed if Congress voted on the nomination of a person who controls close to a billion dollars of government revenues without inquiring as to the policies which he or she will pursue. We hope that if the Congress uses the criteria of social priorities, human needs, and government efficiency, the new Public Printer will be committed enough to those values that the Printing Office will be not only a better place to work, not only a model of employment for the nation, but a reliable servant of Congress and the American people as well.

Mr. MARTIN. President Fishko wishes to make it clear that the intent of his statement is not to challenge the appointment of Mr. Boyle, but to focus his, and the committee's, attention on previous policies, practices, and attitudes at the Government Printing Office which we feel are in need of major change.

President Fishko and I would request the members of this committee to actively seek a commitment from Mr. Boyle to approach his new position with the understanding that Congress, the unions which represent Government Printing Office employees, and the taxpayers have a right to know what policies he will pursue.

We ask that he reexamine previous policies on collective bargaining, technological change, subcontracting, contracting out, equal employment, and promotion opportunity with the hope that he will use the criteria of social priorities and human needs, as well as Government efficiency and be committed to those values.

We are certain that Congress wants a real and meaningful relationship between the Public Printer and the unions which represent the employees at the Government Printing Office and an end to conflict and needless provocation which led to the present resentment, frustration, and confusion.

I thank the committee for their attention and hope the statement of President Fishko will assist them in their deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

As you know, I have raised the same questions and a number of other members have raised, some of which Mr. Boyle has raised himself, and we are going to ask him to respond to the particular questions as well.

Thank you.

Any questions?

Senator GRIFFIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Edward Donahue, legislative vice president, Graphic Arts International Union.

**TESTIMONY OF EDWARD V. DONAHUE, VICE PRESIDENT, GRAPHIC ARTS INTERNATIONAL UNION; ACCOMPANIED BY FREDRICK P. ALLEN, PRESIDENT, I.P. & G.C.U. LOCAL 713; WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, PRESIDENT, ITU LOCAL 101; CORNELIUS V. MCINTYRE, PRESIDENT, I.P. & G.C.U. LOCAL 1; AND THOMAS B. POWERS, ESQ., COUNSEL, GPO COUNCIL OF UNIONS**

Mr. DONAHUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to express the views of the Joint Council of the Government Printing Office. I will not read the total statement. You all have it.

[Mr. Donahue's written statement follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF EDWARD V. DONAHUE

Mr. Chairman, I am Edward V. Donahue, Vice President, Graphic Arts International Union. I am appearing here today on behalf of the Council of Unions, Government Printing Office, which is composed of the following Unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

International Printing & Graphic Communications Union Locals 1, 538, and 713; International Typographical Union Local 101; Graphic Arts International Union Local 4-B, 75-B, and 285; Sheet Metal Workers International Association Local 258; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local 2456; International Association of Machinists Franklin Lodge 2135; American Federation of Government Employees Union Local 2738 and 2876; International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades Local 1632; and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 121.

Accompanying me today are: Fredrick P. Allen, President, IP & GCU, Local 713; William J. Boarman, President, ITU Local 101; Cornelius V. McIntyre, President, IP & GCU, Local 1; and Thomas B. Powers, Esq., Counsel, GPO Council of Unions.

As the Unions representing the workers in the G.P.O., it is obvious that we have a most direct interest in the nomination of a Public Printer who will truly represent the public interest in the Government printing operation. While we do not want to take sides for or against any individual, we nevertheless feel it imperative that whoever is the nominee—and whoever becomes Public Printer—be called upon to make a public disclosure of the policies which he or she will pursue as Public Printer. Because of this concern we are offering this testimony on what we feel are some of the past and present pitfalls of the Government Printing Office, and the directions which we hope a new Public Printer will pursue.

1. THE KIESS ACT AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Obviously, for us as unions, the touchstone of any relationship with a Public Printer must be his commitment to the collective bargaining process. In the past some Public Printers have not been committed to collective bargaining; indeed, the last Public Printer, under which the present nominee worked, showed a consistent and flagrant disregard both for the spirit and letter of the Kiess Act and for

collective bargaining itself. This evident ignorance of the role of unions made for considerable turmoil in the G.P.O. As a result of an eleventh hour bargaining by the Public Printer's office over the last wage package, the Joint Committee on Printing was forced to hear an appeal from the Union. Indeed, upon the hearing of the appeal by the Joint Committee, Chairman Howard Cannon issued a letter which states:

"It appears obvious that new guidelines are necessary to guide future wage negotiations between you and the crafts because the history of the instant case has demonstrated a failure in the bargaining process. While neither side is totally free from blame for this failure, we believe the primary responsibility lies in your refusal to recognize your statutory duty to negotiate wages, salaries, and compensation with the representatives of the crafts."

The Chairman of the Committee went on to note that:

"The intent of the Kiess Act as provided in 44 U.S.C. 305, is clearly established in House Report 412 dated March 31, 1924, which states as follows: 'The wages and compensation for these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees.'"

This evident intent of the act has been consistently circumvented by the Public Printer's action in:

Refusing to take into account fringe benefits in calculating the wage formula, despite the fact that an advisory committee report (which assumed the form of a contractual agreement between the Public Printer and the Union) stated:

"Whenever fringe benefits are considered, the cost of private sector fringes shall be balanced against the cost of Federal sector fringes and the resulting difference, if any, shall be a matter of negotiation."

Breaking off wage conference meetings more than 2 years ago, and waiting only a few weeks before the expiration of the wage agreement to begin real negotiation with the Unions.

Practicing classic J. P. Stevensesque bargaining tactics in presenting a wage agreement only a week before the craft representatives had to vote on the agreement in final form, thus precluding any real negotiations over the substance of the agreement, and provoking a crisis with the Joint Committee's intervention as a result, because of the lateness of negotiation.

Purposefully misleading the bargainers for the representatives of the workers in saying that he was getting the Bureau of Labor Statistics fringe benefits data when in fact he knew months before the negotiation started that he had formally requested only straight wages data from the BLS.

Arbitrarily assuming and exercising the authority to prevent a duly elected representative of a craft from serving on the bargaining committee.

Arbitrarily ruling that a member of a bargaining committee must be an employee of the Government Printing Office with the exercise of police power to remove such a union representative, a flagrant disregard for the Kiess Act (see Congressional Record—page 10560—June 4, 1924—H.R. 7996).

Denying application of the Kiess Act by setting wage rates under the guise of a "Wage Advisory Committee" as differentiated from a bargaining committee.

The use of "Boulwar" discredited techniques of circumventing the unions completely by presenting final wage proposals, not to the bargaining table, but to the press and bulletin boards in the plant. This is one of the oldest tricks in anti-union management's book. It can lead to nothing more than provocation and vituperative battles between unions and management, which is the last thing Congress would want from its agency.

And after the Joint Committee on Printing issued guidelines to the Public Printer in the decision of August 4, 1977, the Public Printer and his staff still have refused to comply with the guidelines and have appealed the decisions to the Comptroller General, despite the fact that these guidelines merely present an orderly process for bargaining with the union.

What is apparent is that the Public Printer does not want any bargaining with the Union, but rather wishes to avoid the issue altogether.

Thus, the Public Printer's pattern of bargaining has become clear. The picture is one of management using tactics strictly for the purpose of beating the union, rather than arriving at settlement. We are confident that this is not the sort of bargaining posture that Congress wants from its agency. We are equally sure that Congress wants a real working relationship between the Public Printer and the Union, since further conflict and needless provocation can only lead to resentment, confusion, and, ultimately, possible work slowdowns and stoppages.

It is indeed sad that the legislation of the Kiess Act, which originated as landmark government legislation, finally recognizing the role of unions in public employment, should be so circumvented and destroyed by the actions of a Public

Printer as to make it appear that the law is virtually worthless. As Congress moves to reform of the National Labor Relations Act, a good law which likewise has been rendered ineffective through deliberate non-compliance by employers, so also it must view with real concern efforts by its own nominees to render an act of Congress null and void through administrative misregulation.

We think that these issues must be faced and resolved before Congress approves a new Public Printer. Certainly it is not Congress' desire to have further labor management problems; nor is it in Congress' interest that the turmoil which has plagued the G.P.O. in the past be continued and even worsened. Therefore, in short, we urge the new Public Printer to commit himself to a policy of frank, open, honest and even hard-nosed bargaining with the union. Hard-nosed collective bargaining, after all, we can deal with. We know how to do it. We are sure the Public Printer knows how to do it. But what we cannot tolerate—and what Congress should not tolerate—is collective bargaining aimed not at a settlement but at breaking the union and frustrating the Congressional objective of wage and compensation negotiations.

## 2. TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE AND MECHANIZATION

Technological change is coming to the Government Printing Office. We who represent the workers at G.P.O. are by no means opposed to such change. We are not the kind of people who enjoy or will work for featherbedding of any sort. But what we are concerned about is that when this technological change comes, the human element be taken into account. In this, we are sure that Congress shares our concern. For when workers are laid off, or have to be retrained, because of technological change, then it seems to us to be the obligation of the employer to soften the real human blow that these changes cause.

Because of this concern, which we are sure that you in Congress share, we have attempted to negotiate a number of humanizing programs.

It is imperative that the Public Printer take human and social costs into account when deciding on how to implement an automation program.

Once again, we would emphasize that we are not opposed to automation. On the contrary, to the extent that automation increases the Government Printing Office's ability to fulfill its mission and the work of Congress, we are wholeheartedly in favor of it. Indeed, it is ironic that at the same time these automation changes increase the capacity of the G.P.O. to produce documents, the G.P.O. continues its destructive policy of subcontracting work. What we are concerned about, however, is that such programs be implemented in a humane way and that the effects of automation be negotiated with us as representatives of the workers. This is hardly a radical or far-reaching request; it is the procedure used in almost every major industrial concern. But we do ask—and demand—that a new Public Printer commit himself to taking human beings into account in the process of technological change.

## 3. SUBCONTRACTING AND CONTRACTING OUT

As the G.P.O. prepares to furlough and possibly lay off many, if not hundreds, of G.P.O. workers, it has stepped up its campaign of sub-contracting to private printing firms throughout the United States. This not-so gradual dismantling of the Government printing operation has serious repercussions, both for the quality of G.P.O. material and for the working conditions and job security of G.P.O. employees.

First of all, as the amount of sub-contracted work exceeds sixty percent of the total revenues of the G.P.O., it seems appropriate to question whether or not the contracting-out is in fact saving any taxpayers' money. The truth of the matter is that millions, if not tens of millions, of dollars are being lost by this sudden flood of sub-contracting on the part of the G.P.O. This is for obvious reasons: the small, often unorganized, and almost invariably patronage ridden sub-contracting operations, through which the G.P.O. loans out its work, do not have the economies of scale which a large operation such as the Government Printing Office can have. Also, written into each and every sub-contract, are the private profits and capital investment costs for these private concerns. In other words, what is happening is that taxpayers' money is going to underwrite the private profits of low cost and usually anti-labor printing operations throughout the United States.

And this brings us to our second major objection to the use of these sub-contractors by the G.P.O. As Congress commits itself to human rights throughout the world, and to labor law reform at home, it seems incredible that it permits to continue a policy in its very own printing offices which support low wage, anti-union printing operations at the expense of its own printing plant at which union workers, working in dignity with decent wages, are employed. Indeed, it is symptomatic of the incredible conditions under which the workers for these sub-contractors

may be employed, that the G.P.O. essentially has no contract compliance survey of the types of wages or working conditions at its sub-contracted plants.

In short, then, what Congress is getting is an artificially sterile view of its printing operations. While more and more Government Printing Office employees here in Washington may be losing their jobs under the phony excuse of "saving money," men and women in the states which the Members of Congress represent are working under sub-standard rates and conditions. This is a sad comment on the commitment by a Public Printer who is, after all, a creature of Congress, to the principle of equity and justice for working people.

And that brings us to the third objection to the sub-contracting: that is the manner in which it is carried out and the intensity with which it is promoted. This is so because the job which the Government Printing Office has to do is unique in quality as well as in quantity. It is a kind of cross between a daily newspaper, a magazine, a book publishing house, and a telegraph service. G.P.O.'s clients—Congress people, government agencies, and the like—often need door-to-door delivery and immediate (in some cases overnight) service. G.P.O. employees can be on a 24-hour call, much like highly paid executives or emergency personnel. The quality of G.P.O.'s product must be superlative. After all, its documents are used in chronicling the laws and legislation of the United States Government. By the cumbersome and expensive method of contracting out, much of the quality that has heretofore so distinguished the Government's printing operation is being lost.

In short, this sudden flood of contracting out poses a danger not only to the workers of the Government Printing Office, but to Congressional policies of labor equity, as well as to the fulfillment of the Printing Office's mission. We would demand that any Public Printer immediately cut down on the amount of work contracted out; indeed, we would hope he or she would return the work rather than lay off present workers to preserve the integrity and high efficiency of the Government Printing Office's operation.

We note that this position is supported by the Carter Administration, OMB circular A-76, which has called for a decrease in contracting of Government work to private firms in favor of in-house work by federal employees. Much of the tendency to expand the contracting out of work flows from the urging of self-serving industry spokesmen parading under the cloak of "Free-enterprise" as they seek to destroy the G.P.O. as an essential Government option to the market place. The G.P.O. is an agency which was established to eliminate the spoils system in the procurement of printing. We call upon Congress to correct the departure from the basic principles which established the G.P.O. with respect to procurement policies.

#### 4. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Finally, in the area of equal employment opportunity we would expect that the Public Printer would move immediately to eliminate the vestiges of past discrimination, develop programs that insure equal opportunity for all employees regardless of race, creed, color, sex, and ethnic origin. The Public Printer should establish within his hierarchy an individual reporting directly to him whose sole responsibility is to insure equal treatment for all G.P.O. employees. Currently, the Director of Personnel who sets personnel policy and practices at G.P.O. is also the person who passes on whether those policies satisfy equal employment opportunities objectives at G.P.O. Only by separating these two functions will it be possible for G.P.O. to effectively embark on a program to wipe out all past discrimination.

At the present time the overall work force at G.P.O. is composed of approximately 53% minority employees, while the supervisory force at G.P.O. is virtually all white male. It is this supervisory force which passes on promotions of all minority employees. This system serves to maintain the G.P.O. practice of discrimination primarily against blacks and women. The Public Printer should commit himself to adopting a program of objective criteria in determining promotions so that the supervisory force will reflect the minority composition of the work force.

In addition, the G.P.O. is attempting to remedy past discrimination which it has caused, by placing the burden on individual employees. The Public Printer should commit himself to an affirmative program by which no employee will be laid off in order to remedy discrimination, but instead will be offered opportunities for training to enable them to meet the employment needs at G.P.O.

The G.P.O.'s practice of discrimination is especially appalling with respect to handicapped employees who have in the past exhibited a high degree of effectiveness and competency. The G.P.O. after having initially recruited such people, arbitrarily limited their opportunities for the future. The Public Printer should commit himself to examine the type of jobs available at G.P.O. which could be filled by

these handicapped employees and offer them the same opportunity for such jobs as is available to other employees.

I might also add that the Unions at G.P.O. stand ready to work with and assist the Public Printer in implementing any meaningful actions he takes in this regard.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, as the unions representing G.P.O. workers, and as American citizens and taxpayers, we feel that we have a right to know what any future Public Printer's policy will be on all of these matters, *before* he or she is confirmed. It would be sad indeed if Congress voted on the nomination of a man who controls close to half a billion dollars of government revenues without inquiring as to the policies which he or she will pursue. We hope that if the Congress uses the criteria of social priorities, human needs, and government efficiency, the new Public Printer will be committed enough to those values that the Printing Office will be not only a better place to work, not only a model of employment for the Nation, but a reliable servant of Congress and the American people as well.

Mr. DONAHUE. I want to emphasize a few points that are enumerated therein. The first is that I did not volunteer to come here. I was selected by the unions, some 9 locals, 14 locals, and 9 international unions that comprise the Council of GPO. I want to emphasize that I do not work at the GPO, which is a key point, which is one of the points that we raised in the testimony.

Accompanying me today are Fredrick P. Allen, president, I.P. & G.C.U. Local 713; William J. Boarman, president, ITU Local 101; Cornelius V. McIntyre, president, I.P. & G.C.U. Local 1; and Thomas B. Powers, Esq., counsel, GPO Council of Unions.

As the unions representing the workers in the GPO, it is obvious that we have a most direct interest in the nomination of a Public Printer who will truly represent the public interest in the Government printing operation. While we do not want to take sides for or against any individual, we nevertheless feel it imperative that whoever is the nominee—and whoever becomes Public Printer—be called upon to make a public disclosure of the policies which he or she will pursue as Public Printer. Because of this concern, we are offering this testimony on what we feel are some of the past and present pitfalls of the Government Printing Office, and the directions which we hope a new Public Printer will pursue.

#### THE KIESS ACT AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Obviously, for us as unions, the touchstone of any relationship with a Public Printer must be his commitment to the collective bargaining process. In the past, some Public Printers have not been committed to collective bargaining; indeed, the last Public Printer, under which the present nominee worked, showed a consistent and flagrant disregard both for the spirit and letter of the Kiess Act and for collective bargaining itself. This evident ignorance of the role of unions made for considerable turmoil in the GPO. As a result of an 11th hour bargaining by the Public Printer's Office over the last wage package, the Joint Committee on Printing was forced to hear an appeal from the unions. Indeed, upon the hearing of the appeal by the Joint Committee, Chairman Howard Cannon issued a letter which states—I will not bother to read that. I think it is self-explanatory. I wish to reemphasize the last quotation.

The chairman of the committee went on to note that:

The intent of the Kiess Act, as provided in 44 U.S.C. 305, is clearly established in House Report 412 dated March 31, 1924, which states as follows: "The wages and

compensation for these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees."

I might say, and I am not going to read page 4, but I might say that the whole question of the Kiess Act and the testimony of Mr. Boyle, compared to the attitude of the last Public Printer, is encouraging. These unions are not looking for some patsy that will, say, do whatever is asked of them, but they are looking to Mr. Boyle if he becomes the nominee as one that will take a look at their point of view with respect to the definition.

Let us take the word "conference." A few years ago, the Joint Committee on Printing approved a wage study committee. That committee was to be appointed on behalf of the Public Printer and the folks from the unions were to elect their representatives. Mr. Boyle's representative said that you have to be a member of the GPO in order to serve on that committee. Then the answer was given that this is not a wage committee, that this is a study committee. But, indeed, that committee, before it got through, found itself in the position as was predictable of finding themselves a wage package going at a late date to the Joint Committee on Printing.

The question of the Kiess Act, that is spelled out in here, the Congressional Record, page 10560. What it says there with respect to—the members of those groups selecting a representative of their choice. Yet we were told by the staff of the Joint Committee on Printing, which, incidentally, is composed of good people, most of whom come out of the Government Printing Office, with many years of experience there. I was amazed to learn, as an outsider, that you would have to work there in order to understand what the Kiess Act says, and their interpretation of this was exactly opposite to what the Congressional Record shows.

We would like to have—we would expect the next Public Printer to recognize the unions and recognize their rights in choosing the people that they negotiate with.

Now, with respect to the wage package that was approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, with a slap on the wrist for the Public Printer for virtually destroying the public bargaining process, it has been stated here before that that was appealed. The document in which the appeals were made were not questioned with the Comptroller General for an opinion. They were—it was rather a statement of advocacy against what the Joint Committee on Printing had directed the Public Printer to do. Even at this late date, even at this late date, the Public Printer persists in sticking to the same old argument with respect to the Kiess Act and with respect to retroactive.

In the private sector, if you were negotiating a contract, and we are taking you down to a deadline, and there was not going to be any retroactivity, there are ways of dealing with it. This office has maintained and has advocated that the Comptroller General say that there will be no retroactivity. The Joint Committee on Printing found that in their deliberations that the Public Printer was at fault and ordered, not in those words, but ordered retroactivity back to June 17, I believe it was, Mr. Chairman. So much for the question of collective bargaining.

On technological change and mechanism, that has been fairly well covered, but I just want to say that people feel insecure when they see technological change coming. I represent an international union and I want to make a point that the majority of the members that I represent are in the private sector, and we have dealt with technological change by putting it on top of the table and removing the fear and bargaining for many—for training programs, and setting up schools and finding ways to meet people in the industry.

As a matter of fact, our experience has shown that in the lithograph field alone, that it is no longer sufficient to learn a trade. You ought to figure out learning a dozen types, and we would like to see the Government Printing Office and the unions jointly solve some of these problems.

Now, on the question of subcontracting and contracting out, our statement would indicate, if you read it literally, that we oppose the subcontracting out. I want to qualify that because that is not true. What we are talking about is subcontracting out when there is a threat of furloughs, a reduction in force at the Government Printing Office. Mr. Boyle was questioned with respect to what percentage, percentages were in terms of contracting out. The Comptroller General's report for 1975 showed, and on the dollar question, that 66.8 percent of banking and printing revenue resulted in services performed by commercial firms. In plain English that means 66.8 percent of the work handled by GPO was subcontracted to commercial printing firms. That was up 23 percent, not 3 percent, but 23 percent over the other year.

I charge, Mr. Chairman, words have been stated here that this is nonpolitical. I charge, Mr. Chairman, that you have \$500 million worth of business, people are going to gather. I note my friends from the Printing Industries of America have testified here today. Members of this committee may not realize it but in an association meeting, or any gathering that I have ever been around in this country where printing is involved, where those that sell printing and produce printing in the private sector are involved, and you gave them their choice between dinner with the Public Printer and the President of the United States, they would take the Public Printer. It is as simple as that.

I would also like to—in passing—square away this “mom and pop” business that the industry keeps talking about. They talked about it before the Labor Committee in the House, et cetera. And let us take a look at it.

I am using Department of Commerce figures. Eighty percent of the commercial printing firms have less than 20 employees. That is true. That is what they said. But they account for only 25 percent of the total dollar volume printed in the United States. Less than 1 percent have less than 250 employees, and they account for 25 percent of the total dollar volume. There is a high degree of sales concentration in industry, and it is not all “mom and pop.” And even the “mom and pop” industries are highly capitalized and highly productive.

One other point I would like to cover. I have got a suitcase full of files, Mr. Chairman. One of our other complaints in terms of subcontracting and the growth of nonunion firms that have put to-

gether with a few craftsmen, recruit other people to get them going at substandard wages, and this area, that is one thing. But when the Public Printer takes the position that he is powerless to cancel a contract of a plant that has 100 percent Government work in it, that is regulated union, and that has forced them on strike, that is another thing. And going beyond that, it is even more serious when they let new contracts. That is another thing.

Beyond that, it is even more serious when the man that owns the plant is breaking the unions of a former employee of the GPO with connection with the setup.

Mr. Chairman, I rest my case. I am looking for a better day from the new Public Printer. And as we said in our statement, we want him to bargain hard and we want to bargain, and we would like to dispense with the nonsense of throwing the word around, what conference means. Conference in the law does not mean bargaining. The House and the Senate are in conference today and yesterday on energy. I wonder if they are bargaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Griffin.

Senator GRIFFIN. Can you give me some idea of the average amount of overtime incurred in the various categories working at the GPO?

Mr. DONAHUE. I do not have any idea, Mr. Chairman. You would have to get that from the Public Printer.

Senator GRIFFIN. Well, you must have some idea. Are not you representing the joint craft unions?

Mr. DONAHUE. Yes, I am representing the Joint Crafts. There is somebody else that might be able to answer.

Might I comment on the question? We heard at the cross-bargaining table everywhere how much overtime somebody is getting. As a matter of fact, the printing industry is an overtime industry by nature, a service industry. It is like shining shoes virtually. You work when the work comes. Overtime is absolutely mandatory and yet we are told by employers, look, what a great thing you have got working overtime. I heard the point made here that some of the employees got to work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. We do not submit that that is good—

Senator GRIFFIN. I am trying to find out how many are doing that.

Mr. DONAHUE. I do not know.

Senator GRIFFIN. How many of your union members at the GPO have been laid off in the past year?

Mr. McINTYRE. None have yet. But recently we have been in hearings, meetings with management, where they were proposing a furlough program because of contracting and that Congress would be going out at the end of this month, and that between the end of this month and the first of January, there would be very little work.

So the employees—and I just recently, as of late Monday, sometime Monday afternoon, the meeting that we had scheduled for yesterday was canceled because there was nothing to talk about because, all of a sudden, we got extra work.

Senator GRIFFIN. What union are you with?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am with a former pressman's union, I.P. & G.C.U. I am president of local 1, and also chairman of the Joint Council of Unions.

Senator GRIFFIN. Then your position is that you cannot give me a rough estimate as to how much overtime the average member of the unions you represent has in a month?

Mr. McINTYRE. Well, I cannot give you—the only rough estimate I could give you is all depending upon the needs of Congress, depending upon how much work you send over to us.

Senator GRIFFIN. I am trying to find out how much overtime you are working.

Mr. McINTYRE. It varies.

Senator GRIFFIN. On the average.

Mr. McINTYRE. Well, I think up until you people came——

Senator GRIFFIN. How about last month?

Mr. McINTYRE. Until you people came back to work, we had very little work in the press room. Now, the last month, I think we worked last Saturday and we had a skeleton crew in there. I believe it was like over the last holiday weekend just to take care of the records.

Senator GRIFFIN. You work an 8-hour day?

Mr. McINTYRE. Eight-hour days.

Senator GRIFFIN. So the overtime is on the weekend?

Mr. McINTYRE. Sometimes it will be 3 hours at night if we are loaded with congressional work, but most of the time they come on Saturday.

Senator GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, it may be unfair to ask them to answer this off the top of their head, but I would like to know, and certainly the staff can get this information together for us, I would like to have the amount of overtime for each of the various categories, compositors, book binders, offset pressmen, and so on for the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Boyle can supply that for the record.

Senator GRIFFIN. I would like to get some picture of the amount of overtime that is being worked there. I would like to know the costs; is it time and a half, is that what they get paid?

Mr. BOYLE. Time and a half. It will be supplied.

Senator GRIFFIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The following material was submitted by Mr. Boyle:]

## PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT REGULAR AND OVERTIME HOURS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1977

	Regular hours	Overtime hours	Total
Office of Production Manager (114 employees) .....	94,923	935	95,858
Photocomposition (135 employees):			
Superintendent's office .....	5,721	54	5,775
Day .....	123,311	9,163	132,474
Night .....	124,126	7,383	131,509
Total .....	253,158	16,600	269,758
Composing (1,510 employees):			
Superintendent's office .....	31,723	489	32,212
Day .....	1,543,844	162,071	1,705,915
Night .....	1,492,902	309,333	1,802,235
Total .....	3,068,469	471,893	3,540,362
Letterpress (369 employees):			
Superintendent's office .....	13,699	80	13,779
Day .....	395,742	10,744	406,486
Intermediate .....	65,669	5,343	71,012
Night .....	314,902	18,632	333,534
Total .....	790,012	34,799	824,811
Offset (625 employees):			
Superintendent's office .....	20,689	8	20,697
Day .....	631,188	18,649	649,837
Intermediate .....	105,731	4,664	110,395
Night .....	541,325	30,348	571,673
Total .....	1,298,933	53,669	1,352,602
Bindery (1,085 employees):			
Superintendent's office .....	25,957	12	25,969
Day .....	1,231,797	69,178	1,300,975
Intermediate .....	46,080	325	46,405
Night .....	956,038	72,474	1,028,512
Total .....	2,259,872	141,989	2,401,861
Total day .....	4,118,594	271,383	4,389,977
Total night .....	3,646,773	448,502	4,095,275
Grand total .....	7,765,367	719,885	8,485,252

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allen.

Senator ALLEN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

It is now 12 o'clock. We only have permission to meet until 12 o'clock.

I am going to ask Mr. Boyle if he would respond further to the questions that have been raised here by a number of the witnesses today. I do not know that he needs to give us any further response with respect to the Kiess Act because I think you responded quite completely, I believe, in that particular. But there were some other questions that perhaps you could elaborate further on, such as the contracting out and the opportunity for retraining for some of these people that may be laid off, and I also—I am interested in the Depository Library Program. Recently, the Government Printing Office has taken a number of steps to improve this program. For example, the depository library council to the Public Printer has been reactivated, and as a result there is now a continuing and productive dialog between GPO officials and participating local libraries in every State. Also, GPO has improved some of its indexes and subject guides so that Government publications can be more easily located. More work remains to be done to modernize and streamline this program so that all Americans have ready access to Government publications through their local depository libraries. I believe the depository library program is a very important one that should be strengthened and improved.

I wonder if you would give a statement with respect to that particular point and then if you would also tell us what your plans are for automation of congressional publications and how do you see this benefiting the Congress, and what kind of timeframe are we looking at, and we may have some other questions to submit to you from the staff.

I regret that we cannot go into more detail in some of these matters right now. But we only have consent to meet until 12 o'clock noon, and it is 12 o'clock.

Mr. BOYLE. Yes, sir. Thank you very much. I will respond to all those questions.

I thought you might ask how we subcontract that job to Taiwan.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I am going to ask that.

Mr. BOYLE. We get that question raised about every 2 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, I told the staff director Mr. Denver Dickerson, of the Joint Committee on Printing to find out why that was contracted. It says Japan, it does not say Taiwan.

RESPONSE SUBMITTED BY MR. DENVER DICKERSON, STAFF DIRECTOR, JOINT  
COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

FCC Form 505, Application for Class C or D Station License in the Citizens Radio Service is required to be filed for approval to operate certain types of radio equipment including CB radios. The Federal Communications Commission was deluged with so many requests it was impossible to keep pace with the demand. In order to relieve the backlog, FCC authorizes and encourages manufacturers of radio equipment that require a class C or D station license in order to operate, include a copy of FCC Form 505 packaged with the radio. Many of the manufacturers of radios in foreign countries that are sold in the United States have the form printed in the country of origin, that is the reason we see the printing imprint from various countries.

Mr. BOYLE. We have seen them from Japan and Taiwan. Everybody who purchases a CB radio has to fill out an application blank for the FCC instruction publication and for the FCC license. The foreign manufacturers of CB radios print the FCC application and places a copy in every CB radio. It is photographed and printed in every country that manufactures CB radios for export to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The same form?

Mr. BOYLE. The same form, yes, sir. Anything printed by the U.S. Government can be reprinted anywhere by anybody. It is in the public domain. A lot of publications are reprinted overseas. They are not printed under contract to the Government Printing Office or any other Government agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The committee will have to adjourn now, and we will—the hearing will be adjourned at this time.

[Whereupon at 12:01 p.m., the committee adjourned.]

[The following material was submitted for the record by Mr. Boyle in response to questions and issues posed by Senator Howard W. Cannon and by witnesses.]

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN J. BOYLE ON CONTRACTING OUT

The contracting out activities of the GPO are in accord with the Federal Printing Program established by the Joint Committee on Printing, the thrust of which is to rely on the private sector for all work which can be economically purchased in a timely fashion to meet the requirements of the government activity needing the printed product. There has not been a stepup in the program. It has been a continuing effort aimed at utilizing the existing capability of the GPO facilities, and purchasing in the most economical fashion any work which cannot be produced in a timely or economic manner in the GPO.

The ratio of work produced in the Central Office has not changed significantly since the program was established in 1965. The Regional Printing Procurement Offices merely took over the purchasing of work produced in authorized agency plants or purchased in the field by the agencies. That work never had been produced in GPO and would not now revert to GPO if the RPPO's were closed.

I categorically deny the statement that our "sub-contracting out operations" are in any way affected by patronage or any other political influence. Work which the GPO contracts out is awarded on a competitive basis in a completely objective fashion to the lowest bidder capable of producing our requirement. Contrary to Mr. Donahue's statements, work which is contracted out is almost invariably obtained at costs lower than estimates for in-house work because of the nature of the work itself or because of the competitiveness of the market.

Concerning Mr. Donahue's remarks with respect to purchases from non-union printers, the purchasing activities of the GPO are only in accordance with the law and the Federal Procurement Regulations. We take a completely neutral position with respect to the union or non-union status of our bidders. We have no alternative in this area but to make determinations of capability on the basis of a carefully considered decision as to whether or not the proposed contractor can or cannot fulfill our requirement.

Concerning Mr. Donahue's comments as to quality and timeliness, work which can be economically produced in the existing facilities of the GPO on a timely basis is not contracted out at the expense of having GPO facilities and employees stand idle. We have no evidence that either timeliness or quality is adversely affected by contracting out that portion of the work not produced in the plant.

There has been an increase over the last several years in the volume of much of the Congressional work necessitating an increase in the work purchased commercially. The Federal Register has increased from 20,000 pages in 1970 to 50,000 pages in 1976, an increase of 250 percent. Congressional bills have increased 73 percent, reports and hearings have increased by 60 percent.

A great amount of the work contracted out could not have been produced in GPO because it requires specialty equipment. Most of the work contracted out could not

have been produced in the required time frame without causing delinquencies in work held in the plant.

In summary. The GPO practices of contracting out are in accordance with its directives from the Joint Committee on Printing and are in full compliance with OMB Circular A-76 and other Federal procurement regulations.

## STATEMENT ON RESPONSE TO COALITION OF MINORITY WORKERS RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. COMMITMENT FOR RETRAINING OF ALL EMPLOYEES REQUESTING

A great number of potentially affected employees will be retrained for other work. However, there will be a surplus of employees in some occupations over the next five years. A commitment for retention and retraining can be made so that every employee that can possibly be utilized by the Government Printing Office will be.

Chapter 41 of Title 5, U.S. Code, contains certain limitations on training. The Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 410, limits permissible training to those courses or other learning experiences "which are or will be directly related to the performance by the employee of official duties for the government, in order to increase the knowledge, proficiency, ability, skill, and qualifications of the employees in the performance of official duties." Thus, training is basically intended only to improve the performance of the current duties. It is not intended to prepare employees for promotion unless competition has been held for access to training which will insure promotion of affected employees. Section 410.302 of Title 5 states, "Merit promotion programs established under section 335.103 of this chapter shall be followed in selecting career or career-conditional employees for training that is given primarily to prepare trainees for advancement and that is required for promotion."

### 2. ABOLISH OR DRASTICALLY CHANGE SUPERVISORY EVALUATIONS BECAUSE OF THEIR DISCRIMINATORY USE AS FOUND BY THE COURT

We know of no instance where a court has found our supervisory evaluations to be discriminatory. On the contrary, in several recent investigations, there has been an indication that the scores on supervisory evaluations do not differ significantly between blacks and whites. The Civil Service Commission regulations regarding Federal Merit Promotion Programs mandate the use of supervisory evaluations for promotions and therefore cannot be abolished.

Certainly, it is always possible to improve a device of this type. We have done so several times in the past and will continue to review and refine these evaluations over the next several years.

### 3. INCREASE APPRENTICESHIP AND SUPERVISORY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS TO OPEN UP PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES

The agency cannot increase the number of apprenticeship opportunities available at this time. In light of reduced workforce, such programs would only create additional excess journeymen as expected reductions in force occur. An agency is not free to create positions merely to promote employees when its mission needs indicate that they are clearly not required. Certainly, in light of increased economies and efficiencies brought about by technological improvements this agency cannot use any more journeymen on a permanent basis. (It might be noted that we have not hired journeymen from the outside for several years now, except on a temporary basis, and we do not plan to do so in the foreseeable future).

The supervisory development program is intended to provide competition among all qualified employees for a one year training program which gives candidates for supervisory jobs some familiarity with supervisory responsibilities. The number of employees trained is limited by the projected needs of the agency for craft supervisors. Given the expected reduction in the numbers of craftsmen during the next five years, no great number of craft supervisory vacancies is expected.

### 4. PREVENT SELECTION TO UPRATE POSITIONS ON CURRENT DISCRIMINATORY BASIS

We know of no discrimination that has ever been proved in regard to our selection procedures for uprate positions (there is a preliminary finding of discrimination in the Offset case by Judge Barrington Parker). However, selections for supervisory positions are made from among candidates who must first be screened through the pre-supervisory selection program and then are subject to full and open competition as vacancies occur under the Federal Merit Promotion Program. There are thus two separate and distinct procedures involved for the would-be supervisor. Given the growing number of minority group supervisors in the GPO, it does not appear that discrimination is being practiced. A member of the EEO organization does sit on

each panel and will continue to do so. We will make every effort to ensure that no discrimination occurs in either of the two procedures noted above.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN J. BOYLE IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON'S  
QUESTIONS REGARDING IMPROVEMENTS IN THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Depository distributions are current. Books are in the mail within 72 hours of receipt. More than a million publications are shipped to depository libraries each month. This can be contrasted with the situation three years ago when depository library shipments were backlogged two and one-half years. As a result of the improvements, the American Library Association, in the past two years, has passed three resolutions commending GPO, its officials, or its programs.

There are 1,217 Depository Libraries in the system. Forty-eight of those libraries are Regional Depository Libraries.

GPO is prepared to act if the proposed Bill to offer depository status to the law school libraries is enacted by this Congress. A supplemental appropriation of some two million dollars will be sought should the Bill be enacted. The Bill would extend Depository status to approximately 180 law school libraries. Thirty-four of those libraries already hold Depository designations.

The Joint Committee on Printing authorization to provide microfiche copies of Government documentation is proceeding. About one-quarter million microfiche will have been shipped before the end of October involving 550 titles. Plans are being laid for additional microfiche conversions of titles now being shipped to depository libraries in conventional ink-on-paper format. It is expected that printing costs will be reduced by approximately one-half million dollars in calendar year 1978 as a result of this program.

I am extremely pleased with the progress GPO has made in the Depository Library Program in the past two years. I am deeply committed to the Depository Library Program. I will encourage input and suggestions from the library community. I will be fully supportive of, and will value the advice of, the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer.

STATEMENT ON AUTOMATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

The Government Printing Office has been in process of automating Congressional publications since the first committee calendar for the House was composed from magnetic tape produced on the Library of Congress computers in 1973. Since that time most of the House committee calendars and several of the Senate committee calendars are phototypeset from magnetic tape produced on the House and Senate computers.

Congressional Hearings have been produced for the past two years, mostly for the Senate Appropriations Committee whereby the reporters of the hearing submit optically scannable transcript to the Committee which is electronically scanned at GPO to produce typeset pages without rekeyboarding.

The number of pages produced by this method has increased steadily. We are now working with the House and Senate Information Systems staffs and several of the committees to go directly into the computer for storage and correction of the hearings and then automatically typeset the corrected data on GPO electronic equipment.

This year the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing approved the formation of a working committee to assist in the coordination of automation efforts of the Senate, House, Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office. The committee is chaired by the Staff Director of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The first major project of the committee is the automation of the Congressional Record. A preliminary study has been completed and problems in the procedure for handling transcript in an automated system have been identified. Work is continuing.

A second major effort is the automation of Congressional bills, resolutions, and amendments. The plan is to capture bills at the source of the drafting stage and use the computer stored data to typeset the introduced bill. The bill will be amended, referred in each of the Houses, engrossed, and enrolled without ever being reset. Some bills will be set by this method in the second session of this Congress.

We are working on the automation of reports, and have produced many other Senate and House Documents through the automated system.

The daily Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations which until this year was funded by Congressional Printing and Binding Appropriation, is well along

on being converted to automated typesetting and will be produced by the new method starting next month.

The sheer volume of Congressional printing dictates that the total conversion process will take some time because of the need to train people and acquire additional input terminals. Each year will see a greater volume of material produced by electronics with a target of total conversion of all hot metal to electronic photocomposition by 1982.

To the Congress we see benefits in faster turnaround time in bills, hearings, reports, and other critical printing needs. An important byproduct will be improved information systems and data drafting systems once much of the material is stored in the computer.

The most important result will be the drastically reduced costs in Congressional printing and binding from the elimination of duplication of the keystrokes necessary to set the type. As an example, this hearing has been photocomposed using the Joint Committee on Printing approved text processing and photocomposer systems. Even though keystrokes were not reduced appreciably on this hearing, cost reductions will be realized by eliminating many of the manual operations, such as page makeup and repro proofing, used in the conventional hot-metal process.

[The following letters were received by the committee to be included in the record:]

OCTOBER 21, 1977.

Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON,  
*Chairman, Rules and Administration Committee,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR CANNON: As Chairman of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, I wish to respond to the statement of Mr. Paul G. Zurkowski, President of Information Industry Association, at the hearings on October 19, 1977, on the nomination of John J. Boyle as Public Printer of the United States. I wish to address the allegations of "mismanagement" of the Government Printing Office Micropublishing Program.

The Depository Library Council is composed of public, academic, State, special and law librarians. It is constituted to provide advice to the Public Printer on matters dealing with the Depository Library Program. The Council is vitally concerned about the goal of the Depository Library Program, which is to provide free, public access to Government publications.

As a consequence the Council has consistently recommended, endorsed, and supported the Government Printing Office Micropublishing Program, which will enhance and improve the Depository Library Program by increasing the availability and accessibility of Government publications to people in all Congressional districts. The Council has advised the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents during the conceptual stages of the program, during the pilot project, and now currently during the preparation for implementation. The Council has held numerous and lengthy discussions at open meetings with Government Printing Office staff and others, including Mr. Zurkowski, regarding this program. The Council has nominated a librarian representative for the Micropublishing Advisory Council, who was appointed by the Public Printer on August 24, 1977. The Council, representing the library community, has recommended specific titles for conversion to microfiche.

The Micropublishing Program authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing on March 25, 1977, provides for the conversion of "non-GPO documentation" to microfiche. This non-GPO documentation consists of printed documents which have been produced outside the Government Printing Office in insufficient quantities for depository distribution. The only feasible and economical method to produce copies for depository distribution, as required by Chapter 19, Title 44, U.S. Code, is micropublishing. "GPO documentation," printed at the Government Printing Office, may be converted to microfiche under the following criteria as established by the Joint Committee on Printing: ". . . as necessary and as requested by individual depository libraries and when savings in costs are clearly demonstrable . . ."

These documents, in microfiche format, can be distributed to depository libraries only and will not be available for sale by the Government Printing Office.

The Depository Library Council has endorsed the Government Printing Office Micropublishing Program as a major innovative improvement greatly needed in the Depository Library Program. The Micropublishing Program should increase the number of documents distributed in compliance with Chapter 19, Title 44, U.S. Code. It should save space in depository libraries, and it should provide cost savings to the Government in the operation of the depository program.

There has been long and careful study given to the GPO Micropublishing Program, all affected parties have had ample opportunity to present their concerns, and the Program has been deemed to be in the public interest by librarians and the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. BUCKLEY, JR.,  
*Chairman, Depository Library Council to the Public Printer.*

Attachment.

MEMBERS OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER

Mrs. Ruth S. Smith  
Manager, Technical Information Serv.  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
400 Army-Navy Drive  
Arlington, Va. 22202

Mr. Anthony Miele  
Director, Alabama Public Library  
Service  
6030 Monticello Drive  
Montgomery, Ala. 36130

Mr. James C., MacCampbell  
Director of Libraries  
University of Maine  
Orono, Maine 04473

Ms. Y. T. Feng  
Assistant Director  
Research Library Services  
Boston Public Library  
Copley Square  
Boston, Mass. 02117

Ms. Laura J. Rainey  
Manager, Technical Information Ctr.  
Rockwell International Corp.  
Rocketdyne Division  
6633 Canoga Avenue  
Canoga Park, Calif. 91304

Ms. Nancy Cline  
Documents Librarian  
207 Patee Library  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pa. 16802

Mrs. Joan Kerschner  
Documents Librarian  
Nevada State Library  
Carson City, Nev. 89710

Professor Jane Hammond  
Cornell Law Library  
Myron Taylor Hall  
Ithaca, N.Y. 14853

Mr. Francis Buckley  
Documents Specialist  
Detroit Public Library  
5201 Woodward Avenue  
Detroit, Mich. 48202

Ms. Jaia Heymann  
Reference Librarian  
Rose Memorial Library  
Drew University  
Madison, N.J. 07940

Ms. Candace Morgan  
Documents Librarian  
Oregon State Library  
Salem, Oreg. 97310

Mr. Patrick M. O'Brien  
Asst. Commissioner for the  
Central Library & Cultural Center  
Chicago Public Library  
425 North Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Ill. 60611

Mr. Bardi C. Wolfe, Jr.  
Law Librarian  
University of Tennessee  
College of Law  
1505 West Cumberland Avenue  
Knoxville, Tenn. 37916

Mr. Karlo Mustonen  
Regional Depository Librarian  
Merrill Library  
Utah State University  
Logan, Utah 84322

Ms. Katherine Mawdsley  
(formerly Garosi)  
Head, Government Documents  
Department  
Shields Library  
University of California  
Davis, Calif. 95616

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1977.

Senator HOWARD W. CANNON,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CANNON: On behalf of the American Library Association, a non-profit educational organization of some 35,000 members, I would like to request that this letter be made part of the hearing record on the nomination of John J. Boyle to be Public Printer.

Specifically, we wish to state our strong support for the depository library program administered by the Office of Superintendent of Documents, and our hope that Mr. Boyle will continue to strengthen and improve that program.

In addition, we would like to comment upon the microform project of the Government Printing Office which was criticized by the Information Industry Association during the course of the nomination hearings. This program has been welcomed by our organization, as one which will help to alleviate a serious problem in the depository library program.

Many librarians have experienced great difficulty in locating and retrieving documents for the public because some government publications are not distributed to depository libraries and are not indexed in GPO's Monthly Catalog. Some of these documents are collected and offered for sale in microfacsimile by private industry, but most libraries cannot afford to purchase many of these items. Depository librarians also question why they should have to purchase these documents, since distribution of all government publications of public interest has for many years been required by law. The GPO microform program offers a solution to the problem by converting documents printed in limited quantities to microfiche for distribution to depositories.

We believe both the Joint Committee and the Government Printing Office should be commended for the innovative, yet practical, program they have developed to meet the requirements of Chapter 19, Title 44, U.S.C.

Sincerely,

EILEEN D. COOKE,  
Director, ALA Washington Office.

[The following questions were submitted by the National Association of the Deaf and responded to by Mr. Boyle.]

*Question 1.* What is your familiarity with people with handicaps who are employees of the GPO?

I have worked in the Composing Division with deaf linotype operators for many years and am fully aware of their capabilities.

*Question 2.* How do you feel about affirmative action regarding people with disabilities?

I fully endorse the GPO affirmative action program plan for the hiring, placement, and advancement of handicapped individuals and disabled veterans which was recently submitted to the Civil Service Commission and approved with a complimentary letter of endorsement.

*Question 3.* How do you feel about giving other job opportunities to the disabled, including deaf people, at the GPO?

I believe my position on the affirmative action plan and my record as Deputy Public Printer for the past four years answers this question.

## NOMINATION OF JOHN J. BOYLE OF MARYLAND TO BE THE PUBLIC PRINTER

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1977

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, commencing at 10:20 a.m., in room 301, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. Hon. Howard W. Cannon (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Cannon, Pell, Allen, Clark, and Hatfield.

Staff present: William McWhorter Cochrane, staff director; Chester H. Smith, chief counsel; Larry E. Smith, minority staff director; Martin B. Gold, minority counsel; Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, professional staff member; Edwin K. Hall, counsel (elections); James F. Schoener, minority counsel (elections); John K. Swearingen, director of information services; Raymond N. Nelson, professional staff member; Peggy Parrish, assistant chief clerk; and W. A. Dowless, editorial assistant (GPO).

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

The first item on the agenda is the nomination of John Joseph Boyle to be the Public Printer. We concluded the hearings at our last meeting and submitted some additional questions to Mr. Boyle. They have all been answered and are in a galley proof form here now to be included in the hearing record.

Is there any further discussion on the Boyle nomination? If not, the Chair would entertain a motion that the nomination be approved and that the nomination be reported to the Senate together with a full printing of the hearing record, which would include Mr. Boyle's responses to the questions that were posed to him at the conclusion of the hearing.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I so move.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the motion? Without objection, then, the nomination of Mr. Boyle as Public Printer will be approved.



A11600 762720

