

7-8-1999

The 1907 Admission of Land-Grant University Depository Libraries: A 90-Year Perspective

Bert Chapman

Purdue University, chapmanb@purdue.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lib_research

Chapman, Bert, "The 1907 Admission of Land-Grant University Depository Libraries: A 90-Year Perspective" (1999). *Libraries Research Publications*. Paper 72.

http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lib_research/72

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

THE 1907 ADMISSION OF LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES: A 90-YEAR PERSPECTIVE

BERT CHAPMAN*

Government Publications Coordinator/Assistant Professor of Library Science,
HSSE Library, 1530 Stewart Center, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1530, USA.
Internet: chapmanb@purdue.edu

Abstract — This presentation of how land-grant university libraries became federal depository libraries in 1907 examines the principal legislative statutes creating the land-grant university system. It proceeds to cover how a congressional Printing Commission, concerned with eliminating duplicative governmental publications, also produced legislation granting federal depository status to the libraries of land-grant universities. There is also discussion of the presence of GPO Access gateways at many land-grant university depositories and the continuing relevance of the land-grant university service ideal to the depository library program during its transition to an increasingly electronic environment. The historical evolution of America's rural electric industry, community network movement, and federal information resource management initiatives also present potentially useful service models for emerging electronic depositories. © 1999 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords — U.S. Land-Grant Universities, U.S. Federal Depository Libraries, U.S. government publishing, community information networks

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Government Printing Office's (GPO) Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) experiences a paradoxical situation of great opportunity and uncertainty at the close of the twentieth century. Significant advances in the technological ability to transmit and disseminate electronic information bring an overwhelming array of government information from local, state, national, foreign, and international sources within a mouse click for individual users. Multitudinous opportunities to manipulate this information through downloading, cutting and pasting, electronic mail, spreadsheets, and the word processing features of contemporary high-powered microcomputers further enhance the options for government information consumers.

Conversely, the high cost of purchasing, implementing, maintaining, and upgrading this equipment, along with continuing personnel costs of training and retraining, strain the ability of even the most affluent depositories to fulfill their obligations. Continuing division of opinion within GPO, Congress, federal agencies, and the depository community over effectively managing this transition to a predominately electronic depository environment are reflected in literature produced by these groups [1].

Participants in the FDLP and its transition to an electronic service environment can draw comparisons to events in the late nineteenth-century idea to serve as a model for future direction. At the 1893 annual meeting of the American Historical Association at the Chicago World's Fair, University of Wisconsin historian

**Bert Chapman is Government Publications Coordinator/Assistant Professor of Library Science at Purdue University. He has previously served as Reference/Documents Librarian at Lamar University.*

Frederick Jackson Turner presented a paper, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History” [2]. This seminal and controversial essay began by citing an 1890 Census Bureau report alluding to the ending of the frontier settlement pattern in the westward expansion of America’s population. Turner asserted that this demographic frontier closing marked the conclusion of the first period of American history, which he saw as being the colonization of the American West [3].

Turner’s frontier thesis can have application to today’s FDLP. Until the advent of CD-ROMs, floppy diskettes, bulletin board systems, and the World Wide Web in the late 1980s and early-to-middle 1990s, the primary media for the public dissemination of government information was print, either in paper or some microform format. The continuing growth of electronic media and increased pressure from congressional appropriations committees has stressed greater reliance on electronic production and dissemination of federal government information. The present era represents an end to the exclusively non-electronic era of federal depository information distribution and access. This growth in electronic media and congressional pressure for greater electronic dissemination of government information also represent the end of the FDLP’s perceived de facto monopoly on providing public access to U.S. government information in the view of many depository community representatives.

The need for managing change in the FDLP is not unique to the present. One period producing significant change in depository operations was the 1907 passage of legislation granting depository status to land-grant university libraries. The story behind this legislation demonstrates the importance of depository libraries being open to new technological and political developments while remaining committed to providing the best possible service to their users. Relevant historical insights into current FDLP developments are also provided by the development of land-grant universities and rural electrification programs.

Development of the land-grant universities contributed to a dramatic increase in the number of college-educated Americans and helped contribute to the United States’ growing domestic economic and international political power at the close of the nineteenth and opening of the twentieth century. The number of Americans receiving undergraduate and graduate degrees between 1870 and 1910 rose from 9,372 to 39,755, and the number of doctoral degrees awarded by American universities during these years went from 1 to 443 [4].

Recipients of university degrees during these decades would go on to apply their training and skills to a nation bearing decreasing resemblance to its predominately agrarian origins and geographic confinement to the Atlantic coast. Between 1790 and 1900, United States territorial holdings increased from 888,811 to 3,026,789 square miles, exclusive of newly acquired Caribbean and Asian/Pacific colonies, and its population had increased from 5,297,000 in 1800, to 77,585,000 by 1901 [5].

American society was also becoming increasingly urban and industrial. The urban population of 1900 was 30,160,000, and it grew to 41,998,932 in 1910, while the number of rural Americans during this period only grew from 45,834,654 to 49,973,334. Gross national product averages ballooned from \$29.6 billion between 1892–1896 to \$46.8 billion between 1902–1906. The number of Americans employed in manufacturing and related industries rose from 6,340,000 to 8,230,000 during the first decade of the twentieth century, while the number of people working in agriculture only rose from 10,710,000 to 11,340,000 during this period [6].

LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

Formation of the land-grant university system dates from the middle of the nineteenth century. Its ongoing evolution has been influenced by four major statutory enactments: the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Land Grant Acts, the Hatch Act of 1887, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.

1862 Morrill Act

The first Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 [7] represents the legislative cornerstone of the land-grant university system. Introduced and shepherded through Congress over a period of several years by Representative Justin Morrill (R-VT), this legislation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862 [8].

The Morrill Act provided 17,430,000 acres of land to various states in proportional grants to establish colleges where agriculture and the mechanical arts were to be the primary subjects. Distribution of grants was based on a state’s congressional representation, with each state receiving 30,000 acres in land or land scrip per congressional representative [9].

Although dwarfed in size by the over 200 million acres of land granted in the Homestead Act of the same year, the Morrill Act represented a significant federal intervention in and subsidy of American education policy. A recent history of the land-grant university system makes this assessment of the Act's significance:

The premise of Senator Justin Morrill's magnificent legislative accomplishment was profoundly democratic: Education would be extraordinarily valuable to all of America if there were universities open to all—to the daughters and sons of farmers, mechanics, and other workers, not only to the rich, the well-born, the privileged. These universities were to promote education in the liberal arts and the pursuit of general knowledge. But they were also to promote education that would be practically applied to meet the economic development needs of that era, primarily agriculture and engineering. We should make no mistake: this was a radical, populist concept. In effect, universities were to be chartered by the people (through their representatives) to serve the people [10].

1890 Morrill Act

A second Morrill Act (August 30, 1890) expanded the scope of the 1862 legislation [11]. Introduced by Morrill, by then a Senator, this legislation sought to include equal funding for both white and black universities. Passage of this bill required overcoming white southern opposition to further expansion of 1862 Morrill Act provisions. Upon passage, the Morrill College Act provided for an annual appropriation of \$15,000 to every state to enhance the growth of the institutions endowed by the 1862 legislation. The initial \$15,000 appropriation was to be increased by \$1,000 annually for 10 years until it reached an annual level of \$25,000. Primary beneficiaries of this legislation were Tuskegee University and 17 other historically black colleges in the South, which remain land-grant institutions today [12].

Hatch Act

Another foundation of the contemporary land-grant university system is the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887 [13]. Spearheaded by Representative William Henry Hatch (DMO), this legislation established agricultural experiment stations in conjunction with existing land-grant universities. The Act appropriated \$15,000 annually per state “to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science . . .” [14].

Under the auspices of this legislation, research produced by agricultural experiment stations has produced pest-resistant and disease-resistant crops for farmers, developed new industries such as aquaculture, enhanced understanding of the roles played by vitamins and minerals in human diets, promoted irrigation of arid regions, enhanced water conservation, and led to numerous other scientific advances [15].

Smith-Lever Act

The fourth significant legislative enactment molding the land-grant university system is the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914 [16]. This product of a collaborative effort between Senator Hoke Smith (D-GA) and Representative Asbury Francis Lever (D-SC) resulted in the establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) within land-grant universities. This organization's purpose was to disseminate research findings of agricultural experiment stations to farmers and the American public through forums such as publications and field demonstrations [17].

Initial implementation of Smith-Lever came from an introductory appropriation of \$600,000 with each state receiving \$10,000 annually. A crucial feature of this legislation was that federal funds were provided for no more than 50 percent of CES costs with the remainder being provided by state, county, local, and other funding sources. CES resulted in the creation of a national network of county extension offices that still continue to provide technical advice and support to American farmers. The value of both CES and the agricultural experiment stations became particularly apparent during World War I through their efforts to increase food production and conservation for the United States and its European allies [18].

The Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities describes the influence of the Smith-Lever Act:

With the enactment of the Smith-Lever Law, the land-grant college had been developed into a

distinctive institution that defined its character and function in terms from those of the ordinary college or university. It afforded resident instruction in the practical sciences, industrial arts, business, engineering, agriculture, teacher training and liberal arts. . . . The land-grant college became increasingly an active agency in the economic, industrial, and social advancement of the Nation. . . . Higher learning was no longer confined to the narrow limits of the classics, letters, and cultural arts. The monopoly of learning that once existed in the early days of the American Republic had vanished [19].

This expansion of American educational opportunity, which a recent study of land-grant university libraries sees as combining the concepts of the self-made man and independent farmer, enhanced the flexibility of land-grant universities enabling them to serve as proving grounds for farming and fostering productive careers in urban industry [20]. Rural development would receive additional augmentation from New Deal era policy making in electricity.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The development of electrification in America, with particular emphasis on rural areas, offers another instructional model of technology and governmental resources producing citizen empowerment for depositories grappling with the rush of electronic operating and service environments. A recent analysis of electric power development in the United States emphasizes the important role of European national governments in facilitating the electrification of their countries.

European governments made rural electrification an important program and greatly surpassed American private initiatives. More than two-thirds of German, French, Dutch, and Scandinavian farmers enjoyed not only electricity but also reasonable rates by the end of the 1920s, when 90 percent of U.S. farmers could not get distribution lines into their homes and those few who did often paid double the urban rate. For half a century in America rural electrification existed primarily as an idea, while the countryside remained in darkness [21].

An essential factor in bringing electricity to rural America was passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 on May 20, 1936 [22]. This legislation created the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) which received the authority to make \$40 million annually in loans to state and nonprofit organizations to finance the construction and operation of generating plants, transmission lines, and distribution lines to provide electricity to rural residents not receiving central electrical service. A 1981 governmental study of the history of rural electric service maintains that REA efforts led to the electrification of 98 percent of American farms [23].

The growth of the land-grant university system and rural electrification combined the resources of the federal government and individual ingenuity, to produce instruments of citizen empowerment capable of fulfilling perceived societal needs for their respective eras in a pragmatic matter. This need for flexible orientation also applies to changes confronting GPO and the FDLP at the close of the nineteenth century and in the 1907 legislation that drastically expanded the depository library system with the admission of land-grant university libraries.

1895 PRINTING ACT AND AFTERMATH

Many characteristics of the modern FDLP came into existence with the enactment of the Printing Act of 1895 on January 12, 1895 [24]. Among its various provisions, this important legislation transferred the Office of Superintendent of Documents from the Department of the Interior to the GPO. It consolidated existing statutes covering the printing, binding, and distribution of government publications. The legislation also expanded depository library membership to include state libraries, executive branch department libraries, and military academy libraries. Additional aspects of this legislation gave the Superintendent of Documents the authority to investigate conditions in depository libraries, sell public documents, and to publish the *Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications* to enhance bibliographic control of federal publications [25].

Despite the considerable enhancements wrought by the 1895 Printing Act, federal policymakers and depository librarians remained dissatisfied with the overall status of depository operations. Depositories had no choice in determining the publications they received and many proved unable or unwilling to cope with this vast quantity of often duplicative material received from GPO and individual federal agencies. Evidence of

depositories returning significant volumes of duplicative material is demonstrated by the more than 800,000 documents returned to the Superintendent of Documents from depositories between 1895 and 1905 [26]. This multiple publication of documents saw federal printing expenditures rise from \$4,905,881 in 1890 to \$7,080,906 in 1904. Concern over these rising costs led to congressional establishment of a Joint Printing Investigation Commission in 1905 [27].

The Commission was not the first investigation of GPO printing operations. From GPO's establishment in 1860 through the first decade of the twentieth century there were nine congressionally authorized investigations of its operations. Federal printing expenditures rose from \$866,868 in 1868 to \$6,581,565 in fiscal year 1911. Additional stimulus for investigating federal printing came from the more than 1,000 pages of laws and regulations covering GPO operations including the sale and distribution of government publications [28].

A sign of depository library willingness to achieve a more efficient distribution system during this era can be demonstrated by comparing the results of two surveys sent to depositories in 1907 and 1910 by the Superintendent of Documents and the Printing Investigation Commission. Both surveys asked depositories if they wished to select the publications they received from GPO. Results from the 1907 survey showed that 56 depositories favored selecting which publications they received, while 257 depositories wished to receive everything. The 1910 survey demonstrated significant movement toward depository advocacy of selection, with 112 libraries favoring this of the 279 depositories responding [29].

Commission Investigations of GPO

Federal policymaker dissatisfaction with the quality and efficiency of governmental administration was not confined to federal printing. The early years of the twentieth century also saw the formation of commissions, besides the Joint Printing Investigation Commission, to enhance the quality and efficiency of federal administration. Two of the most prominent of these bodies were the Keap Commission and Taft Commission appointed by Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. These commissions found considerable financial and administrative deficiencies within the federal government such as duplicative departments and inefficient labor usage. Congressional opposition to these commissions' recommendations limited their impact and effectiveness, although Congress did approve a 1912 Taft Commission recommendation to centralize distribution of government publications at GPO [30].

The concern with governmental administrative efficiency also contributed to the growing conflict between Congress and the executive branch over where governmental administrative power should reside. During this period executive power was assuming increasing dominance. One study of this conflict as it related to federal printing and information maintains that the number of executive branch technical experts increased 1,000 percent between 1861–1931. Events such as World War I, the Depression, and World War II would further accelerate this growth in executive branch power over federal information dissemination. Coupled with this rise in executive branch power, as applied to federal information dissemination, was a corresponding decline in the total percentage of congressional printing done at GPO in relationship with overall GPO printing, from 27 percent in 1920, 17 percent in 1947, and 12 percent by 1965 [31].

Taft Commission Report

The final Taft Commission report was released on December 4, 1911, and justified its advocacy of centralized distribution of government publications from GPO instead of federal agencies by citing GPO's close proximity to the Washington, DC, post office and Union Station. Implementing this centralized distribution system would produce annual savings of at least \$250,000 according to the Commission [32].

Federal administrative reforms such as those advocated by the Taft Commission were weakened following the return of the House of Representatives to Democratic control following the 1910 elections. Further deterioration in these reforms arose from a breakdown of House institutional control following rebellion against the autocratic rule of House Speaker Joseph Cannon, which gave individual members greater latitude to influence policy. The Commission found its budget reduced and eventually eliminated by a Congress wary

of its desire to formulate an executive branch budget without congressional involvement. This constitutional conflict over federal appropriation policy, the failure of the Taft Commission to achieve consistent purpose, and Democratic opposition led to the Commission's demise and the impetus for federal administrative reform shifted back to Congress [33].

LATER PROGRESSIVE ERA ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

The desire for federal administrative reform revived just prior to World War I as more administratively reform-minded members of Congress, favoring congressional and executive branch consolidation to save money, eventually succeeded in passing the 1921 Budget and Accounting Act. This Act created the Bureau of the Budget responsible for preparing an executive branch budget [34]. Creation of the Budget Bureau and the Printing Reform Act of 1919 (Public Law 65-314) also had important implications for federal information policy. The Printing Reform Act gave the Joint Committee on Printing considerable power over federal printing and the authority to eliminate publications not explicitly authorized by Congress. Passage of the Budget and Accounting Act created the Bureau of the Budget, which eventually became the present-day Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This legislation provided the impetus to terminate numerous government publishing activities and to shift federal information resource management priorities from Congress to the executive branch [35].

Printing Commission Report and 1907 Law

Although the Printing Commission's initial report appeared on March 26, 1906, legislation originating in early 1907 represents the Commission's principal contribution to depository library development. On February 18, 1907, Senator Thomas Collier Platt (R-NY) submitted the Joint Printing Investigation Commission report into the *Congressional Record* [36]. The Commission recommended that the efficiency of congressional publication distribution be optimized by including the Serial Set (House and Senate documents and reports series) in a consistent numbering scheme based on the order in which they were received at GPO [37].

Land-Grant Libraries Proposed as Depositories

The Printing Investigation Commission report also sought to streamline depository distribution by proposing the following enhancement to the depository system:

The Commission deems it most desirable that some automatic provision of law may be provided whereby the number of documents available for depository distribution may be placed upon a parity with the number of depositories designated. Added to its provision for the correction of this evil, the Commission has deemed it desirable to include among designated depositories the land-grant colleges. This list of educational institutions number 65, embracing many of the leading colleges and universities of the country, the combined membership of whose faculties number 2,672, or an average faculty of 41 [38].

The Commission report asserted that the cost of this proposed increase in the number of depositories would not be more than \$30,000. The Commission believed this additional cost would offset existing costs of document distribution to depositories by federal departments, Senators, and Representatives, which, in the Commission's view, represented 50 percent of distributed depository publications [39].

Platt introduced the provisions of this report as S. 8510 on February 18. The following day, Representative Charles Landis (R-IN) introduced H.R. 25736 as the House version of S. 8510, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Printing [40]. On February 21, H.R. 25736 was reported with amendments in House Report 8058 and placed on the House Calendar. Platt reported S. 8510 with amendments on February 22 and asked for Senate consideration of this bill on February 25. On February 26 the House passed S. 8510 with only minor amendments. Senate passage also followed that day and President Theodore Roosevelt signed the legislation into law on March 1, 1907 [41].

The new legislation [42] came from the efforts of Platt, Landis, and Printing Commission members

Representative James Griggs (D-GA), Representative James Perkins (R-NY), and Senator William Whyte (D-MD) [43]. The work of the Printing Commission continued until 1912, culminating in a report from Chairman Senator Reed Smoot (R-UT), that recommended a complete revamping of federal printing practices and creation of a selection plan for depository libraries [44].

IMPACT OF 1907 PRINTING ACT

A year prior to the passage of the 1907 legislation the depository library system consisted of 483 libraries, and the Superintendent of Documents cataloging and index section received 22,664 documents during Fiscal Year 1906 [45]. With the addition of 67 land-grant university libraries and other recently established depositories, the overall number of depositories rose to 615 by 1907 [46].

The increase in the number of depositories, coupled with the printing reforms of the 1907 legislation, produced a significant impact on the GPO and Superintendent of Document operations. The number of daily letters concerning public documents received by the Superintendent of Documents rose from 300 to 500. Public sales of documents increased from 43,784 in 1906, to 116,009 in 1907, and 156,318 in 1908. The number of publications received from federal agencies increased from 710,096 in 1906 to 2,795,805 in 1907, and 3,844,342 in 1908 [47].

A particularly vivid illustration of this legislation's impact can be seen in depository distribution figures. In 1906, the number of publications distributed to depositories from GPO was 222,275. In 1907, this total more than doubled to 503,564, and, in 1908, distribution to depositories more than tripled to 1,610,696, with geological depository library distribution being excluded from this total [48].

Another impact of this legislation was reflected in federal spending. Smoot contended during a March 12, 1912, address in the Senate that Printing Investigation Commission recommendations produced a savings of over \$988,000 in federal printing and binding expenditures going back to 1904 [49].

IMPACT ON LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Expanding the depository library system to include land-grant university libraries helped enhance collection holdings for these libraries. One study shows that between 1900 and 1930 the average holdings of land-grant university libraries in relationship to the principal state university library rose from 25.1 percent to 30.4 percent [50]. Another study of land-grant library resource growth and development cites the 1907 depository law, along with the Hatch and Smith-Lever acts, as influencing library growth in land-grant universities. Even so, collection holdings and expenditures in these libraries lagged behind those of the liberal arts-oriented state universities during the decades after passage of the 1907 legislation [51].

Historical literature is limited on the influence this legislation had on land-grant university library collection growth. An historical portrait of one land-grant university library mentions the 1907 receipt of some French government publications and the 1905 and 1910 donations of U.S. documents from their state's U.S. Senator, but fails to mention the U.S. documents received as a result of land-grant university libraries receiving federal depository status [52].

Granting depository library status to land-grant university libraries also made government information accessible to the increasing number of students receiving higher education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The number of students in undergraduate or graduate degree programs rose from 52,000 or 1.1 percent of the 18–24-year-old population group in 1870 to 355,000 or 2.9 percent of this population in 1910 [53].

Attributing the growth of holdings in land-grant university libraries as stemming solely from an infusion of documents following the 1907 depository law would be unrealistic. It seems clear, though, that the collection growth experienced by these libraries because of this newly gained access to depository publications played a significant role in enhancing collection size and quality. This infusion of government publications into land-grant university libraries also contributed to their transformation in collection, use, and relationship to institutional instruction during the early decades of the twentieth century. Providing depository library status to

these increasingly important universities also provided government agencies and congressional appropriators with a relatively centralized and efficient means for publishing governmental research. It also provided an opportunity to increase citizen knowledge of governmental operations [54].

Limited Depository Community Involvement in 1907 Printing Act

The changes wrought by the 1907 Printing Act enhanced the growth of the depository system and reflected the ability of that system to adapt to changing technology caused by duplicative federal agency printing and cost reduction pressures exerted by congressional policymakers. Depository enhancements in 1907 came about with little documented pressure or lobbying from the depository community or the American Library Association (ALA).

The first formal meeting between the Superintendent of Documents and depository community members occurred just three months after the passage of the 1907 Printing Act at ALA's annual meeting in Asheville, North Carolina, on May 28, 1907 [55]. Review of the 1907 ALA Bulletin reveals no mention or advocacy of depository status being extended to land-grant university libraries. This apparent lack of involvement stands in vivid contrast to the active involvement of the depository community and ALA in passage of the Depository Library Act of 1962 and in subsequent legislation affecting the FDLP [56].

CONTINUING GOVERNMENT INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS

The reforms of the 1907 Land-Grant Act, later Printing Investigation Commission reforms, and other Progressive era reforms related to federal administration did not end depository distribution problems or other federal information management issues. Between 1905 and 1909, 2,620,596 publications were returned to the Superintendent of Documents by federal departments and 2,166 libraries remained on departmental as well as depository mailing lists. An example of the problems caused by such continuing duplicative distribution is the Louisville Free Public Library receiving 3,000 documents franked to a Louisville resident, with 750 of these documents being the 1904 *Yearbook of Agriculture*, while this library reported that only 300 of these 3,000 documents were needed at their library [57].

Government Information Distribution Problems in the 1970s

Continuing problems with depository distribution, along with disagreement about requisite solutions, were also documented in the 1970s and later by a variety of Printing Investigation Commission successors. A 1979 Library of Congress study for the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee revealed that efficient distribution of government publications to depository libraries remained a problem. This compilation demonstrated that while 102,000 publications were produced by a group of 74 executive branch agencies between January 1977 and June 1978, only 66,000 of these titles were listed in the *Monthly Catalog* [58].

That same year a partial analysis of GPO operations by the Coopers & Lybrand accounting firm for the Joint Committee on Printing contended that no major changes were needed in GPO practices. This report went on to mention the assertion of GPO officials that their statutory authorization legislation in Title 44 required revision due to its ambiguity and failure to reflect government printing requirements and changes in printing technology [59].

Further recommendations of the Coopers & Lybrand report included advocacy of examining all sections of Title 44 covering quantities, distribution, and cost to determine their contemporary relevance. Additional recommendations proposed formulating policy directives concerning the use of congressional funds to distribute non-congressional material, requesting congressional committees to develop and monitor their printing budgets, and studying the automatic distribution of government publications to determine factors such as the criteria used to distribute publications to members of Congress [60].

1980 PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

A more significant effort to manage federal information resources was the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

of 1980. Objectives of this legislation included reducing public and private sector information processing burdens by developing consistent federal information collection practices, increasing the availability and accuracy of agency data and information, expanding and strengthening federal information management activities, establishing a focal point for information management in an Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) within OMB, and giving OMB the authority to approve or disapprove federal agency forms used to collect information from individuals, businesses, and local and state governments [61].

Passage of the PRA saw significant efforts by the incoming Reagan administration to achieve the PRA's goal of reducing federal paperwork by 25 percent by the end of fiscal year 1983. In early 1981, OMB established the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) with resources and professional skills comparable to OMB's budget and management divisions. A specific step taken by OMB to ensure achievement of PRA federal paperwork reduction objectives was the June 1981 decision of OMB Director David Stockman to adopt formally PRA's 25-percent reduction in paperwork goal. Additional OMB steps consisted of including tax and financial reports, independent agency information collection, regulatory and procurement paperwork, and disclosure requirements into OMB paperwork inventory information collection. Issuing comprehensive paperwork control regulations following public comment under 5 *CFR* 1320 also represented OMB's commitment to PRA objectives [62].

These initiatives resulted in an early 1984 OMB report, which maintained that PRA's 25-percent federal paperwork reduction was not only met but also exceeded with a 32-percent reduction in federal paperwork achieved by October 1, 1983. Only seven of 35 monitored agencies failed to achieve at least a 15- percent paperwork reduction [63].

Despite these apparent accomplishments, an independent assessment of PRA was less laudatory. This analysis contended that PRA's requirements had been carried out in a piecemeal manner and that agency information resource managers viewed PRA requirements as producing wasteful internal paperwork burdens detracting from sound information management. Additional findings of this assessment revealed that information resource management received limited support and little direct involvement from top managers. Moreover, PRA implementation involved excessive oversight from Congress, OMB, and other federal managers and staff personnel involved in information resources management [64].

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION INITIATIVES

The Clinton administration's National Performance Review (NPR), spearheaded by Vice-President Al Gore, sought to take advantage of trends in computerized technology to promote what it viewed as a more cost-efficient means to deliver government information. Specific actions proposed in the voluminous body of NPR literature for improving federal information management and delivery included developing the government's information infrastructure to make effective use of this foundation in an electronic environment, consolidating and modernizing government data processing centers, reengineering basic systems for enhanced service delivery, consolidating and integrating existing government computer networks, and reducing the burden on federal agencies of preparing nearly 5,000 reports for Congress at a purported cost exceeding \$100 million [65].

Another significant report on federal information resources management appearing at this time was *Making Government Work: Electronic Delivery of Federal Services*.

Produced by the now defunct congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), *Making Government Work* mentioned that governmental transition to electronic service delivery was inevitable given extensive financial investment by federal agencies in information technology along with the increased availability of personal computers in educational, work, and office settings. This report also mentioned that the federal government lacked an overall strategy or vision for electronic service delivery that enhanced citizen access to government information and services was not assured by electronic dissemination, that there is no guarantee that electronic delivery of government information was cost-effective, the existing telecommunications infrastructure was incomplete, and that existing government information access statutes, such as the Freedom of Information Act, were insufficient for an electronic environment [66].

104th CONGRESS REFORM EFFORTS

Pressure to reform multiple sectors of the federal government including federal information resources management became particularly acute following the 1994 congressional elections, which gave the Republicans control of both the House and Senate for the first time since 1954. Motivated by a strong sense of fiscal conservatism and a desire to achieve optimum use of evolving information technology to enhance federal fiscal efficiency, members of the 104th Congress passed the *Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 (ITMRA)*. Buried within a defense spending bill, this legislation gave the director of OMB the power to analyze, monitor, and evaluate the performance of federal information technology investments and established Chief Information Officers (CIO) within various federal agencies to implement OMB-directed reforms [67].

During an oversight hearing on ITMRA implementation, former Senator William Cohen (R-ME) asserted “. . . poor information management is one of the biggest threats to the Government Treasury because it leaves Government programs susceptible to waste, fraud, and abuse.” He went on to maintain that successful implementation of information technology legislation needed the following characteristics:

There are five key issues which I believe are critical to successful implementation of ITMRA. Number one, top agency management must become more involved in the role that technology plays in their organization; number two, agencies must focus on results, rather than process; three, agencies must appoint qualified chief information officers or CIOs, as outlined in the law; four there are many cultural challenges and a need for a trained, qualified and informed work force, both in the agencies and at OMB; and finally, OMB must play a vital role in ITMRA implementation [68].

This same hearing also included a General Accounting Office (GAO) assessment of federal information technology management. This report criticized federal performance in delivering information technology at an acceptable cost by referring to costly and unsuccessful attempts to modernize the Federal Aviation Administration’s air traffic control system and the Internal Revenue Service’s automated tax system [69].

Another example of a recent attempt at federal information resources management was a 1995 reauthorization of the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Act sought to strengthen the authority of OMB’s Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to reduce public paperwork burdens through timely and fair public information dissemination and strengthened OIRA management of agency information resources management and policies. Additional components of the proposed legislation were stipulations requiring agencies to perform cost-benefit and risk analysis for proposed federal rules with an impact exceeding \$25 million. It also added a peer review risk assessment process for regulations with an economic impact exceeding \$100 million [70].

FEDERAL IRM MANAGEMENT TRENDS AND THE FDLP’S FUTURE

These seemingly futile historical and contemporary efforts to achieve effectual management and distribution of the universe of federal information resources are unlikely to achieve permanent resolution. This background and pressure to reform the contemporary FDLP distribution system through drastic technological changes in governmental information dissemination and pressure from a budget-conscious Congress to reduce the federal deficit are the principal pressure points affecting FDLP institutions.

The need for current FDLP member institutions to adapt to changing technology and federal budgetary exigencies while remaining responsive to their constituents’ government information needs can be demonstrated by examining historical and current social forces such as the presence of GPO Access gateways at land-grant university depositories, the development of U.S. rural electrification, and the rise of community networks providing electronic access to information services. One way land-grant university depositories have provided leadership in facilitating access to government information has been the establishment of GPO Access gateways. At the end of 1996, 11 of the 40 GPO Access gateways were established at land-grant universities as geographically diverse as Purdue, Oklahoma State, Louisiana State, and Montana State [71].

Although locally unique factors undoubtedly contributed to the establishment of Access gateways at these respective institutions, the strong leadership role of land-grant university depositories in establishing these sites demonstrates the ongoing importance of providing innovative service to meet constituent needs while adhering to the service ideals of the land-grant university system and depository library program.

COMMUNITY NETWORKS

Such innovative leadership by land-grant university depositories, combined with the cooperative use of both government and private sector financial and technical support to achieve desirable public policy results, can also be found in the emergence of community-based networks. These organizations, combining the resources and expertise of public and private sector personnel, provide electronic information and services about their municipalities to benefit local residents and businesses, along with individuals and organizations desirous of learning more about these communities [72].

Douglas Schuler's *New Community Networks: Wired for Change* makes the following observation concerning the role of these emerging civic forums:

. . . a community network is more than a sounding board for individuals (although it is that). A community network can be a tool for the community as a whole and can be used to address community needs using community assets. The community must 'own' the community network both legally and psychologically. The community network should be a *part* of the community, like a park, public market, or familiar landmark [73].

Schuler also contends that community networks must serve as sources of citizen integration and empowerment into community life, represent an integral part of the community, and work in partnership with other community institutions and organizations [74]. He makes the following assertion about the roles such networks can play in facilitating public access to government information:

Community networks can play important roles in opening up the governmental process to public view. The new community needs to know what an agency's mission is and how its issues are being addressed. Its activities must be monitored continually, perhaps through associations created specifically to monitor individual agencies. The process of engagement can be initiated through face-to-face meetings. The goal is the creation of mechanisms that facilitate two-way communication, sharing of information, and that facilitate the development, implementation, and evaluation of joint projects [75].

Successful networking by depository librarians is essential for the future vitality of the FDLP and must emulate the citizen empowerment model of land-grant universities, rural electrification, and community networks while also recognizing the end of the FDLP's monopoly on providing public access to government information due to the decentralization inherent in the Internet. This networking must begin by successfully communicating to local colleagues and institutional administrations the importance of providing the public with no-fee access to government information through bibliographic instruction and expertise, intellectual guidance and interpretation, downloading, other forms of technical assistance, and high-quality service provided by depository library personnel. Facilitating such gatekeeping access on the part of depositories and depository librarians enhances individual and public knowledge of governmental activities, can promote heightened public participation in governmental activity, and increases the possibility of achieving better quality government [76].

COMBINING COMMUNITY NETWORK AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION IDEALS

Depository librarians must also use the land-grant cooperative extension service ideal of promoting

government information as a means for resolving citizen and societal problems and facilitating public debate on contemporary issues such as property rights, welfare reform, and educational funding. Outreach such as this can also encourage depository constituent groups such as students, faculty, and staff to gain a greater understanding of their civic obligations as they exercise their electoral responsibilities and seek to participate in discussions on the public policy issues important to their communities [77].

Promoting the essential role of government information in a free society must extend beyond immediate colleagues and institutions. Those in academia need to explain to students and faculty the unique role of free government information in the United States and compare it with the relative absence of such access to governmental information in many countries around the world.

Depository librarians, regardless of institutional background, need to build, cultivate, and maintain relationships with users of government information in their communities such as businesses, nonprofit organizations, local government officials, attorneys, and the general citizen. Achieving such successful relationships with these individuals and organizations may produce dividends such as obtaining financial support for the procurement of needed electronic equipment when such support is not possible through normal funding channels [78].

Most importantly, using relationships with local individuals and organizations can enhance their appreciation of the role of government information and provide the FDLP with allies who can contact congressional representatives to voice support for FDLP goals and objectives. Cultivating and maintaining strong relationships with congressional Representatives and Senators are also essential on the part of the depository community to ensure the passage of legislation advantageous to depository interests. The significant number of new members of Congress following the last two elections makes this particularly important given their multifaceted ideological agendas and probable unfamiliarity with government information issues.

Legislation enacting the land-grant university system and the depository library program resulted from a bipartisan commitment to providing federal support to achieve desired public policy goals. Maintaining this bipartisan support for the FDLP is particularly important in an era of divided government and budgetary constraints. Whatever one's personal political preferences are, making promotion of depository interests captive to extraneous partisan or ideological objectives would be a tragic mistake, an abdication of the service ideal for which the profession strives, and contrary to the spirit and intent of land-grant university system statutes.

The pattern of thought assuming preeminence in depository library and governmental thinking is one in which electronic access and dissemination play an increasingly exclusive role as the frontier for locating government information. Practical application of this still-emerging infrastructure means depository librarians must be skilled technicians adept at retrieving information from multiple and far-flung Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and diverse CD-ROMs. They must also be skilled at successfully locating, extracting, and manipulating digitized data from PDF files and be able to exploit other Internet software capabilities along with traditional bibliographic access and interpretation skills.

Contemporary and future depository service will be provided in a hybrid environment requiring institutional resources to acquire and maintain the necessary equipment and the flexibility of individual librarians to work successfully with government information in diverse formats. Depository librarians need to know how to help one patron find an International Trade Administration market research report on Australian agriculture on STAT-USA's WWW server, 1870 census data on the population of Tippecanoe County, Indiana for their next user, and a congressional serial set report on Rocky Mountain exploration for another user. The depository community must recognize that each of these users will expect his or her depository to have the information, highly skilled librarians, and requisite facilities they need to access and use this information in the format they desire.

CONCLUSION

Incorporating land-grant university libraries into the depository system provided a means of expanding the distribution of government publications to institutions that were on their way to becoming national and international leaders in the research process. This provided a more centralized and publicly accessible means of locating government publications for faculty, students, and, by extension, the citizens of their respective

states.

This more centralized distribution and access was provided as a result of the 1907 law granting depository status to land-grant university libraries and strengthened by the Printing Investigation Commission and other commission and congressional enactments during the first two decades of the twentieth century. These Progressive era developments in depository library history, and subsequent events such as the 1962 Printing Act, represent the principal statutory infrastructure of the contemporary FDLDP and were also influenced by information dissemination technologies present at the time of their enactment.

Ironically, the rapid growth of electronic information dissemination mechanisms such as the Internet, desktop publishing capabilities in individual government agencies and divisions, and the intentions captured in the proposed 1997 Government Printing Office Reform Act [79] appear likely to result in decentralized dissemination of government information. This new model for federal government information will change the relationship among citizens, depository libraries, and government agencies. Former Joint Committee on Printing Chair Representative Charlie Rose (D-NC) partially alluded to these emerging changes during a June 19, 1991 hearing that examined the impact of new technology on GPO operations:

For over 130 years the GPO has been the focal point of the government's information production and dissemination efforts. However, changing technology has radically altered the processes of producing and distributing information. Many of the functions that formerly required specialized equipment and highly skilled craftsmen can now be done on personal computers in an ordinary office environment. Information that was formerly printed and shipped by the ton over days and weeks can now instantly be telecommunicated anywhere in the world. Radically new information products, such as CD-ROM, are beginning to proliferate in the marketplace. It is in this new technological world that the GPO must adjust in order for GPO to remain the government's information focal point [80].

The depository community remains steadfast in its support of the current centralized depository distribution system. Existing trends in government information dissemination and ongoing congressional attempts to reduce the federal budget deficit and devolve governmental power to the states such as recent welfare reform legislation, though, are transforming the top-down approach to federal governance. These changing trends compel the depository community to accept and adjust to this decentralized information dissemination model if it expects to be a viable player in government information receipt and delivery. Failure to adapt to the ongoing devolution of federal power by uncritically embracing the current system of government information distribution risks marginalizing the FLDP when legislative decisions about its future direction are made.

The technological changes wrought by historical and contemporary social forces such as the land-grant university system, rural electrification, the Internet, the growth of personal computers, growing public technological literacy, telecommunications advances, and the community network movement have permanently altered the way citizens and communities access government information. These individuals and organizations, if they choose to, no longer must rely on a centralized institutional mechanism such as the FDLDP to facilitate primary access to their government information needs. Depository community members failing to accommodate themselves to this reality, risk marginalizing their ability to promote their technical and critical evaluative skills to users who no longer need to turn to depository libraries as their first source for accessing current government information [81].

Demonstrating such adaptive ability to meet the information needs of constituent groups in a flexible manner has proven a hallmark characteristic of the land-grant university system and the FDLDP, regardless of existing technological infrastructure or user ability. Individual depository librarians must recognize and accommodate the diverse electronic access skills of individual depository library users as the electronic frontier of accessing government information approaches. Depository librarians can further enhance the value of their service by incorporating the land-grant ideal of extending the benefits of practical knowledge to all people into a depository service philosophy within the limits of parent institution resources. Incorporating this land-grant philosophy into personal and institutional depository service policies also represents a contemporary application of the early land-grant statutes seeking to extend scientific knowledge of agricultural practices through the Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension Service.

Through the prudent and ongoing cultivation of constituent groups and funding sources depository

librarians have the potential to increase their appreciation of the value of government information while maintaining their ability to provide high-quality mechanisms for delivering government information to users. This objective can be attained through the emerging decentralized structure of government information access and delivery as well as through the current centralized FDLP. Successful accomplishment of and continuing adherence to these objectives will enable depository libraries to remain true to the democratizing ideals of Justin Morrill's landmark legislation.

NOTES

1. Examples of this diverse array of opinion on the future direction of the Depository Library Program include: U.S. Government Printing Office, *Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program as Required by Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 Public Law 104-53* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996); U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill 1997*, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 1996, House Report 104-657, 27–28; Bruce W. McConnell, “New Wine in Old Wineskins: U.S. Government Information in a Networked World,” *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 3 (May/June 1996): 217–226; Bernadine E. Abbott-Hoduski, “Democracy in America is Best Served by a Multiformat Federal Depository Library Program,” *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 3 (May/June 1996): 241–252; Duncan M. Aldrich, “Depository Libraries, the Internet, and the 21st Century?,” *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 3 (May/June 1996): 381–392; and Peter Herson, “The Electronic Federal Depository Library Program,” *Government Information Quarterly* 13 (1996): 341–343.
2. Frederick Jackson Turner, *History, Frontier and Section: Three Essays by Frederick Jackson Turner*, with an introduction by Martin Ridge (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1993), 10–11.
3. Frederick Jackson Turner, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” in *History, Frontier and Section: Three Essays by Frederick Jackson Turner*, 59, 88.
4. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), 1:386.
5. Lewis L. Gould, *The Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 30.
6. Gould, 32.
7. “An Act Donating Public Lands to the Several States and Territories Which May Provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts” (PL 37-130, 2 July 1862), 12 *United States Statutes at Large*, 503–505.
8. Roger L. Williams, *The Origins of Federal Support for Higher Education: George W. Atherton and the Land-Grant College Movement* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 37.
9. Williams, 36.
10. C. Peter Magrath, Foreword to *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage: Land Grant and Other Higher Initiatives for the Twenty-First Century* by John R. Campbell (Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press, 1995), xi–xii.
11. “An Act to Apply a Portion of the Proceeds of the Public Lands to the More Complete Endowment and Support of the Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts . . .” (PL 51-249, 30 August 1890), 26 *United States Statutes at Large*, 417–419.
12. Campbell, *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage*, 19.
13. “An Act to Establish Agricultural Experiment Stations . . .” 24 *United States Statutes at Large*, 440–442.
14. U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Agricultural Research for a Better Tomorrow: Commemorating the Hatch Act Centennial, 1887–1987* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987), xxvi–xxviii.
15. *Agricultural Research for a Better Tomorrow*, 12. See also James Powell Weeks, “George Washington Atherton and the Creation of the Hatch Act,” *Pennsylvania History* 56, no. 4 (October 1989): 299–317 for additional coverage of the Hatch Act's passage.
16. “An Act for Provide for Cooperative Agricultural Extension Work . . .” (PL 63-95, 8 May 1914), 38 *United States Statutes at Large*, 372–374.

17. See: Campbell, *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage*, 23; J.B. Edmond, *The Magnificent Charter: The Origin and Role of the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges and Universities* (Hicksville, NY: Exposition Press, 1978), 78; and U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, *A Brief History of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry United States and Landmark Agricultural Legislation 1825–1986*, 99th Cong., 2nd sess., 1986, 66.
18. *A Brief History of the Committee on Agriculture*, 66; Campbell, *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage*, 22–23; and Edmond, 78–83.
19. U.S. Office of Education, *Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*, Bulletin 1930 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1930), 1:31.
20. Donald G. Davis, Jr. and John Mark Tucker, “Change and Tradition in Land-Grant University Libraries,” in *For the Good of the Order: Essays in Honor of Edward G. Holley*, ed. Delmus E. Williams (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1994), 136.
21. David Nye, *Electrifying America: Social Meanings of a New Technology* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), 287.
22. “To Provide for Rural Electrification and Other Purposes” (PL 74-605, 20 May 1936), 49 *United States Statutes at Large*, 1363–1367.
23. U.S. Rural Electrification Administration, *Rural Lines-USA: The Story of Cooperative Rural Electrification* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), 4, 2. See also: Clayton Brown, “Rural Electrification: Sources for the South and West,” *Government Publications Review* 7, no. 2 (1980), 139–143, for additional rural electrification historical source materials.
24. “An Act Providing for the Public Printing and Binding and Distribution of Public Documents” (PL 53263, 12 January 1895), 28 *United States Statutes at Large*, 601–624.
25. See Peter Herson, Charles M. McClure, and Gary R. Purcell, *U.S. Government Printing Office’s Depository Library Program: A Descriptive Analysis* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1985), 6–9; Leroy C. Schwarzkopf, “The Depository Library Program and Access By the Public to Official Publications of the United States Government,” *Government Publications Review* 5, no. 2 (March/April 1978): 147–156; and Sarah Jordan Miller, “The Depository Library System: A History of the Distribution of Federal Government Publications From the Early Years of the Nation Until 1895,” (Ph.D. Diss, Columbia University, 1980), 2–3. Miller’s account is an exhaustive portrait of the depository library system’s initial historical development. See also: Sarah Jordan Miller, “Government Publications in the Private Collections of Nineteenth Century America: A Century-Long Source For Federal Documents Holdings in Libraries,” *Government Publications Review*, 13, no. 3 (May/June 1986): 355–370, for the role played by private donations in enhancing documents collection growth in one land-grant university library and other U.S. libraries.
26. U.S. Government Printing Office, *11th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents, for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1905* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1905), 292.
27. See Herson, McClure, and Purcell, *GPO’s Depository Library Program*, 7; and U.S. Government Printing Office, *100 GPO Years 1861–1961: A History of United States Public Printing* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), 85.
28. U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Reed Smoot (UT), “Amend of Printing Laws,” 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record* (12 March 1912), 48, Pt. 4, 3184–3185. Evidence of augmented federal printing expenses is demonstrated by the \$2,858,000 cost for printing *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion*. See: U.S. Congress, *Message from the President of the United States, Transmitting a Report by the Committee on Department Methods on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government, Together with a Draft of a Proposed Bill Providing for the Creation of a Permanent Commission on National Historical Publications*, 60th Cong., 2nd sess., 1909, Senate Document 714, p. 10, for *War of the Rebellion* expenditures.
29. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Preliminary Report of the Printing Investigation Commission*, 61st Cong., 2nd sess., 1910, Senate Document 652, 13.
30. See: Peri Arnold, *Making the Managerial Presidency: Comprehensive Reorganization Planning* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 42–43; and Forrest McDonald, *The American Presidency: An Intellectual History* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1994), 330–331.
31. John Spencer Walters, “The Presuperhighway Politics of U.S. Government Printing and Publishing, 1917–

- 1960,” *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 2 (March/April 1996): 94–95.
32. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Report of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency*, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1912, Senate Document 293, 7–9.
 33. See: Charles Stewart III, *Budget Reform Politics: The Design of the Appropriations Process in the House of Representatives, 1865–1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 186, 190–191; and Charles Stewart III, “Budget Reform as Strategic Legislative Action: An Exploration,” *Journal of Politics* 50, no. 2 (1988): 308–309.
 34. “An Act to Provide a National Budget System and Independent Audit of Government Accounts, and for Other Purposes” (PL 67-13, 10 June 1921), 42 *United States Statutes at Large*, 20.
 35. John Walters, “Politics as Usual: The Joint Committee on Printing and Executive Agency Publication, 1919–1921,” *Government Publications Review* 20, no. 3 (May/June 1993): 41, 48, 55.
 36. U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Thomas Platt (NY), “Printing and Distribution of Documents,” 59th Cong., 2nd sess. *Congressional Record* (18 February 1907), 41, pt. 4, 3176–3179.
 37. “Printing and Distribution of Documents,” 3178.
 38. U.S. Congress, Senate, Printing Investigation Commission, “Supplemental Report of Printing Investigation Committee,” 59th Cong., 2nd sess., 1907, Senate Report 6828, 10.
 39. “Supplemental Report of Printing Investigation Commission,” 10.
 40. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Representative Charles Landis (IN), “Public Bills, Resolutions, and Memorials Introduced,” 59th Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record*, 41, pt. 4 (February 19, 1907), 3396.
 41. “Public Bills, Resolutions, and Memorials Introduced.” See *Congressional Record* 41, pt. 4:3590, 3601, 3950, 3975, 3997–3999, 4100, and 4324 for additional coverage of this legislation’s voyage through Congress.
 42. “An Act to Amend an Act Providing for the Public Printing and Binding and Distribution of Public Documents” (PL 59-153, 1 March 1907), 34 *United States Statutes at Large*, 1012–1015. See also: U.S. Government Printing Office, Office of the General Counsel, *Legislative Histories of the Laws Affecting the U.S. Government Printing Office as Codified in Title 44 of the U.S. Code*, by Mark C. Cramer and Jean S. Reed (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985) for detailed coverage of this and other important depository library statutes and legislation.
 43. See: U.S. Congress, Senate, *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774–1989*, Bicentennial ed. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989), 1097, 1338, 1633–34, 1653–1654, and 2046 for biographical sketches of the five Printing Commission members.
 44. Milton R. Merrill, *Reed Smoot: Apostle in Politics* (Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 1990), 359. Smoots’ presentation of Printing Investigation Commission findings can be found in: U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Reed Smoot (UT), “Amendment of Printing Laws,” *Congressional Record*, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., vol. 48, pt. 4 (12 and 13 March 1912), 3184–3196, 3244–3255.
 45. U.S. Government Printing Office, *12th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents for Fiscal Year Ended June 20, 1906* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907), 306.
 46. U.S. Government Printing Office, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1908* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1909), 352.
 47. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1908*, 375, 379.
 48. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1908*, 375.
 49. “Amendment of Printing Laws.”
 50. Davis and Tucker, “Change and Tradition in Land-Grant University Libraries,” 152.
 51. Jessie Carney Smith, “Patterns of Growth in Library Resources in Certain Land-Grant Universities,” (Ph.D. Diss, University of Illinois, 1974), 90, 93–124.
 52. Henry Ormal Severance, *History of the Library University of Missouri* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 1928), 51–52.
 53. *Historical Statistics of the United States*, 1:383.
 54. *Survey of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities*, 1:609–613. See also: Miller, “Government Publications in the Private Collections of Nineteenth Century America,” 363–365.
 55. U.S. Government Printing Office, *13th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Documents for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1907* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907), 365.

56. See: Adelaide R. Haase, "Report of the Committee on Public Documents," ALA Bulletin, 1, no. 4 (July 1907): 132–135, for the lack of lobbying by ALA personnel for depository library enhancements in the 1907 Printing Act. A brief reference to this law is made in the same publication by Superintendent of Documents William L. Post, "Address of Mr. Post," 138. For more information on ALA's Public Documents Committee consult Susan Lee Grabler, "Government Information Of, By, And For the People: The Changing Mission of the American Library Association's Public Documents Committee, 1876–1956," *Journal of Government Information*, 22, no. 1 (January/February 1995): 45–69. See also: U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Rules and Administration, *Depository Libraries: Hearings before the Subcommittee on the Library*, 87th Cong., 2nd sess., 15 and 16 March 1962, 27–56, 90–94, 96–106, and 121–146 for evidence of ALA and other librarian advocacy of specific federal depository library legislation.
57. *Preliminary Report of the Printing Investigation Commission*, 1910, 8–10.
58. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, *Lack of Accountability in Government Public Information and Publishing Programs*, 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979, Committee Print, 1.
59. U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, *Analysis and Evaluation of Selected Government Printing Office Operations*, report prepared by Coopers & Lybrand, 95th Cong., 2nd sess., 1979, Committee Print, i-ii.
60. *Analysis and Evaluation of Selected Government Printing Office Operations*, A-14–A-15.
61. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations *Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980*, 96th Cong., 2nd. sess., 1980, House Report 96-835, 1–2.
62. U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Reducing Federal Paperwork, 1980–1983: A Report to Congress Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), 3–4.
63. *Reducing Federal Paperwork*, 6.
64. Sharon L. Caudle, "Federal Information Resources Management After the Paperwork Reduction Act," *Public Administration Review* 48, no. 4 (1988): 791, 794–795.
65. See: U.S. National Performance Review, *Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less: Reengineering Through Information Technology* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993), 55–57 and U.S. National Performance Review, *Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less: Streamlining Management Control* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993), 33–35.
66. U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, *Making Government Work: Electronic Delivery of Federal Services* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993), 4–15, 148–150.
67. See Division E of Public Law 104-106 *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996*, for the text of the *Information Technology Management Reform Act*.
68. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, *Implementation of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and the District of Columbia*, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., 17 July 1996, 2–3.
69. *Implementation of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996*, 55.
70. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, *H.R. 830, Paperwork Reduction Act and Risk Assessment and Cost/Benefit Analysis for New Regulations: Hearing before the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs*, 104th Cong., 1st sess., 7 February 1995, 2.
71. Search of main *GPO Access* server <http://www.access.gpo.gov/> on January 2, 1997. One of the GPO Access gateways is the Columbia Online Information Network (COIN), which includes the University of Missouri-Columbia as a sponsoring institution. Although its sponsorship of the COIN Access gateway is partial, the University of Missouri is included in this count of land-grant university depositories serving as GPO Access gateways.
72. Douglas Schuler, *New Community Networks: Wired for Change* (Reading, MA and New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company and ACM Press, 1996), 25.
73. Schuler, 250.
74. Schuler, 346.
75. Schuler, 141–142.

76. Ridley R. Kessler, Jr., "A Brief History of the Federal Depository Library Program: A Personal Perspective," *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 4 (July/August 1996): 379; see also John A. Shuler, "Civic Librarianship: Possible New Role for Depository Libraries in the Next Century," *Journal of Government Information* 23, no. 4 (July/August 1996): 419–425, for a more detailed scenario of possible public involvement by librarians.
77. Campbell, *Reclaiming a Lost Heritage*, 135, 145.
78. See John A. Shuler, "A New Order of Things: The Political Future of Documents Librarians and a National System of Federal Depository Libraries," *Government Information Quarterly* 11, no. 3 (1994): 321–322, for advocacy of building local support for depository program objectives. See also Doug Schuler, "Let's Partner as Patriots," *American Libraries* 28, no. 8 (September 1997): 60–62, for additional advocacy of library and community network collaboration. See G. Scott Aikens, "A Personal History of Minnesota Electronic Democracy, 1994," *Journal of Government Information* 25, no. 1 (January/February 1998): 1–9, for coverage of an electronic democracy initiative.
79. U.S. Congress, Senate, *Government Printing Office Act of 1997* (Draft bill version. Also available electronically at <http://www.uky.edu/Libraries/Code44rev.html> . This legislation was formally introduced as the *Wendell H. Ford Government Publications Reform Act of 1998*, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., S. 2288, *Congressional Record*, 144, no. 91, daily ed. (10 July 1998), S7953-55. This bill did not pass during the 105th Congress and has expired. Its reintroduction during the 106th Congress is uncertain.
80. U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, *New Technology and the Government Printing Office: Hearings*, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., 19 June and 24 July 1991, 1.
81. See Susan M. Ryan, "Square Peg in a Round Hole: Electronic Information and the Federal Depository Library Program," *Journal of Government Information* 24, no. 5 (September/October 1997): 368–373, for analysis of technological change and governmental decentralization on the Depository Library Program.