It is wicked journalism to quote the hated Baghdad on this controversial issue of importance, while censoring by silence learned American civil libertarians such as Barber, Chomsky, Grieder, Phillips, Schmookler, and Thurow who may concur with Baghdad in this instance. The threat of "total control," was named as the singular issue of concern to Americans, in e-mail sent to the Cultural Environment Movement discussion list, Feb 12, 1996, by Dr. George Gerbner dean emeritus of the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania. This statement followed approval of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Feb 8, 1996. The new field of global control opened by the WTO telecoms deal greatly exacerbates such concerns.

End "total control" of GII

"Total control" of GII must end when the telecoms treaty comes before the US Senate for ratification. Global conquest and oligopoly were of the industrial age. In the 21st-century knowledge age, one may triumph only with people power.
to supply depository copies at the agency's expense. GPO continued to sell
individual copies in bookstores at $7 each. In December 1994, the Interna-
tional Cancer Information Center, publisher of the Journal, received a Federal
"Hammer" award for its new Information Associate Program.

Then, a disturbing development. Just a few week[s] ago, in a letter dated
January 2, our Library Program Service was notified that the Journal had been
"privatized." Ownership was transferred from the National Cancer Institute to
Oxford University Press — USA, Inc. The letter said: "Under the terms of a
Cooperative Research and Development Agreement signed by the two organ-
izations, the name of the publication will be retained, and Oxford will assume
all responsibility for printing the Journal and will hold copyright to the
Journal's content."

The letter went on to explain that "because the Journal is no longer a publica-
tion of the U.S. Government, copies of the Journal and JNCI Monographs will
not be provided to the Depository Library Program nor will sale copies be
available at the GPO bookstore." The new price, from Oxford, is $120 for an
individual and $150 for an institution.

The last paragraph in this brief letter said: "We appreciate the service the
Depository Library Program has provided in disseminating the Journal and
JNCI Monographs for many years."

Looking back, I do not regret that we at GPO invested our resources in
promoting the Cancer Journal in the late 1980s. Nor do I regret assisting in the
transfer of subscribers to the Information Associates Program in 1993. But I do
regret the loss of this valuable resource to American citizens through the
depository library program in 1997.

I have here the November 20 issue of the Journal which I purchased from the
main GPO Bookstore. Maybe this last, public domain issue has some historical
value.

Looking through the Journal, a number of questions come to mind. I note that
the masthead lists some 26 staff members. I wonder if the editorial and news
staff is still being paid by the American taxpayer, but working for the Oxford
University Press? I wonder if the Oxford Press is sharing revenues from the
new, higher subscription rate with the National Cancer Institute? I wonder if
copyright will prevent a librarian from sending a copy of an article to another
librarian?

I have no way of knowing the answers to these questions — because the details
of the Cooperative Research and Development Agreement are not public
information, according to NCI legal counsel.

Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. There are other recent examples of
information gathered by government employees disappearing from the public
domain — for a price. I worry that these cases will become precedents and the
precedents will set an irreversible trend.

I want to make it clear that I do not question the motives or goals of the agency
publishers who take this course. They are doing what they feel is right in a new
environment which calls for cutting costs and generating revenues. They are
seeking to preserve valuable information.

But what if this new trend drives future Federal Government Information
Policy? Since the founding of our nation, the cornerstone of information policy
in the United States has been the principle of universal access to Federal
information. This principle is being set aside without many of the usual checks
and balances in our democratic society: Without any high level policy debate,
without clear rules, without thought to unintended consequences, and often
without full public disclosure of the negotiations and agreements.

Is all Federal information with sufficient demand going to be sent to market? If
so, we should think about what that means.

Does it mean that a Government agency may sell its name as well as its
information?

Does it mean that a wide array of private sector publishers will no longer have
access to the information to add value and redistribute it to many different
markets in different products?

Does it mean the public consumer must pay two or three times as much, or
more, for the same information?

Does it mean that agency publishers will focus their attention on more popular,
marketable information and eliminate other, perhaps more significant but less
marketable information?
Does it mean that programs authorized by Congress will begin to move away from public needs, to focus instead on market needs never contemplated by our elected representatives?

Does it mean Government employees working at taxpayer expense to support the information requirements of private firms? And isn't that corporate welfare?

And what if the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, now owned by the Oxford University Press, does not meet the profit goals of the new owner? Does it mean that instead of a "Hammer" award, there will be the "axe" usually awarded sub-par performers in the market place?

Who represents the public in a Bottom-line Information Era?

What is to prevent our nation's bridge to the 21st Century from turning into a toll bridge for Government information?

In 1989, the late Office of Technology Assessment, may it rest in peace, declared that "congressional action is urgently needed to resolve Federal information issues and to set the direction of Federal activities for years to come."

Now, eight years later, there is some talk of legislation to update Federal Information Policy to the Electronic Era. The critical issues at stake today are preservation of official information, public access, Government accountability, and an informed electorate. Americans should not pass up this opportunity to define their own information future.

Those best positioned to know the value and power of information should take the lead. It is not an easy issue for the media because it lacks the essential elements of hot news. It is more significant than sensational.

It is not an easy issue for politicians because there is no visible crisis and framing sound policy seldom delivers votes.

So it may be up to those among us who by nature are reluctant to get out front. Remember those riveting lines of Yeats: "The best lack all conviction, While the worst are full of passionate intensity." Let's not let that happen.

Good afternoon. I am Robert Oakley, Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center and Director of the Edward B. Williams Law Library. I also serve as the Washington Affairs Representative for the American Association of Law Libraries. I am honored to appear before the Subcommittee today on behalf of the American Association of Law Libraries, the American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries and the Special Libraries Association to support the FY 1998 budget request of the Public Printer of $30,477,000 for the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses appropriations.

Transition to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program

Recognizing the need to centralize government printing and to establish a mechanism to provide our Nation's citizens with no-fee access to Federal government information, Congress passed the Printing Act of 1895 that established the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) within the Government Printing Office. The FDLP has evolved over more than one hundred years to become one of the most effective and successful partnerships between the Federal government and the American people today. The goals of the FDLP are based on principles that Congress and the library community have long affirmed as being essential to our democratic society. These principles