



WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER



BOX 54, 110 MARYLAND AVENUE, N.E. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20002 • TEL. 202-547-4440
TWX 710-822-1976 ISSN: 0001-1746

Vol. 33

April 21, 1981

No. 4

: All or any part of the ALA Washington Newsletter :
: may be reprinted for distribution :

C O N T E N T S

Oversight Hearing - Library Programs -	Taxation - Manuscript Donations . .	p. 3
ACTION NEEDED	Information Policy.	p. 4
ESEA IV-B	NEA II Regulations.	p. 4
Congressional Budget.	Energy Conservation Grants.	p. 4
NHPRC - ACTION NEEDED	Budget Workshop	p. 5
Attachments: Brown Bill - Information Science and Technology Act		
Committee lists - House Govt. Operations, Senate Govt. Affairs		
President Reagan's National Library Week Statement		

Oversight Hearing on Federal Library Programs

"What are you doing to motivate people who use libraries to get in touch with their Members of Congress?" asked Rep. Peter Peyser (D-NY) at an oversight hearing April 7 on federal library programs. "You had better take those gloves off and let people know what is happening, get them fighting," Peyser continued. "The administration has not treated education fairly in any sense of the word, but unless we get a deluge of mail, nothing is going to happen."

Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI) agreed: "It's true there is greater use of libraries when the economy is bad. There is a tremendous group of people out there who could influence Congress. You've done half the job here; the other half is out there. It's not unpatriotic to question the President's budget. Have your customers write to us."

Cosponsored by the House Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education Subcommittee and the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, the hearing was held on National Library Week Legislative Day and focused on the impact of the proposed budget cuts on libraries. Testifying were the following panel of witnesses: Peggy Sullivan, ALA President, Chicago Public Library; Louise Bedford, Montgomery County (Kentucky) Public Schools; Bob Carmack, University of South Dakota; Annette Phinazee, North Carolina Central University Library School; and Delia Martinez, Chair, and Laura Chodos, Member of Steering Committee, both of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services Task Force (whcLIST).

Testimony covered not only the effect of cuts in Department of Education library programs, but the added impact of cuts in postal subsidies, CETA public service jobs, etc. In addition, Sherry Horton, a National Merit Scholarship finalist from Louise Bedford's school district, gave an impromptu but very eloquent defense of school libraries. Chaired by Rep. Carl Perkins (D-KY), the hearing was also attended by Reps. Erdahl (R-MN), Hawkins (D-CA), Kildee (D-MI), Peyser (D-NY), Petri (R-WI), Ratchford (D-CT), Roukema (R-NJ), and Weiss (D-NY).

Three House Members inserted statements on libraries in the Congressional Record during National Library Week: Rep. Perkins on the threat to libraries from the budget proposals (April 7, H1387-8), Rep. Biaggi (D-NY) on "The Best Credit in Town:

Your Library Card" (April 7, E1612-13), and Rep. Hawkins, who chairs the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee, and was impressed by witnesses' testimony on the effect of CETA cutbacks on libraries (April 8, E1687-8).

ACTION NEEDED: The message so eloquently expressed by Reps. Peyser and Kildee above was reiterated by others at the oversight hearing and by some Members and staff whom the over 300 library supporters visited on Legislative Day April 7. There has been an early deluge of mail in support of major cuts in federal spending; such mail continues while letters objecting to specific cuts or providing data on the effects of specific cuts are just beginning to come in. Some Members are not convinced that federal spending is the major cause of inflation but feel it is politically unwise to say so. Members are unlikely to speak up for library programs unless their constituent mail backs them up. Program areas where there is no public outcry may take more than their "fair share" of cuts.

Appropriations subcommittees will begin to make decisions in mid to late May, so letters sent now have maximum effect. Write to your own Representative and Senators about the program(s) you know best. You can increase the impact of your efforts in three ways: 1) Send blind copies of your letters to the ALA Washington Office so that we can make use of the information you provide. 2) Address your letters also to key committee and subcommittee chairs such as Reps. Perkins, Simon and Natcher and Sens. Stafford, Schmitt and Hatfield. (See committee lists attached to 2/10 and 3/12 Newsletters. Earlier Newsletters also have specifics on proposed budget cuts affecting libraries.) 3) Spread the word to your colleagues, students, teachers, other users, citizen, Friends, and White House Conference groups.

ESEA IV-B

The Reagan Administration has not yet sent details of its elementary and secondary education block grant proposals to Congress. Louise Bedford's testimony at the April 7 oversight hearing summarized early responses to an ALA Washington Office survey on the impact on school library/media centers of the proposed budget cuts and block grants. Many thanks to all those who responded.

Congressional Budget Actions

The Senate on April 2 voted 88-10 to pass a budget reconciliation measure (S.Con.Res. 9) directing authorizing and appropriations committees to make changes to bring spending for fiscal years 1981, 1982 and 1983 within the Reagan Administration's budget requests. The resolution assumes that education funding and postal subsidies will be cut as much as the President asked for; in some other areas it cuts even deeper. Several amendments to restore partial funding for various social programs were defeated. The ten Senators who voted against S. Con. Res. 9 were Cranston, Dodd, Eagleton, Kennedy, Levin, Metzenbaum, Pell, Sarbanes, Tsongas, and Weicker (the only Republican). Sens. Mathias and Williams did not vote.

In the House, the Budget Committee approved April 10 a Democratic alternative developed by committee chair James Jones (D-OK) as its budget reconciliation measure (H.Con.Res. 115, H. Rept. 97-23). The committee resolution restores \$650 million of the Administration's cuts in education and \$150 million of the almost \$800 million in Administration cuts in Postal Service revenue foregone appropriations. An amendment by Rep. Paul Simon (D-IL) to restore an additional \$100 million in postal revenue foregone funds was defeated by a voice vote. The House budget measure faces a stiff floor fight on April 28 when Members return from recess. House and Senate budget reconciliation measures must then go to a conference committee to iron out the differences. Final decisions on postal, education and library funding will be developed by appropriations subcommittees working within the limits set by the budget measures, beginning in late May and voted on over the summer by House and Senate.

National Historical Publications and Records Commission

The authorization for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) expires September 30, and the Reagan Administration has recommended no funding for NHPRC for FY 1982. With very modest funds (it is currently both authorized and funded at \$4 million), the NHPRC has, through its Records Program, assisted numerous preservation projects, many of them in libraries. April 2, House Government Operations Committee Chair Jack Brooks (D-TX) introduced a bill (HR 2979) to extend NHPRC for two years at an authorization level of \$3 million per year. Co-sponsors are Reps. Glenn English (D-OK), Chair of the Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee, Frank Horton (R-NY), ranking minority member of the full committee, Ted Weiss (D-NY), L. H. Fountain (D-NC), Thomas Kindness (R-OH), M. Caldwell Butler (R-VA), and David Bowen (D-MS), a former member of NHPRC. The subcommittee will hold hearings on the bill April 27 and expects to markup the bill April 30.

Both the House Government Operations Committee and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee must approve a reauthorization bill by May 15. No Senate bill has been introduced as yet. If Congress has not demonstrated its intent to renew NHPRC by that date, no funds can be provided for FY 1982 in the regular appropriations process. Ensuring funding will be difficult enough with a zero budget recommendation.

ACTION NEEDED: Librarians interested in continuation of NHPRC programs should write to their Members of Congress immediately. This is especially important for constituents of key members. On reauthorization: The House and Senate committees and subcommittees with jurisdiction over NHPRC are attached to this Newsletter. On appropriations for FY 1982: Lists of House and Senate Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Appropriations Subcommittees were attached to the February 10 Newsletter. These subcommittees will be making their funding recommendations after May 15.

Taxation - Manuscript Donations

Since the March 25 Newsletter, additional bills have been introduced restoring a tax incentive for the donation by the author of manuscript materials to libraries. What follows is a listing of all such bills introduced so far this session:

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Date Introduced</u>	<u>Sponsor & Cosponsors (if any) as of 4/20/81</u>
HR 148	1/5	William Brodhead (D-MI)
HR 444	1/5	Frederick Richmond (D-NY)
HR 2823	3/25	Thomas Downey (D-NY)
HR 2835	3/25	Bill Green (R-NY); Richmond, Pritchard, McCloskey, Ireland, Fenwick, Pepper, Jeffords, Horton, Wyden, Dwyer, Ottinger, Clay, McCurdy, Peyser, Weiss, Whitehurst, Erlenborn, McClory, Burgener, Addabbo, Coelho, LaFalce, Lehman, Akaka, Fish, McKinney, Daschle, Stokes
S. 649	3/6	Max Baucus (D-MT); Lugar, Kasten, Leahy, Williams, Heinz
S. 851, 852	4/1	Daniel Moynihan (D-NY)

Most of these bills would provide a tax deduction equal to the fair market value of artwork or manuscripts donated by the creator to a library or museum -- the same deduction already available to collectors of such works who donate them to nonprofit institutions. The exceptions are the Moynihan bills, developed in an effort to make the tax law "neutral" with respect to what an artist or author does with his or her own artwork or manuscripts. S. 851 provides a tax deduction, S. 852, a tax credit, for such donations to nonprofit institutions, the amount of the deduction or credit would depend on the artist's or author's income. A set of tables (included in the bills) would be checked to determine the applicable percentage. Both bills are titled the "Pen and Ink Act of 1981." No hearings have yet been scheduled for any of the above bills. Letters of support from constituents would be helpful.

Information Policy

Rep. George Brown (D-CA) has introduced a revision of last year's "Brown Bill" (HR 8395). The new bill, HR 3137, introduced April 8, is not a major revision, but does make changes in the functions of the Institute for Information Policy and Research, provides for "affiliates" instead of "members," calls specifically for coordination with other government programs, and reduces authorization levels to about one-third of the levels in the previous bill. A reprint of Mr. Brown's introductory statement on the bill, including a useful comparison with government information activities in other countries, is attached to this Newsletter.

On April 2 the House Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights held a hearing on HR 1957, the International Communications Reorganization Act of 1981, introduced February 19 by Rep. Glenn English (D-OK), subcommittee chair. Last year a subcommittee investigation concluded that the U.S. is organizationally unprepared to meet the expanding set of problems in international communications and information. It issued a report last December, "International Information Flow: Forging A New Framework" (H. Rept. 96-1535), on which HR 1957 is based. The committee's supply of the report is exhausted, but the House recently agreed to print 1,000 more copies.

To coordinate, develop and implement U.S. policy on international communications and information, HR 1957 would establish a Council on International Communications and Information in the White House. The Council would take over certain functions of the Commerce Department and the International Communications Agency, and all policy activities of other agencies in this area would have to be approved by the Council. Advising the Council would be two bodies: 1) a 30-member advisory committee, and 2) an interagency committee.

HEA II Regulation Review

Regulations for a number of Education Department programs are undergoing review to identify opportunities for de-regulation and alternative approaches, according to an announcement in the March 27 Federal Register (pp. 19000-02). Regulations to be reviewed by September 30 include the Higher Education Act title II-C research library program (final regs published in 12/24/80 FR, 85430-33, effective 3/30/81); HEA II-B library training (final regs published in 12/24/80 FR, 85422-8, effective 3/30/81); II-B special purpose grants (as part of the EDGAR Grant Programs Without Specific Regulations, see 12/22/80 FR 84058-60); Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR); and Selection Criteria for FY 1981. Comments are solicited by May 31 and should be directed to the contact person listed in the preamble to each specific regulation. Meanwhile, final regs are under development for the HEA II-A college library resources (proposed regs were published in 12/23/80 FR, 84950-52) and the HEA II-B research and demonstration program (proposed regs in 12/30/80 FR, 86312-5).

Energy Conservation Grant Program Cycle III

The April 9 Federal Register (p. 21229) includes an announcement of the energy conservation grant program cycle III for schools and hospitals and buildings owned by units of local government and public care institutions. The cycle began March 30, 1981. Applications recommended by the state for funding must be submitted to the appropriate Department of Energy Regional Office no later than July 10. The notice contains fund allocations by state for schools and hospitals. Up to fifteen percent of the funds may be used to support technical assistance analyses. It has not yet been determined whether there will be funds available for technical assistance in buildings owned by units of local government and public care institutions. A subsequent notice will be issued if an allocation is to be made. For further information contact Ronald Milner or Harry Lane, Office of Institutional Conservation Programs, Office of Conservation and Solar Energy, Room 2H043, 1000 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585 (202/252-2330).

"FEDERAL EDUCATION FUNDING: THE CRISIS WE FACE"

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS WORKSHOP

The Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs and the Institute for Educational Leadership will sponsor a two-day workshop on May 4-5.

The goal will be to enable participants from the education field to do more effective lobbying by familiarizing them with the budget and appropriations processes, informing them of current budget and appropriations issues, and updating them on budget and appropriations status as of the time of the workshop.

The workshop will be launched from a press conference on Monday morning at which the heads of major educational organizations will appear. The program which follows will have speakers from Capitol Hill, from lobbying organizations, and from education organizations with budget and appropriations expertise.

Pertinent subjects will be covered in sessions of general interest such as: How to Build a Coalition, and How to do Grass Roots Lobbying. Monday afternoon will afford an opportunity to break into smaller groups including one covering the budget situation as it affects library programs. Monday's session will end with a Capitol Hill reception.

Tuesday will begin with a breakfast session and wind up by noon to afford an opportunity for Capitol Hill lobbying in the afternoon. The cost of the two-day workshop is \$125.00.

The workshop will be held at the Mayflower Hotel, and room reservations will be handled there. For workshop reservations, contact: The Committee for Full Funding, 1707 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006; Telephone: (202) 775-0099. For more information on workshop content as plans progress, contact: Al Sumberg at the American Association of University Professors at: (800) 424-2973.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 97th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 127

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1981

No. 58

House of Representatives

Rep. George Brown (D-CA) introduced on April 8 the Information Science and Technology Act of 1981 (HR 3137), a revision of HR 8395 which he introduced late last year. The stated intent of HR 3137 is to maintain and enhance U.S. leadership in information science and technology by establishing an Institute for Information Policy and Research to address national information policy issues; to provide a forum for the interaction of government, industry and commerce, and educational interests in the formulation of national information policy options; to provide a focus and mechanism for planning and coordinating federal research and development activities related to information science and technology; and to create a Special Assistant for Information Technology and Science Information in the White House. The Institute would operate under a 15-member Presidentially-appointed National Information Science and Technology Board, to include representatives of the private sector, trade and professional associations, and educational institutions and associations, and to include the Chair of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Rep. Brown is a member of the Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), which expects to hold hearings on the bill in late May.

(Page H1410)

THE INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1981

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Information Science and Technology Act of 1981. This legislation is a revised version of a bill I introduced late in the 96th Congress, H.R. 8395. I would like to explain why I think legislation is needed in this area and why I favor the particular approach of this bill.

In presenting the case for legislative action I think it will be helpful to review the role that information products and services now play in our economy and, increasingly, in our schools, homes, and leisure activities. I will also discuss the status of policy development in information-related issues in a number of other nations as well as in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that America is well advanced into the information age. As we continue our rapid transition from an economy based on industrial production to one based increasingly on information products and services, information and the ability to access it quickly and reliably becomes a vital source of political and economic power. Information technology now permeates nearly every aspect of industry and commerce, and its importance is felt not only in the dollar value of information products and services themselves, but also in the central role of information technology in increasing productivity and promoting innovation in other sectors of industry and commerce.

THE INFORMATION INDUSTRY

By any measure, the American information industry is impressive in size and scope. The electronic data processing industry had worldwide revenues of over \$60 billion in 1979; the share of this market for U.S. industry was about \$46 billion. By one informed estimate, more than half of the U.S.

labor force now makes its living from information-related jobs. In 1976 there were 1.2 million computer terminals in the United States; now there are over 3 million. The percentage of GNP spent on computer usage was 2.1 percent in 1970; it is expected to be 8.3 percent by 1985.

The information and communications industry has had and continues to have a remarkable record of productivity. In a Harvard study, productivity increase in this industry accounted for 25 percent of the total productivity increase of American industry.

By one estimate, information and communication equipment and services are now second only to agricultural products as our leading export category. American computer firms now derive nearly 50 percent of their revenues from overseas sales.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. Speaker, the reason why marketing of information technology is big business is that this technology has proven to be cost-effective in a great variety of tasks. The Industrial

Revolution replaced human muscle power with energy-powered machines; the information revolution allows us to make industrial processes "smart" through control theory and automation. Modern industrial processes, and much of our advanced military technology, are now deeply dependent on computer control.

Just as earlier machines replaced muscle power, information technology offers great possibilities for augmenting the human intellect. Computers now aid in the design of complex systems; we will soon see industrial products that can diagnose their own failures and make repairs.

One of the areas in greatest need of productivity increase is white-collar work; here again the clever use of information technology could produce great gains. We are all acquainted with automation of clerical tasks through word processors and related equipment; but even greater productivity gains here may yet come from a restructuring of managerial jobs to permit information technology to simplify and coordinate tasks and to eliminate redundancy.

COMPETITION IN THE INFORMATION ARENA

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made clear my view that the stakes are high in the information game, both in terms of international trade in information products and services and in increasing our overall domestic productivity. The rapid rate at which the technologies are changing and interacting means that there is a relatively short time in which to recoup large investments in new products and services before they become obsolete. It is therefore vital to establish distribution channels into key world markets, a fact which other nations have not been slow to recognize.

International trade in information products and services has become highly competitive, and American superiority can no longer be taken for granted. Japan has now captured a significant share of the semiconductor market, and is the world leader in fast text transmitting devices. The terminal systems of Satellite Business Systems, and IBM-Comsat-Aetna joint venture, include three key components of Japanese manufacture. France and West Germany are now our sole suppliers of traveling wave tubes, an essential component of satellite communications systems. The French firm CIT-Alcatel is setting up an experimental fiber optics link in New York; the teletext system soon to be tested by WETA-TV here in Washington is the Canadian-made Telidon.

Nor is this competition limited to hardware. On the contrary, many experts believe that the decisive competitive arena of this decade will be software—including software for processing text, graphic images, and digitized voice—and in services. Several nations have taken or are contemplating steps to limit foreign access to data transmission facilities or to place restric-

tions on entry of markets. My colleagues on the Government Operations Committee have explored these developments quite thoroughly in hearings, and I commend them for calling attention to this important problem. The adoption of these policies abroad represents an important step in the formulation of comprehensive national information strategies on the part of these nations.

NATIONAL INFORMATION POLICIES ABROAD

Mr. Speaker, I would like to examine briefly the efforts of four foreign nations in formulating national policies regarding information issues: Japan, France, West Germany, and Great Britain. In all of these countries the expressed concerns go far beyond the economic preservation of their information industries to delve deeply into the profound effects that information technology will have on their respective societies.

Japan: As early as 1972, the Japanese Government published "The Information Society: A Year 2000 Japanese National Goal." This report provided a long-range plan for developing an information society in Japan but with an intermediate goal of establishing "the computer mind" by 1985; it included goals not only for the manufacture of semiconductor chips, office equipment and robots, but also for general mass education for computer literacy. Later plans called for the improvement of science information systems, upgrading of data bases, and extensive networking of libraries. Last year, an advisory committee to the Ministry of International Trade and Industry published the JIPDEC report, a preliminary plan for "fifth-generation" computers; that is, computers needed for the 1990's. This document was aimed at identifying and formulating policy for research and development needs and at anticipating some of the social impacts of future information systems. The JIPDEC report makes clear Japan's intention to assume the mantle of information leadership:

The obligation now is for Japan to lead the world in this area, by means of the development of new technology based on original concepts.

France: The publication of the Nora/Minc report, "The Computerization of Society," commissioned by President Giscard in 1978, signaled France's intent to compete vigorously for a share of world information markets. The report is unequivocal on the future importance of the computer: "Mass computerization will take hold, becoming as indispensable to society as electricity." It emphasizes the importance of policy decisions in determining how information technology is to be used:

Depending on the policy into which it is incorporated, computerization will bring about changes for the better or for the worse; there is nothing automatic or preordained about its effects, which will depend on how relations between the government

and French society develop in the coming years.

Among the many suggestions of the Nora/Minc report was the establishment of a research institute to study the long-term effects of communications, particularly its economic, sociological, and cultural consequences.

The French Government has been very active in promoting the use of computers and telecommunications. France has developed a videotex system, Antiope, and plans to replace the phone book's "Yellow Pages" with an Antiope-based information retrieval system by 1987. Earlier this year, France initiated a program called 10,000 microcomputers in schools. The micros are being placed in schools at Government expense; already 1,500 teachers are trained to use them, with a program in place to train 1,000 additional teachers each year.

West Germany: In 1975 the Federal Republic of Germany launched an ambitious program for the advancement of information and documentation with the goal "of creating an efficient capability to satisfy the information needs of society." This plan included the establishment of 16 specialized information centers, and computer networks joining the centers with libraries. In 1977 the Society for Information and Documentation was created, integrating several Government agencies dealing with information, and was given the task of coordinating research and development in the information field and dissemination of scientific and technical information. In September of 1979, the Government announced a \$500 million information technology program for 1980-83 aimed at improving the understanding of the social impact of the technology, increasing the country's capability in the skills needed to create products using the technology, and improving the country's communications infrastructure.

Great Britain: In 1978 then-Prime Minister Callaghan asked the Advisory Council for Applied Research and Development (ACARD) to set up three working parties to examine the social, industrial, business, and social impacts of semiconductor technology. The ACARD report on semiconductor applications was published in September 1978 and became the basis for the \$140 million microindustry support programme, the \$110 million microapplication project, and other support schemes.

In 1980 another ACARD report recommended creation of a Ministry for Information Technology. The report stated:

One Minister and Government Department should be responsible for coordination of Government policies and actions in the promotion and development of information technology and its applications through awareness, education and training, sponsorship of industry, provision of risk capital, public purchasing, publicly funded R&D, national and international regulations and

standards, legislation, communications, and related programmes.

The British Government has moved swiftly to implement this recommendation and has appointed a minister with prime responsibility for information and communications issues.

Following the lead of other European nations, Britain has mounted a significant effort to exploit the potential of computers in education and training. The Government recently committed \$25 million to setting up a national center for computers in education, and the BBC plans to run a TV series next year that will teach viewers how to use computers.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with these examples, but I think the message is clear. In each of these countries there is a firm perception that information technology is rooted in an economic and cultural context, and in particular that a coherent approach to information issues must involve mutual support and cooperation, rather than antagonism, between industry and Government. This is perhaps most clearly seen in Japan, where, for example, in a program to develop very large-scale integration (VLSI) technology, the Government channeled \$100 million in research funding through an intraindustry committee which allocated funds and research tasks, and arranged sharing of the results. Japan has also had, since 1967, a nonprofit independent organization, funded by business and government, called the Research Institute of Telecommunications and Economics. This was established to conduct socioscientific research and study of telecommunications. Its mission is to forecast social needs for telecommunications, to anticipate the role of telecommunications in the future society, and to contribute to systematic telecommunications theories and policies.

An analogous structure in the computing field, the National Computing Center Ltd., has existed in Great Britain since 1966. A nonprofit organization financed by industry, commerce, and government, it provides information, advice, and training; promotes standards and codes of practice; and cooperates with the coordinates the work of members and other organizations concerned with computers and their use.

INFORMATION POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

Where, then, does the United States stand in its development of information policies?

Let us agree at the outset that our political and economic traditions prescribe some fundamental differences in our information posture from that of most other countries. The first amendment prohibits the Government from interfering with the free flow of information, except in limited circumstances, and we have a strong commitment to private ownership and operation in information and communications, unlike most developed countries. These political and economic tradi-

tions and the highly pluralistic nature of our society make a coordinated treatment of information policy concerns a difficult and delicate task. We tend to take information and the tools used to process and transmit it for granted, and to think of it as ancillary to the real business at hand, be it energy, health care, banking, or whatever. In addition, unlike most countries, we do not have the motivation for policy development of being under foreign domination in information products and services.

When all possible excuses have been made, however, I still think that the United States is doing an inadequate job of planning for the information future. The decisions we make about this future will have profound implications, not only for our economic well-being, but for the size and structure of the work force, for the evolution of our educational institutions, for personal privacy and civil liberties, and for many other concerns central to our personal and societal values. Yet at the present time responsibility for Federal research, development, and policy activities concerned with information is uncoordinated and fragmented throughout numerous agencies, and there is no effective forum where Government and private interests may cooperate in consideration of policy issues. An integrated approach would require that information technology and its development be considered together with the potential economic and social impacts of this technology and with policy issues regarding information access and delivery. It would not require that all these functions be performed under the same roof or even by the same agency; but it would require coordination of activities and high-level planning and direction.

It does not seem possible to do this under the present structure. As currently organized, civilian research and development in information science and technology is primarily supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) basic research and some policy research and analysis and by the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) research on network architecture, standards and protocols, security. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) is charged with providing policy advice to the President on information and telecommunications issues. NTIA, a small agency, has had to struggle—not always successfully—for visibility and influence within the Department of Commerce. NSF, NBS, and NTIA all have their own mechanisms for eliciting outside advice from the information community.

Within the Executive Office of the President (EOP), where ultimate policy responsibility must reside, OMB has assumed the primary responsibility for Federal information policy and management, a role greatly strengthened by the passage last year of the

Paperwork Reduction Act. General information policy issues have been addressed elsewhere in the EOP, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) has had a nominal concern with scientific and technical information.

Mr. Speaker, what is plainly missing in this picture is some mechanism for connecting concerns for the development of this powerful technology (primarily scientific and technological questions) with consideration of the policy issues which the employment of this technology inevitably raises (primarily economic, political, and social questions). Technology development cannot be permitted to be the sole determinant of political and social values, but neither can it be made to conform to predetermined dogma concerning its proper use. Profound technological advances change the way we think about the world. We need to develop conceptual approaches broad enough to appreciate the potential of this technology and to anticipate and plan for the changes to come, before the rush of events forecloses some of the options now available to use in developing and managing this technology.

THE INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION POLICY AND RESEARCH

It seems to me that a successful approach requires at least these ingredients: (1) a better understanding of the potential impacts and the limitations of information technology; (2) the joint development by the public and private sectors of guidelines to translate this understanding into a consensus for future action; and (3) a mechanism with the authority and resources to refine and implement the policy guidelines thus arrived at. The legislation which I am introducing today attempts to provide these ingredients.

Title I of the Information Science and Technology Act establishes an Institute for Information Policy and Research as an independent agency in the executive branch. The Institute has a lifetime of 10 years, unless extended by Congress and is viewed as a transitional mechanism to facilitate our Nation's evolution into an information society. The Institute is not intended to conduct basic research in information science and technology or development of hardware. It would not itself determine policy, nor would it have any regulatory authority. Its purpose is to provide ingredients (1) and (2) preceding:

To investigate and provide assessments of current and projected future developments in information science and technology, and of potential applications and their impacts, to serve as a basis for policy determination in information-related issues; and to provide a forum for considering the information concerns of government, industry and commerce, educational interests, and the public.

The intent behind the independence of the Institute is to allow it an unconstrained perspective on such issues as institutional structure and regulatory

policy. Placement of the Institute within an existing department or agency could easily skew the Institute's view toward that agency's particular mission and involve it in bureaucratic squabbles.

The independence of the Institute, its degree of freedom in hiring practices, and its association with academic and commercial institutions should enable it to assemble and maintain a staff of the highest intellectual and leadership capacity.

STRUCTURE OF THE INSTITUTE

Under section 105 of the bill, the Institute would operate under the general supervision and policy control of a 15-member National Information Science and Technology Board, to be appointed by the President for 5-year terms. The Board would include policy-level Federal officials with information responsibilities; representatives of private sector businesses providing information products or services, or trade associations comprised of such businesses; representatives of scientific or professional associations and of educational institutions. Board membership would represent the variety of different functions involved in information processing and transfer, including technology development and marketing, provision of access to information, and consumption of information.

Section 106 provides for a Director of the Institute, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, and such staff as necessary.

The Institute would have a procedure by which organizations and institutions with a serious interest in information issues could become affiliates (section 104). Along with the diversity of viewpoints represented by the Board, this provision is designed to promote cooperative interaction among government, industrial and commercial interests, and scientific and educational institutions. In developing the programs of the Institute, the Director is instructed to consider the concerns of the affiliates, as well as to consult with the Board.

In addition to the initial 3-year appropriation for the Institute, the Board would set a fee schedule for affiliates. The Institute would evolve toward a joint public-private funding arrangement somewhat analogous to that of Japan's Research Institute for Telecommunications and Economics, or England's National Computing Center, mentioned earlier.

FUNCTIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

A fundamental assumption in the Information Science and Technology Act is that in some areas we do not yet understand information and information technology well enough to formulate optimal policies. Extending and deepening our base of understanding is a fundamental mission of the Institute for Information Policy and Research.

There is a broad spectrum of research and analysis involved in infor-

mation issues, from basic research in information science through hardware and software development to research on applications and their effects and on the policy options for providing access. While it is difficult to make a clean cut in these functions for purposes of clarifying responsibility, the Institute's emphasis is on policy and research issues which are of overall national import and which transcend particular agency missions. Not surprisingly, these are precisely the kinds of issue which everyone assumes that someone else is looking after. In the words of the Nora/Minc report, which recommended a similar structure in the French Government, the Institute's task "would be to analyze, warn, alert, propose, and persuade". It would not replace or duplicate the research programs of the National Science Foundation or the National Bureau of Standards.

The Institute would be expected to develop a cadre of highly qualified experts to perform studies and analysis in-house when possible. Section 109 of the bill explicitly charges the Director with coordinating its programs with other agencies and with funding any basic research and technical studies it deems essential through NSF, NBS, and the Institute for Telecommunications Studies, where appropriate. The Institute could, through contracts or cooperative agreements, conduct studies and analyses for other agencies or nongovernmental organizations.

Mr. Speaker, section 104 of the act charges the Institute with 11 specific functions. I will mention several of these, which give a good indication of the scope of the Institute's duties.

MONITORING OF DEVELOPMENTS IN INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Institute is to collect, assess, and make available to the Federal Government and to Institute affiliates data and information about developments and trends in information science and technology throughout the world. The collection process would draw on existing sources where possible and would be coordinated and supplemented when necessary by the Institute's own efforts.

RESEARCH OF IMPACTS OF TECHNOLOGY

More research into the economic and social impacts of information technology is needed as a foundation for building policy. The Institute's study areas would include potential impacts on the size, structure, and training needs of the work force; development of better measures of the effectiveness of information technology in enhancing productivity, especially in the services sector; and research into the psychological and sociological effects of human interaction with information technology.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING NEEDS

In hearings held last year by the Science and Technology Committee jointly with the Education and Labor Committee, the importance of widespread

"computer literacy" for increasing productivity and for national security was repeatedly emphasized. It was also pointed out that the United States now lags behind many other nations in teaching of computer skills. In a recent Army testing of 1,663 computer programmers, 77 percent failed to meet minimum standards. The Institute is directed to conduct studies and make recommendations directed at citizen preparation for the information age, with particular attention to the difficult question of equality of opportunity for information access.

BACKGROUND OF REGULATORY DECISIONS

The convergence of computing with telecommunications and the resulting emergence of "hybrid" technologies raise regulatory issues and protection-of-property issues with serious consequences. By virtue of its independent status, the Institute would be in a unique position to analyze potential impacts of regulatory decisions and patent and copyright policies on the development of new technology configurations, and on their uses for such purposes as electronic mail systems and electronic funds transfer. The Institute could aim at developing model codes and regulations responsive to new or novel applications of information technology and telecommunications. It could also provide direction in future disputes arising from public-private competition in the provision of data and information services.

SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC R&D

The Institute is directed to identify areas of overall national importance in future technical research and development. Of particular concern are future needs for large-scale computing capabilities and networks for scientific research, where the needs transcend the missions of individual agencies and require coordinated action among a number of scientific disciplines to prevent duplication and to allocate limited resources wisely. Because of its unique cooperative nature the Institute would be in an ideal position to, for example, catalyze industrywide joint research in the development of VLSI technology, or to encourage further industry-university cooperation in computer science research and development.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION CONCERNS

International issues such as trans-border data flows are of increasing concern to American firms doing business abroad. The Institute could contribute both by collecting needed data on the nature and extent of these flows and in developing a better understanding of the underlying economics, for example, of how to put a value on different categories of information. It could also play a key role helping less developed countries (LDC's) to acquire needed information by working with the private sector to improve access to existing data and by contributing to the development of in-

ternational information systems suited to the needs and capabilities of LDC's.

IMPROVING FEDERAL INFORMATION PRACTICES

The Institute could have a major impact on Federal information practices by conducting studies and recommending specific policies and methods for the use of information technology by the Federal Government to improve overall administrative effectiveness and to reduce costs through improved productivity. The foundation here has been laid by the Paperwork Reduction Act. What is needed now to improve Federal Government productivity is not simply more and bigger computers, but a critical examination of task structures and administrative hierarchies and a restructuring of jobs to take advantage of the simplifying and coordinating capabilities offered by flexible new technologies. The Institute is directed to set a standard in its own functioning for the productive and humane use of information technology.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Another area in which the Institute could have an important effect is in developing and assessing policy options for improving the dissemination of scientific and technical information (STI). Particular needs include better coordination of STI activities among agencies and the elimination of institutional barriers to improved STI flows; integration of data bases and elimination of unnecessary duplication through increased networking capabilities; and some kind of centralized indexing system for STI generated within the Federal Government or under grant or contract with the Federal Government. The problems in this area are, for the most part, institutional rather than technological; they will require coherent planning and high-level support.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

In order to carry out the program outlined above, section 108 of the legislation provides for transfer to the Institute of the Office of Policy Analysis and Development of NTIA and of information-directed programs in the Division of Policy Research and Analysis of NSF. In both cases these are programs which fit naturally with the Institute's responsibilities. In particular I believe that the services which the NTIA's Office of Policy Analysis and Development was designed to perform would be more effectively rendered within the Institute than in the program's present niche in the Commerce Department.

The President may in addition transfer to the Institute any other policy research and analysis conducted within the Federal Government, provided that such programs are of overall national import and transcend individual agency missions. Candidates for transfer would include such programs as the "computer vulnerability" studies now being performed by the Insti-

tute for Computer Science and Technology of NBS.

REPORTS

Under section 105 of the act, the Board of the Institute is instructed to submit an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, describing past, current, and proposed activities of the Institute. In addition, the Board is to submit biannually a 5-year outlook on public policy issues concerning information and the application of information technology. This 5-year outlook is expected to anticipate future issues of signal importance.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 110 authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985 of \$6, \$8, and \$10 million respectively. These would of course be offset in future budgets to the extent of amounts appropriated to the programs being transferred to the Institute, so that the net cost of the Institute would be considerably less than the above figures. The appropriations would be augmented by fees paid by Institute affiliates and by any additional fees received for particular research projects.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE INFORMATION

Mr. Speaker, the Institute for Information Policy and Research is the heart of the Information Science and Technology Act, but the Institute is not itself a policymaking body. As I remarked earlier, ultimate responsibility for policy determination in the information area must rest within the Executive Office of the President. I believe that the Office of Management and Budget has an important role in this policymaking, and section 105 of the act makes the Director of the OMB Office of Federal Information Policy a member of the National Information Science and Technology Board.

However, I also believe that an effective future-oriented policy for information and information technology requires much more active participation by the Office of Science and Technology Policy than has been the case in the past. As I have noted, decisions about the future direction of research and development in information science and technology will influence, and be influenced by, very important questions concerning information access and delivery. For this reason title II of the Information Science and Technology Act provides for a new position in OSTP, that of special assistant for information technology and science information. This individual would be a member of the National Information Science and Technology Board, and would assist the Director of OSTP in "formulating policy and providing advice within the executive branch on scientific and technical information and the technologies involved with its collection, processing, and dissemination."

It is my hope that the presence of this special assistant within OSTP would provide a strong link between the Institute for Information Policy and Research and the Executive Office of the President, a link reinforced by the presence on the Board of the Institute of the Director of the Office of Federal Information Policy of OMB. The Special Assistant is explicitly directed to establish a suitable mechanism to coordinate the activities of the Institute with those of executive branch agencies having significant responsibilities for research, development, and application of information science and technology. He is further directed to explore and make recommendations concerning a Federal information locator system for scientific and technical information generated under Federal auspices, and for improving dissemination of this information both domestically and internationally.

CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS ISSUES

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with a very complex area, and I would not claim that the bill I am introducing today represents any ultimate wisdom. Others may have better ideas, and I am open to suggestions for alternatives. I am convinced, however, that Congress must move quickly to address some of the important concerns arising from the information revolution. A concerted effort is needed, and I look forward to working with other Members and other committees to meet the legislative challenges presented by these exciting new advances.

National information policies will evolve whether answers are arrived at consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or haphazardly. The question is whether our Government, and Congress in particular, will be foresighted enough to take a considered and coordinated approach. I hope and believe that Congress will, and I invite my colleagues to join with me in working to make that hope a reality.

SUMMARY

Rapid advances in microelectronics and telecommunications technology, and the convergence of computers and telecommunications, have created new opportunities for economic growth, increased export markets, and gains in productivity, and will permit increased public access to all kinds of useful information. At the same time, these advances have important implications for the size and structure of the work force, for the evolution of educational institutions, for personal privacy and civil liberties, and for many other concerns central to our personal and societal values. If we are to take advantage of the opportunities made possible by the new information technologies and minimize potential negative impacts, our social and governmental institutions must come to grips with the important policy questions raised by these scientific and technological developments.

Information and communications technologies are still in a stage of rapid development, and this development will be a dominant feature of the coming decade. The Information Science and Technology Act establishes an Institute for Information Policy and Research, with a lifespan of 10 years. This independent institute in the executive branch would be a transitional mechanism to facilitate our Nation's evolution toward a society based increasingly on information products and services. This mechanism would make possible cooperative planning among the Federal Government, business, educational interests, and State and local governments, for the productive and humane use of information technology in the workplace, school, and home.

The independence of the Institute would allow it a broad and integrated perspective on such issues as institutional structure and regulatory policy, a perspective not subject to the political or bureaucratic constraints on the several dispersed agencies now concerned with information issues. As structured in this legislation, the Institute would not be engaged in hardware research and development, nor would it have any regulatory authority. Its primary purpose would be to provide a focal point for policy research and analysis and a forum for consideration of the information interests of Government, business, and education.

The Institute would be governed by a 15-member National Information Science and Technology Board representing all functions involved in information generation and transfer, and administered by a Director. It would conduct policy research and analysis, develop and recommend policy options, and propose goals and methods in support of policy development for scientific and technical R. & D.; dissemination of scientific and technical information; international information issues; regulatory issues; and impacts of information technology on education and training needs and on the work force. The Office of Policy Analysis and Development of NTIA would be transferred to the Institute, and other policy research and analysis programs which are of overall national importance and transcend particular agency missions may be transferred.

The bill requires close coordination between the Institute and other agencies, including the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce. Appropriations of \$6, \$8, and \$10 million are authorized for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985 respectively.

Title II of the bill establishes the position of Special Assistant for Information Technology and Science Information in the Office of Science and Technology Policy. The special assistant would be a member of the Board of the Institute and would have responsibility for coordinating the Institute

functions with other agencies of the executive branch and with assisting the Director of OSTP in formulating policy on information technology and on scientific information.●

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Government Operations

97th Congress, 1st Session

Jack Brooks (D-Texas), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

L. H. Fountain, North Carolina
Dante B. Fascell, Florida
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York
Don Fuqua, Florida
John Conyers, Jr., Michigan
Cardiss Collins, Illinois
John L. Burton, California
Glenn English, Oklahoma
Elliott H. Levitas, Georgia
David W. Evans, Indiana
Anthony Toby Moffett, Conn.
Henry A. Waxman, California
Floyd J. Fithian, Indiana
Ted Weiss, New York
Mike Synar, Oklahoma
Eugene V. Atkinson, Pennsylvania
Stephen L. Neal, North Carolina
Doug Barnard, Jr., Georgia
Peter A. Peyser, New York
Barney Frank, Massachusetts
Harold Washington, Illinois
Tom Lantos, California

REPUBLICANS

Frank Horton, New York
John N. Erlenborn, Illinois
Clarence J. Brown, Ohio
Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Calif.
Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio
Robert S. Walker, Pennsylvania
M. Caldwell Butler, Virginia
Lyle Williams, Ohio
Joel Deckard, Indiana
William F. Clinger, Jr., Pa.
Raymond J. McGrath, New York
Hal Daub, Nebraska
John Hiler, Indiana
David Dreier, California
Wendell Bailey, Missouri
Lawrence J. DeNardis, Connecticut
Judd Gregg, New Hampshire

Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee

Glenn English (D-Oklahoma), Chairman

DEMOCRATS

Ted Weiss, New York
Henry A. Waxman, California
John L. Burton, California
- To be appointed -

REPUBLICANS

Thomas N. Kindness, Ohio
John N. Erlenborn, Illinois
Wendell Bailey, Missouri

U. S. SENATE

Committee on Governmental Affairs

97th Congress, 1st Session

William V. Roth, Jr. (R-Delaware), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Charles H. Percy, Illinois
Ted Stevens, Alaska
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland
John C. Danforth, Missouri
William S. Cohen, Maine
David Durenberger, Minnesota
Mack Mattingly, Georgia
Warren Rudman, New Hampshire

DEMOCRATS

Thomas F. Eagleton, Missouri
Henry M. Jackson, Washington
Lawton Chiles, Florida
Sam Nunn, Georgia
John Glenn, Ohio
Jim Sasser, Tennessee
David Pryor, Arkansas
Carl Levin, Michigan

Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee

Ted Stevens, (R-Alaska), Chairman

REPUBLICANS

Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland

DEMOCRATS

David Pryor, Arkansas



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

April 5 - 11, 1981

More than a century and a half ago Thomas Jefferson said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

Long an inspiration to many, Jefferson's great library attested to the knowledge and information resources that were available to him. Even greater resources are accessible to every American through the libraries of our nation today.

National Library Week's theme is "America, the Library Has Your Number." It says to me that there just isn't any request too big or too small for our libraries.

If we are to guard against ignorance and remain free, as Jefferson cautioned, it is the responsibility of every American to be informed. During National Library Week, I urge Americans everywhere to use our nation's libraries and to take full advantage of the services which they provide.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan