Spring 2003
Volume 31, Number 1
ISSN: 0091-2085

# DttP

## A Quarterly Journal of Government Information Practice and Perspective

GODORT

## Contents

INTERNATIONAL • U.S. FEDERAL • STATE • LOCAL

# GODORT

## Keep up with your colleagues.

GODORT is looking for fresh, exciting program ideas in these and other areas.
If you have an idea, don't keep it to yourself—Let us know!

{**cataloging/classification**}

{**collection management**}

{**federal**}

{**international**}

{**management**}

{**new technologies**}

{**preservation**}

{**promotions and outreach**}

{**reference**}

{**state**}

INTERNATIONAL • U.S. FEDERAL • STATE • LOCAL

GODORT

DttP



*DttP: A Quarterly Journal of Government Information Practice and Perspective* is the official publication of the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) of the American Library Association (ALA). *DttP* provides current infomation on government public technical reports, and maps at the local, state, national, foreign, and international levels; on related government activities; and on documents librarianship, *DttP* is published quarterly in spring, summer, fall, and winter. The opinions expressed by its contributors are their own and do not necessarily represent those of GODORT. Acceptance of an advertisement does not imply endorsement by ALA/GODORT of the products or services offered.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS:** *DttP* is sent free to ALA/GODORT members on a per volume (annual) basis. For subscriptions, prepayment is required in the amount of $30 in North America, $40 elsewhere. Checks or money orders should made payable to "ALA/GODORT" and sent to the Editor. Changes of address and claims six months of the date of issue should be sent to the Editor. To purchase back issues, write to: UMI, 300 North Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

**ADVERTISING:** Inquiries about rates and specifications for regular and classified advertising should be sent to the Editor. Classified advertising is accepted for Positions Open, Positions Wanted, and for services, sales, products, personals, and general announcements that are related to government documents.

**CONTRIBUTIONS:** Articles, news items, letters, and other information intended for publication in *DttP* should be submitted to the Editor. All submitted material is subject to editorial review. Contributions must be submitted on a 3½ " floppy disk using an unformatted ASCII file. The name of the file and the word processing software that is used should be indicated on the file label. Each floppy disk should be accompanied by a printed copy, double-spaced, for reference. Contributions should include the names of all authors, the titles, and their organizations. The deadline for submission of material is: January 15 (spring issue); April 1 (summer issue), July 15 (fall issue), and October 15 (winter issue).

**INDEXING:** *DttP* is indexed in *Library Literature* beginning with volume 19, number 1 (March 1991).

**EDITORIAL PRODUCTION:** ALA Production Services—Troy D. Linker, Kevin Heubusch; Ellie Barta-Moran, Angela Hanshaw, Kristin McKulski, and Karen Sheets.

**GODORT MEMBERSHIP:** Membership in ALA is a requisite for joining GODORT. Basic personal membership in ALA begins at $48 for first-year members. Personal and institutional members of ALA are invited to select membership in GODORT for an additional fee of $15 per year. For information about ALA membership contact: ALA Membership Services, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611-2729; 1-800-545-2433, ext. 4298; e-mail: membership@ala.org.

31(1): 1–36 ISSN: 0091-2085 

# From the Editor

Well, it has been a rough year for *DttP* and GODORT. Budgets continue to be shaken, disruptions to production schedules, and a major financial failure by one of the principal subscription agencies that handle the accounts of a good part of our paid subscriber base has clouded my stewardship for this publication. That being said, I can assure our readers that things are getting better. For one, I am stepping down from this post (and the post of advertising manager and subscription manager) and moving on with some other challenges. Andrea Sevetson will lead a new editorial team starting with the combined Fall/Winter 2003 issue. I am confident they can take this publication to its next level of evolution. They have my support and prayers. On that note, then I have one more issue to deliver. I want to thank everyone contributed to the editorial board and articles over the years. ☆

# From the Chair

## Bill Sudduth

"The Future is Now" was an often used phrase of Coach George Allen of the Washington Redskins of the early 1970's. Coach Allen was referring to his team of veterans that he had assembled to get a struggling franchise to the Super Bowl. I am borrowing the phrase to highlight the work and accomplishments at our Midwinter meetings and decisions that need the fullest support of the membership over the next few months and years.

At the GODORT Business Meeting we heard from Bruce James, 24th Public Printer of the United States. Mr. James outlined his broad vision and goals to modernize GPO and the Federal Depository Library Program. The spring Depository Library Council Meeting (April 6–9 in Reno, Nevada) will be an exciting opportunity for members of the Federal Depository Library community to shape a vision on the future role and shape of the FDL program. GODORT has been involved in many attempts to revise Title 44, and work with the GPO to seek new roles and definitions for the program. Mr. James has challenged us to come to the table and work with him on envisioning the FDL. As part of this challenge we need to do our homework and we need to ask tough questions like "What is a 21st Century FDL?" We need to remember our core statements on access to government information as expressed in the "GODORT Principles to Government Information". We need to dust off notes from the 1993 Chicago Conference on the Future of Government Information, and look closely at what works and doesn't work in our institutions. I encourage each and every member to contribute to the process. If you can't be in Reno then, talk to your directors, talk to your regional librarians or contact me with your concerns, your ideas, your questions about the future of the FDLP. Mr. James is challenging us, the experts, to work with him and Judy Russell to modernize and sustain the strengths and shed the weaknesses of this country's most vital public information program. We must respond to this challenge.

In addition to Mr. James' challenge to the depository community, GODORT is facing several other challenges. During Midwinter we made great progress in responding to these challenges, but much work remains to be done.

Chief among these challenges is GODORT's budget and the necessary steps we need to take to curb spending and stabilize revenues during the next few years. How has this organization gone from a $50,000+ to a $133 reserve fund in just eight years? Frankly, it a combination is issues. One, we have had some wonderful but costly receptions. Second, good programming costs (conference equipment costs for 2002 was $8,000 or just under $10 per member). Third, *DttP* continues to generate more costs than revenue.

Where do we go from here? The Steering Committee passed a greatly revised budget for 2002-2003 and a paired down budget for 2003-2004. These budgets stop the bleeding but we need to recommit to building up our reserve. Many issues are being addressed by the Executive, Steering and other committees. One bright spot is the upcoming pre-conference in Toronto on the digitization of government information. The Program and GITCO Committees have wonderful speakers, a large venue and have kept costs to the minimum. Also we all look forward to the next edition of the Directory of Government Documents Collections and Librarians coming out this spring. The Publication Committee is working with our *DttP* editor outline some solutions. We still need to address the costs of receptions and be very careful about what programming and conference equipment we can truly afford. Once we get a handle on these issues we can focus on the future.

Our most tangible symbol for developing future leaders is the Rozkuszka Scholarship. I applaud the Steering Committee's commitment to continue the scholarship despite the current budget situation. This year's scholarship will be supported through a special appeal to the membership. All members should be receiving a letter in the early spring asking for support. If you do not receive a letter, donations can be sent directly to the GODORT Treasurer, Tim Byrne. As for the future, we need a Development Committee and a concerted effort to fully fund the Rozkuszka Scholarship. The goal should be a fund of $100,000. The current balance is $20,000. That's $80,000 or just over $10 per member per year for the next 10 years.

### Structural Changes for the Future

I strongly ask that the membership support the changes to the Bylaws recommended by the Steering Committee. In particular, we need to free the Membership Committee from the burdens of conference planning and logistics and allow them to work on issues to recruit new members and retain continuing members.

The bylaws change related to dues categories will allow the roundtable to be more creative in attracting corporate members and providing support for student and retired members. Finally, I ask the membership to support the formation of a Development Committee that can coordinate fund-raising and support to our Rozkuszka Scholarship and other long-term financial goals. GODORT's membership has a wealth of talent in this area and we need to tap into this talent to assure our future viability.

Who will our future leaders be? The Membership Committee made wonderful contacts at the midwinter meetings and has a very successful New Members Luncheon. Plans for Toronto are nearly complete. I encourage all to stop by the GODORT web page for further updates. The Nominating Committee has prepared an excellent ballot for the member's consideration and I encourage all to participate and vote.

Finally, I applaud the work and discussions held by the Publications Committee regarding the future of our quarterly, *DttP*. The Publications Committee is continuing its diligent search for a new editor. I again ask for those who have experience in this area to once again consider the opportunity. The next editor will have the collective experience and support of the past editor and the Publications Committee.

The "Future is Now", the opportunities to shape the future of access to government information has never been greater. I hope to see many in Reno and even more in Toronto. Until then—Documents to the People. ☆

# International Documents Roundup

**Lynne M. Suart**

## Water

Water is a vital resource for human health, economic growth, and environmental quality. But, will there be enough water in the future to meet the needs of households, industry, agriculture, and the environment? According to the United Nations, approximately one billion people do not have access to clean drinking water. The growing world population has created an ever-increasing demand for water that many governments cannot satisfy. Lack of sewage treatment and purification plants for household and industrial waste, especially in developing countries, has polluted drinking water. Land under irrigation doubled between 1900 and 1950 and continues to grow.[1] In some areas of the world the volume of available irrigation water cannot meet demand, and potential conflict exists among countries over access to water.[2] Countries, regional bodies, intergovernmental organizations, and the United Nations are working to ensure there is water for the future. The United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (August 26-September 4, 2002) addressed this issue, stating that its goal was to halve the proportion of people lacking access to clean water or proper sanitation by 2015. Water issues include quality, quantity, various uses, pollution, access and conservation. The following publications from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and World Health Organization (WHO) cover many of these issues.

## OECD

The Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) membership includes thirty countries that work to develop economic and social policies. The following is a sample of OECD publications that cover water and its various issues.

- ☆ *The Price of Water, Trends in OECD Countries* (1999) summarizes developments and trends in water pricing practices occurring over the past ten years, covering water use in the agriculture, industry and household sectors. There are extensive tables and figures that include household tariffs, industrial water price level variations, and impacts of metering individual apartments. Related publications and good sources of statistics are the OECD's environmental Policy Committee's *OECD Working Papers: Agricultural Water Pricing in OECD Countries* (Vol. VII. No. 33, 1999), *Household Water Pricing in OECD Countries* (Vol. VII. No. 37), *Industrial Water Pricing in OECD Countries* (www.olis.oecd.org/olis/1998doc.nsf/LinkTo/env-epoc-geei(98)10-final), and *Water Subsidies and the Environment* (www.olis.oecd.org/olis/1997doc.nsf/LinkTo/ocde-gd(97)220).
- ☆ *Water Consumption and Sustainable Water Resources Management* (Geyer-Alley 1998); the published proceedings of an OECD workshop on sustainable water consumption (Sydney, Australia 10-12 February 1997). According to the report, OECD Member countries have made major strides in the management of their water resources over the past three decades. Now however, water is returning to the policy agenda. Persistent water quality problems, the need for heavy investments in water delivery and treatment infrastructure, and growing competition for finite supplies are forcing greater attention to the mix of policies needed to achieve efficient and effective integrated water resources management. The integrated management of water resources is not a new concept but is evolving, giving greater emphasis to the full recognition of the water needs of the environment in pricing policies, allocation decisions and institutional reform. Drawing on examples from OECD

Member countries and selected countries from the Asia-Pacific, the proceedings examine progress made on a range of key water policy issues and some of the more innovative attempts to put into practice a wider vision of integration.

- *Biotechnology for Water Use and Conservation, the Mexico '96 Workshop (1996)* was the third in a series of OECD workshops dealing with bioremediation/bioprevention. The published proceedings include papers that discuss the biological quality of water and public health, bioremediation/biotreatment of aquifers, surface waters, marine and coastal waters, prevention of water pollution from municipal, industrial, and agricultural sources. There are also four Mexican cases studies on biotechnology and water. Many papers include tables, figures, and diagrams, and the questions, comments, and answers that followed the presentation.

## World Bank

The World Bank is concerned about the declining availability of water in many countries and its negative effect on human health and economic development. Its Water Resources Management Web Site (http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/essd/essdext.nsf/18ByDocName/WaterResourcesManagement) serves as a central organizing point for water throughout the World Bank. It addresses water as a resource in its many dimensions, using an integrated water resources perspective to ensure that social, economic, environmental and technical dimensions are taken into account in the management and development of water resources. The following publications reflect the World Bank's interest in pricing water as a commodity to promote conservation and efficient use.

- *Water Pricing Experiences, An International Perspective.* World Bank Technical Paper No. 386 describes water pricing in 22 countries. (http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1997/10/01/000009265_3971201161412/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf) Each country report covers past and current practices, statistics, current debates, and future prospects and a bibliography.
- Another technical paper, *Management of Water Resources, Bulk Water Pricing in Brazil*, No. 432, was written for Brazilian leaders and policy-makers in the area of water to guide them in the implementation of bulk water pricing reform. (www.wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1999/10/07/000094946_99092311540412/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf)
- The book, *The Political Economy of Water Pricing Reforms* (ed. Dinar, 2002), attempts to explain the political economy of water pricing reforms. It is divided into two parts: the first provides the theoretical and empirical foundation, and the second is a collection of five country case studies that attempt to support the framework and empirical evidence.

## FAO

Founded in October 1945, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is an autonomous agency within the United Nations system. Its mandate is to raise levels of nutrition and standards of living, to improve agricultural productivity, and to better the condition of rural populations. Because water plays a critical role in food production, the FAO publishes a great deal of material that covers irrigation, water management, and water pollution.

- *Control of Water Pollution from Agriculture* (FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 55, 1996), is a good introduction to the various types of agricultural water pollution. It covers the nature and consequences of agricultural impacts on water quality and describes practical measures that can be used to control water pollution. Besides it publications, FAO publishes water data on rural water use online. Established in 1993, the AQUASTAT Programme generates rural water use data at the country and subcountry level, giving priority to the countries of the African Continent. Its home page is www.fao.org/ag/agl/aglw/aquastat/main/index.stm.

## WHO

The World Health Organization (WHO), a specialized agency of the United Nations, was established in 1948, inheriting specific tasks relating to epidemic control, quarantine measures, and drug standardization from the Health Organization of the League of Nations and the International Office of Public Health at Paris. Located in the Department of Protection of the Human Environment, the division of Water, Sanitation and Health's (WSH) (www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/index.html) works to reduce water and sanitation related diseases; and to maximize the direct and indirect benefits to health and well-being of sustainable management of water resources and wastes. WSH publications include guidelines, fact sheets, assessment reports, and training materials. Many of these publications are available in print and on online. The following is a small sample.

- In 1984, WHO published *Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality*. The second edition of this work (1993) is now in three volumes. Volume one (Recommendations) presents guideline values for various constituents of drinking-water, Volume two (Health criteria and other supporting information) contains recommendations with important information that is required to understand the basis for the values, and Volume 3 (Surveillance and control of community supplies) offers communities information on how to safeguard their water supplies. A third edition is planned for 2003.
- *Global Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment 2000 Report* is a snapshot of the of the water and sanitation conditions of the world. Besides the current numbers, the report contains

international development targets, health hazards of poor water supply and sanitation, and the health benefits of improved water supply and sanitation. It is on line at www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/Globassessment/GlobalTOC.htm.

☆ *Arsenic in Drinking Water* (revised May 2001), located at http://who.int/inf-fs/en/fact210.html, is one of many fact sheets. It covers the source, effects, measurement, prevention and control of arsenic, WHO's activities, and a description of the situation in Bangladesh.

While much progress has been made in the efforts to protect the world's water supplies, it is obvious that there is much to do to ensure adequate water for the future. ☆

## References


1. Paul Kennedy. *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century.* New York: Random House, 1993, p. 13.
2. Editorial. *New York Times.* Action A, Page 24, Column 1, August 29, 2002


# Tech Watch

Megan Dreger

## Dynamic Web Pages

"Dynamic," a buzzword for webmasters everywhere, is shorthand for "dynamic web pages" or "dynamic content." Though not all web pages are (or need to be) dynamic, its popularity is increasing.

So, what is a dynamic web page?

At one time, web pages were all *static*, meaning they did not change unless someone manually edited the file. The user could view the html document using a browser, and perhaps activate a small program (like an applet), but the web page could not display anything other than what it was pre-formatted to do. This worked well for small sites and for pages that contained information that didn't change often. However, it was problematic for larger sites and for webmasters who needed more.

Then, *dynamic* pages came along, meaning the pages are created on the fly. The content of dynamic pages can change based on user inputs (e.g. a user fills out a web-based form), user identification (e.g. the user signs in to Boston's MyGov service), or other criteria. The term *dynamic* is often used to describe *database-driven* web sites. That is, web sites that create individual web pages on the fly based on content from a database. For example, most web-based library catalogs are database-driven because the web page showing the search results does not exist independently—it is created only when the database is queried.

Below are brief overviews and examples of various technologies used to create dynamic web pages. They are not limited to database-driven technology, but instead cover a broad range of tools. This is not an exhaustive list; it is a list of some of the popular tools with notes about the associated extensions that might be found in a URL.

## Common Gateway Interface

Common Gateway Interfaces (CGI's) are a popular way to process information such as online forms, database queries, and interactive questionnaires. The CGI allows the web server to communicate with programs that process or respond to user input. When a CGI is used there is sometimes "cgi" or "cgi-bin" in the URL. For example, the NASA Technical Reports Server (http://techreports.larc.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/NTRS) can be searched using an online form. The CGI takes the user's search terms, searches the database, and returns the relevant results. Examples:

Singapore's Storm Charts (http://intranet.mssinet.gov.sg/cgi-bin/storm_form)
U.S. Gazetteer (www.census.gov/cgi-bin/gazetteer)
Oregon State Employee Search Form (www.state.or.us/cgi-bin/employee.html)

## Active Server Pages

An Active Server Page (ASP) is an html file with scripts embedded in it. The scripts are small programs that instruct the web server to insert the desired content into the web page before it is sent to the user. The script may tell the web server to perform a database query and insert the results into the web page. For example, the Virginia State government has a web page with a "Who's My Legislator" form the user can fill out (http://conview.state.va.us/whosmy/constinput.asp). Based on the information provided by the user, the ASP returns a page listing the appropriate legislators. With ASP, there may be an .asp extension on the URL. Examples:

United Nations Treaty Collection (http://untreaty.un.org/English/treaty.asp)
National Atlas of the United States (www.nationalatlas.gov/natlas/natlasstart.asp)
Montana's Secretary of State (http://sos.state.mt.us/css/index.asp)

## JavaServer Pages

Similar to Active Server Pages, JavaServer Pages are html files containing java programs that are processed on the web server before a web page is sent to the user. The java programs, or *servlets*, can do many things. One popular use is to query a database. The Ohio House of Representatives "Your Representatives" interactive form (www.house.state.oh.us/jsps/Representatives.jsp) performs the same tasks as Virginia's ASP form above, but uses JSP instead. Note that there may be a .jsp extension. Examples:

United Nations Atlas of the Oceans (www.oceansatlas.org/index.jsp)
U.S. Department of Education (www.ed.gov/index.jsp)
Cleveland City Planning Commission GIS (http://planning.city.cleveland.oh.us/gis/cpc/basemap.jsp)

## PHP

PHP, originally "Personal Home Page," now is short for "PHP:Hypertext PreProcessor." In any case, PHP is a popular freeware tool for web applications. Like ASP, PHP is an html file with an embedded script. The script is processed by the web server before it is sent to the user's browser. The web page seen by the user looks like any other except that the URL may end in .phtml, .php, or .php3. Examples:

United Nations Industrial Development Organization's Biosafety Information Network and Advisory Service (BINAS) (http://binas.unido.org/binas/index.php3)
Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives (http://clerk.house.gov/members/index.php)
California's State Parks (http://ceres.ca.gov/ceres/calweb/parks.phtml)

## Server Side Includes

A Server Side Include (SSI) is a sort of placeholder which will be replaced with content before the final web page is sent. SSI's are often used for information shared among many web pages, such as headers, footers, and menus. For instance, if all of the pages on a large web site use the same header, the webmaster could use one file for the header portion of all the site's documents and insert it into each web page by using an SSI. If changes are made to the header, they are made to the one file only and will be automatically updated on all the pages of the site. On the user's browser the page looks like any other page, except that the URL usually ends with the extension .shtml (or variations .shtm and .stm). Examples:

The text versions of the United Nations homepage in English, French, and Spanish (e.g. www.un.org/english/engtxt.shtml)
The Bonneville Power Administration (http://www.bpa.gov/indexmain.shtml)
The Missouri Department of Conservation (www.conservation.state.mo.us/index.shtml) ☆

# 19th and Early 20th Century Federal Documents

## Research Avenues and Access Tools

### Introduction by August A. Imholtz, Jr., Pre-Conference Co-Chair

Editor's note: this is the first set of papers from this conference. The other set will be published in a future issue of *DttP*.

The papers printed here are the first set from presentations given at the day-long Government Documents Roundtable (GODORT) pre-conference held at the University of California at Berkeley on June 14, 2001. The pre-conference was a joint undertaking by GODORT's Rare and Endangered Government Publications Committee and the Federal Documents Task Force.

The speakers touched on various problems and issues, bibliographical, political, and contextual, in their lectures on 19th and early 20th century government publications. Gregory C. Harness, the United States Senate Librarian, examined the first Library of Congress collection and explained its 21st century recreation. August A. Imholtz, Jr., former Executive Editor of LexisNexis Academic and Library Solutions, in the morning discussed some bibliographic problems resulting from pre-Civil War Congressional printing practices and in the afternoon he briefly recounted the less well known stories of some U.S. naval exploratory missions to the Dead Sea, the coast of Africa, and on the Congo River. John A. Shuler of the University of Illinois at Chicago outlined some of the political issues at work in the development of the Government Printing Office in the 19th century and the struggle between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch for control of the government printing activities. Cindi Wolff, current GODORT Chair, gave us a fascinating account of the historical census, what the volumes contain and how they can be mined. Donna P. Koepp of the University of Kansas commented on an interesting series of historical maps, largely drawn from the U.S. Congressional Serial Set, highlighting the mapping and exploration of the North American continent. And finally, Steven F. Daniel, former Senior Director Editorial at LexisNexis Academic and Library Solutions, enlivened the afternoon with his fascinating account of the Congressional investigation into the sinking of the Titanic and other U.S. government document blockbusters. Donna Koepp and Steven Daniel's largely visual presentations unfortunately do not lend themselves to full reproduction here. The texts of the other talks are given here largely as presented with footnotes added and some of the pre-conference handout materials consigned to tables.

I would like to thank first of all Cindi J. Wolff for her hard work as co-chair of the pre-conference program. Then on behalf of Cindi and myself, I would like to express our thanks to Andrea Sevetson for putting the Maud Fife Room, a wonderful facility in Berkeley's Wheeler Hall, at our disposal, to William O. Wears of LexisNexis Academic and Library Solutions who so ably handled our electronic demonstrations, to Ann E. Miller, immediate past GODORT Chair who enthusiastically supported the pre-conference from initial idea through the final successful event, and to GODORT members Nancy Kolenbrander of Western Carolina University, Brian Rossman of Montana State University at Bozeman, and Tammy Stewart of Southwest Missouri State University who helped with all the practical arrangements. ☆

*August A. Imholtz, Jr., is former Executive Editor of LexisNexis Academic and Library Solutions*

# The Printing and Distribution of the Serial Set

## A Preliminary Contribution to 19th Century Congressional Publishing

August A. Imholtz, Jr.

### Introduction

During the first Congress, each House passed a special resolution for each and every bill or other document they wished to have printed. This practice, as Laurence Schmeckebier sagely noted, "was soon found <to be> impracticable; and the whole subject of printing was referred to a special joint committee."[1] The report of that first joint committee on printing, adopted by both Houses of Congress, provided:

> That it would be proper that it should be left to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, to contract with such persons as shall engage to execute the printing and binding business on the most reasonable terms, the paper being furnished by the said secretary and clerk, to such person, at the public expense; that such person as they shall contract with shall be obliged to render a state of his accounts quarterly; and that 600 copies of the acts of Congress, and 700 copies of the journal, be printed and distributed to the members of the legislature, to the executive and judicial, and heads of departments of the Government of the United States, and the executive, legislative, and judicial of the several states.[2]

From such simple and relatively straightforward stipulations it was scarcely possible for the members of the joint committee to imagine the record of chaos, graft, waste, and scandal that would accompany the printing of the laws and publications of the Congress over the first three-quarters of a century of the history of the new United States.

### Printing Situation, 1789–1817

The Senate appointed Thomas Greenleaf, proprietor of the New York newspaper the *Advertiser* its first printer and, by the way, newspaper owners would be involved in Congressional and almost all federal printing more or less up to the establishment of the Government Printing Office. Greenleaf printed the first journal of the Senate in 172 folio pages.[3] Francis Child and John Swaine performed a similar service for the House with its journal amounting to 177 folio pages. The sequence of printers to the two houses of Congress is listed in Table 1.

Suffice it to say that during the first fourteen Congresses the size, format, and quality of the printing varied from printer to printer. As early as 1793 in the second session of the second Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, would complain of the standard of the House's printing. Writing to the Speaker of the House on Feb. 27, 1793, he said:

> Sir:
>
> I beg leave, through you, to observe to the House of Representatives, that the statements communicated by my first and second letters in answer to theirresolutions of the 23rd of January last, which were printed by order of the House, have been printed in an incorrect and very confused manner.[4]

### Problems Associated with Printing, 1789–1817

The major problems associated with early Congressional printing were:

- ☆ No uniform numbering system of the documents printed—this meant there could be no simple, uniform method of citation and retrieval of documents.
- ☆ No simple method of ensuring distribution of publications to all who required them—again due in large part to want of a numbering system.
- ☆ No uniform size of materials printed—I have seen in the early congressional files in the National Archives reports [what we at least would call reports] printed the size of a modern greeting card. More to the point, the Yale College Library catalog of 1823 described its congressional holdings as a set of "pamphlet volumes" consisting of six folio size volumes, one quarto, and fifteen octavo-sized volumes.[5] The consequences for subject-access, storage and retrieval at a time when libraries shelved holdings by size should be readily apparent.
- ☆ No uniform editorial quality control, as Alexander Hamilton was surely not the only one to note.

In addition to these general problems, there occurred both an explosion of printing at the time of the War of 1812 and a loss of considerable number of original publications as a consequence of the British burning of Washington during that conflict. A.W. Greely observed in his classic work on the printing of the first fourteen congresses that we may never have a full accounting of what was produced.[6] Therein lies the germ of another research project, I think, but one outside of the present topic.

At this point, Timothy Pickering, then a representative from Massachusetts, introduced a series of resolutions which created order in the printing of the Congressional documents. On Dec. 8, 1813, the third day of the second session of the 13th Congress Pickering offered the following simple House resolution:

> That henceforward, all messages and communications from the President of the United States; all letters and reports from the several Departments of the government; all notions and resolutions offered for the consideration of the House; all reports of committees of the House; and all other papers which, in the usual course of proceedig, or by special order of the House, shall be printed in octavo fold, and separately from the journals—shall have their pages numbered in one continued series of numbers, commencing and terminating with each session.[7]

Six days later, perhaps at the insistence of printers well aware of the difficulties attendant upon numbering all the pages of a session in a single numbering sequence would occasion, Pickering presented another resolution:

> That the documents which were the subject of the order of the House of the 8th instant, instead of having their pages numbered in one continued series of numbers from the commencement to the termination of each session, shall be themselves numbered in a regular series in the order of time in which they shall be directed to be printed, the number of each document to be distinctly marked on the top of the title page and of every subsequent page, in addition to the number of each page of such document.[8]

This resolution was passed by the House on the day introduced and because of it, I believe, Timothy Pickering should be considered the true Father [or at least the Grandfather] of the Serial Set rather than Dr. Ames, who devised the numbering scheme for the volumes which was made possible only because of Timothy Pickering's numbering system. But if that is true, why doesn't the Serial Set begin with the 13th instead of the 15th Congress? It is because the Pickering resolution applied only to documents printed in octavo, thus folio volumes were not included in the numbering system.

Pickering himself was a somewhat conflicted person. He was a pacifist who in the War of Independence became George Washington's Adjutant General and then, from 1780–85, Quartermaster General. In his first post under President Washington he served as special emissary to the Seneca Indians, a position in which he distinguished himself by retroceding to the Senecas more than a million acres of land that they were compelled to surrender in the Treaty of Fort Stanwix of 1784. Upon the resignation of Henry Knox, Washington appointed Pickering Secretary of War and then, after Edmund Randolph resigned the post of Secretary of State, Washington again turned to Pickering. John Adams retained Pickering together with most of Washington's cabinet—a practice not likely to be repeated in our day—until Pickering's disagreements with the second president, particularly those arising from Pickering's intense anglophilia and the resulting abomination in which he held France—not a good recommendation for a secretary of State—compelled Adams to dismiss him in 1800. Pickering returned to politics, being elected to the Senate from Massachusetts (1803-1811) and then in the House from 1811, hence his opportunity for reforming the issuance of Congressional publications.

The series numbered according to Pickering's principle for the 13th Congress 2nd session through the 14th Congress is sometimes called the Congress "State Papers," not to be confused, of course, with the *American State Papers* retrospective collection of documents.

Where did Pickering get his idea for numbering our Congressional documents? In Britain, Charles Abbot introduced the serial numbering of Sessional Papers and their assemblage in bound volumes starting with 1801 while he served as Speaker of the House of Commons (1802–1817). Previously the House of Commons, like the House of Lords, had produced printed papers "spasmodic in origin and irregular in form."[9] Abbot organized the House of Commons materials in three classes: bills, reports, and accounts and papers, each having assigned consecutive numbers reflecting the order of printing rather than subject matter. Sarah Jordan Miller in her excellent Columbia University dissertation of 1980, *The Depository Library System: A History of the Distribution of Federal Government Publications to Libraries of the United States from the Early years of the Nation to 1895*, does not think that Abbot's numbering system had any influence on Pickering[10], but remember two things: Pickering was a lifelong Anglophile, even during the War of 1812, and he, in his position as U.S. Secretary of State, could have been acquainted with the British parliamentary series. Obviously, one should try to verify this in the microfilmed collection of Pickering's papers [another little task]. Pickering additionally had a great personal predilection for quoting earlier documents in his speeches, newspaper articles, and other writings; hence he had some real practical experience of the difficulties inherent in working with the disorganized mass of Congressional publication

Pickering also should be given credit for advancing the cause of distributing Congressional publications. On Dec. 13 of that same year, 1813, he introduced a resolution that would do two things: increase the number of copies of Congressional documents to be printed, and distribute them beyond the traditional distribution to the federal government. The following documents were to be printed in an edition of 200 copies beyond the usual number printed:

> the public journals of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the present and every future Congress, commencing with the present session, and of the documents; published under the orders of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, from the commencement of the present session.[11]

And the distribution was designated in this manner:

> that so many other of the said copies shall be transmitted in like manner as the acts of Congress are transmitted, to the Executives of the several States and Territories, as shall be sufficient to furnish one copy to each Executive, one copy to each branch of every State and Territorial Legislature, one copy to each University and College in

each State, and one copy to the Historical Society, incorporated, in each State.[12]

Though overshadowed by the deliberations, and speculation, regarding the Embargo (Pickering of course was against it and on account of his opposition was burnt in effigy) which was passed at the same time as the consideration of the printing and distribution of Congressional publications, the Senate passed the measure on Dec. 17, four days after House passage; and the President signed it into law on December 27, 1813. This act may be considered the beginning of what became the depository library system.

## How Well Did the Distribution Work?

John Quincy Adams, the Secretary of State, reported to Congress in April 1817 (since the Secretary of State was then vested with the responsibility for the distribution of documents) that:

> In compliance with a resolution . . . of the 27th December, 1813, . . . . the Secretary of State has the honor to report that the documents referred to have, up to the year 1817, been transmitted as prescribed, partly by mail, and partly by water and land carriage.
>
> That, of the documents for the year 1817, 25 copies have been deposited in the library of Congress, and that a copy of the same has been forwarded by mail, under the frank of this Department, and in conformity to the fourth section of the act of 18th of April, 1814, to each of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, of the district courts, and of the Territories of the Untied States, with the exception of the Mississippi Territory, which, during that year, was passing, in part, from the Territorial to the State form of government, whereby, it became difficult to identify therein the particular judges who were entitled to the said documents.
>
> That the remainder of the documents for the year 1817 were, as usual, and according to the plan adopted of the distribution of the laws of the Unites States, deposited in the hands of an agent convenient to navigation, with a view to their being shipped and conveyed, by water and land carriage, to the Executives of the several States and Territories, in the portions that the Acts of Congress are transmitted to the same, and according to the injunctions of the joint resolution of Congress of the 27th of December, 1813.
>
> That none of the documents for the year 1817 have been shipped from this place, owning (as the agent states) to the late period at which they were delivered to him by the bookbinder, and to the want of an opportunity thereafter to ship them hence.
>
> If further provision be necessary to insure the transmission of the journals and documents according to the said resolution, Congress may deem it expedient to make an application of supernumerary copies to be substituted for those which, by casualties and accidents unavoidable in the conveyance of packages so bulky and so liable to take damage to the most distant quarters of the Union, are occasionally prevented from reaching their destinations. Delays of several months must necessarily occur after the expiation of every session of Congress before the laws, journals, and documents of the session can be forwarded in the requisite number to all the States and Territories respectively. By the employment of a greater number of printers and bookbinders these delays might, doubtless, to a certain extent, be abridged, but not, probably, without a considerable increase of expense.[13]

## Usual Number of Bills, Documents, and Reports Printed

The "usual number" of items to be printed was fixed by statute and was amended as the country, and therefore the Congress, increased in size. In addition to those variations in the "usual number," usually but not always upward, there were quite a few "unusual" numbers for special publications; but more about that below. Let us just look at a few years to get an idea of the progression. In 1809 the usual number was 300 copies of documents[14], the journals having been required by the Constitution, were set at a higher number as noted before. In 1812 the usual number increased to 400 copies, and then by the legislation of 1813 it was increased to 600 which figure was reaffirmed by the Printing Act of 1819.[15]

From the records in the Legislative Archives Division of the National Archives and Records Administration it has been possible to document the actual number of reports, documents, and bills printed for selected periods in the pre-GPO era.

The Senate records include for 1826-1847, i.e. the 19th to the 29th Congresses, a large folio-sized ledger volume recording the number of copies printed of every document[16] (remember that the Senate legislative and other "reports" were issued as Documents until the 29th Congress when a separately designated "reports" series was initiated following the long-standing example of the House]. Here are some sample figures which may never before have been published:

## Senate

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 19th Congress | Documents | = 600 copies |
| | Bills | = 400 |
| | President's msg | = 3000 |
| 20th Congress | Documents | = 687 |
| | Bills | = 400 |
| 21st Congress | Documents | = 687 |
| | Bills | = 400 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 22nd Congress | Documents | = 687 |
| | Bills | = 400 |
| 23rd Cong. 2nd | Documents | = 850 |
| | Bills | = 500 |
| 24th Congress | Documents | = 850 |
| | Bills | = 500 |
| 25th Cong. 2nd | Documents | = 1114 |
| | Bills | = 770 public |
| | Bills | = 554 private |
| 26th Congress | Documents | = 1114 |
| | Bills | = 770 public |
| | Bills | = 554 private |
| 27th Congress | Documents | = 1164 |
| | Bills | = 770 public |
| | Bills | = 554 private |
| 28th Cong. 2nd | Documents | = 1214 |
| | Bills | = 770 public |
| | Bills | = 554 private |

On the House side, unfortunately, I could not locate in the files of the National Archives a comparable single ledger record of printing, but I did find the printing registers indicating the number of copies of each report and document printed for the following years:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1833 | Documents & Rpts | = 1000 |
| | President's message | = 10,000 |
| | Bills | = 485 |
| 1835 | Documents & Rpts | = 1035 |
| | President's message | = 15,000 |
| | Bills | = 485 |
| 1837 | Documents & Rpts | = 1090 |
| | President's message | = 15,000 |
| | Bills | = 485 |
| 1838 | Documents & Rpts | = 1090 |
| | Bills | = 485 |
| 1839 | Documents & Rpts | = 1160 |
| | Bills | = 500 |
| 1840 | Documents & Rpts | = 1160 |
| | Bills | = 500 |
| 1847 | Documents and Rpts | = 1380 |
| | Bills | = 600 |

In addition to the manuscript records in the National Archives, there are other, printed sources for information on Congressional printing: for example, the numerous Serial Set reports on printing matters, the annual reports of the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate on contingent expenses [which for the House for a short period of the 28th through the 30th Congress actually give the number of bills, reports, and documents printed by item by item]; the many resolutions for special printing; the *Biennial Register* which gives total expenditures for House and Senate printing, sometimes by printer, sometimes not; and other sources.

## The Congressional Printers and the System of Their Selection

A list of the printers of Congressional materials, 1789-1860, is included in Table 1. This list is really two lists: it shows for the first 14 Congresses the printers of the Journals of each chamber who, it is assumed, performed the majority of the printing for the houses. From the 15th through the 35th Congresses, the principal printers are shown together with newspaper affiliations where determinable. What is not shown in the second list, however, is the separate relations with binders (often the printer of the last Congress will become the binder of the next), nor the separately provided for contracts for maps and engravings, nor the contracts with printers for the special publications—be they sets of *American State Papers*, *Registers of Debates*, or sets of exploration reports. Nonetheless, I hope the lists will be useful and at least begin to show the cast or regular and new characters in the drama of pre-Civil War Congressional printing.

After the removal of the federal government to the District of Columbia, it was difficult to engage printers capable of handling the rapidly expanding volume of Congressional and other governmental printing. From 1789 to 1804, printers, usually by session, were selected by the Committee on Printing of each House to print the journals and other documents deemed necessary. In 1804 a new system, which would run through 1818, was introduced: proposals were requested and the printing contracts were awarded to the lowest bidder for each House. But delays in the delivery of the printed materials, together with errors introduced by the printers, continued to frustrate Congress.

The situation became so serious that the Senate at least returned briefly almost to the practice of the first Congress:

> S.doc. 30, Dec. 4, 1818
>
> IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
>
> December 4, 1818.
>
> Mr. Lacock submitted the following motion for consideration:
>
> Resolved, That no paper or document shall hereafter be printed for the use of the Senate, but by special order, except messages from the President of the United States, or communications from the House of Representatives.[17]
>
> Both Houses were extremely displeased with the performance of the printer for the 15th Congress, E. De Krafft.
>
> ASP No. 460 Printing for Congress
>
> Communicated to the Senate on the 17th December, 1818
>
> Mr. Wilson made the following report to the Senate:
>
> The joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, on the subject of the public printing, beg leave to report, in part:

That they have examined the proposals of the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and find in them the following stipulations:

"In every instance the printer supplies the paper, and deposites the work, duly folded, (and stitched, when necessary) and no possible delay is to occur in the *daily* execution and delivery of the work, so that, in all cases *where it is practicable*, the matter ordered to be printed on every given day may be ready for delivery next morning at the hour to which the House so ordering the printing stands adjourned, except in the printing of the annual reports made from any of the Departments, under any permanent act requiring such reports, in which cases, forty-eight hours longer will be allowed."

In the proposals made by Mr. De Krafft to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and which were accepted by the latter, is the following paragraph:

"It is to be expressly understood that I am to receive the *whole* of the printing, &etc. of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fifteenth Congress; and for the *prompt execution* and fulfillment of the above propositions, should they be accepted, I offer as surety R.C. Weightman, Esq. of this city."

The committee have afforded Mr. De Kafft an opportunity to afford them all the information and explanation in his power. He avers that the printing has been done as promptly as practicable, agreeably to the conditions offered, and insists on his right to the whole of the printing, according to his words and proposals.

The committee are, however, of opinion that *it is practicable*, with a greater number of hands and presses, to execute the business with much greater despatch; that the delays and disappointments experienced during this session, in relation to a number of documents, have not only been inconvenient to the members of both Houses, but highly detrimental to the public interests; and that it is absolutely necessary for the furtherance of the business of the nation to guard against such frequent and long disappointments in future; and they therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That when any printing is done by virtue of a joint rule or resolution of the two Houses, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, jointly, and, when ordered by either House, the Secretary and Clerk, respectively, be authorized and required to employ such printer or printers as will most expedite its execution and delivery, and allow him or them the same prices as are now allowed to the printer employed by the said Secretary and Clerk, giving the latter the *preference* when it shall be *practicable* for him to execute and deliver it as soon as it can be done by any other printer or printers.[18]

Late in 1818 a resolution was passed for a joint committee to investigate public printing and make a report, which it did with great diligence. This Joint Committee on Printing reported:

H.doc. 139
REPORT of the Joint Committee on Printing, Feb. 19, 1819

. . . three different modes of procuring the printing of Congress to be executed have undergone their discussion and deliberation:

**Offering the work by advertisement** (as at present) to the lowest bidder.

On this mode the committee would remark, that although at the first glance it may strike the mind as the most economical, experience and observation do no prove it so. Competitors for the work underbid each other, until it is undertaken for a less sum than it can be afforded at; and too small an establishment, and too few workers are consequently employed, to execute the printing with the necessary promptitude. Hence, both Houses have frequently to wait long for interesting and important communications from the President, heads of departments, reports, bills, resolutions, etc. upon which they are called to act….

Another disadvantage attending the present mode is, that the reduced price of the work prevents that care and attention from being bestowed on it, which is necessary to its neatness and accuracy. And documents are not only distributed through this nation, but dispersed throughout Europe, which are executed in such an inelegant and incorrect manner, as must bring disgrace and ridicule on the literature and press of our country.

**A second mode suggested** to, and considered by, the committee, was the establishment of a National Printing Office (with a bindery and stationery annexed) which should execute the work of Congress while in session, and that of the various Departments of Government during the recess….

The committee are of opinion that such an establishment, under the superintendence of a man of activity, integrity, and discretion, would be likely to produce promptitude, uniformity, accuracy, and elegance, in the execution of the public printing; and they are not certain that it would not, in the result, connecting with it a bindery and stationery, as already suggested, be found the most economical. But as the principle is somewhat novel, and the details would require some deliberation, the committee have not deemed it advisable at this late period of the session, and amidst the pressure which both Houses experience from the accumulation of business important to the nation, or interesting to individuals, to submit a proposition on which there would probably be a considerable diversity of opinion, and consumption of time.

Under all circumstances, the committee have deemed it their duty to recommend, that a tariff of prices for every kind of printing required to be done for Congress be fixed by a joint resolution of the two Houses, to continue in force for two years, and that before the close of the present session, each House make choice, by ballot, of a printer to execute its own work expeditiously, and to ensure such care and attention as shall give it such a degree of accuracy and elegance, as shall not dishonor the literature and typography of the country. …. In addition to the bond and security, to be required of them for the faithful performance of their obligations, a provision might be added that in case of any unreasonable delay, another person might be employed to do the work at such price as the Secretary or Clerk might be able to get it done for…The committee therefore, submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on public printing be instructed to report a resolution for carrying the foregoing proposition into effect.[19]

The Printing Act of 1819 thus fixed the size of the type used, the style, including the numbering as ordained before, and the page size.

This system prevailed until 1846 with many of the old problems and some new ones. The increasingly partisan nature of the printers employed tended to annoy the party out of power, but even more importantly, the tariffs remained fixed at the 1819 rate whereas advances in printing technology allowed printers to do the work far more cheaply than had been the case when the tariffs were established. Finally, under the Act of 1846 a new permanent Joint Committee on Printing was established and, mirabile dictu, the Committee returned to the system of awarding printing contracts to the lowest bidder. The Joint Resolution of August 3, 1846, stipulated that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives should advertise for sealed proposals for the printing for the succeeding Congress with the printing classified and divided as follows:

One of bills and resolutions; one of reports of committees; one of journals; one of executive documents; and one for every other description of printing; each class to be a separate job, and to be provided by separate contract.[20]

History, however, repeated itself and this practice was scrapped once more with the enactment of the Printing Act of 1852 which "reinstated the election of printers by each House but also created the office of Public Printer."[21]

During the Buchanan administration the question of public printing had become such a scandal and was investigated in such great detail by a congressional committee, that on June 23, 1860, a government printing office, first proposed more than half a century ago, was finally established. Lack of promptness in delivery of documents, uniformity of quality, and, most of all, waste of the taxpayers' money brought about the establishment of the Government Printing Office.

## Establishment of the Government Printing Office and the Record of Publication

The records of the numbers of copies of Congressional publications printed and distributed are derived from the annual reports of:

the Superintendent of Public Printing (1853–1866)

the Congressional Printer (1867–1875)

and the Public Printer (1876–1900).

Over time these reports vary somewhat in their statistical content and in the manner of presentation of the data but they do provide a concise annual record of the official Congressional printing for the last four decades of the 19th Century. In Table 2 you will see the "usual number" of bills, reports, and documents printed for the House and Senate, for many years the number bound, and of the number bound the number sent to the Department of the Interior for distribution.

Dr. John Shuler's paper covers the early history of the GPO and the revolution it brought to government printing, but I would like to quote one remark made by F.A. Crandall, Superintendent of Documents, in *Superintendent of Documents Office Bulletin No. 1*, 1896:

"The usual number," he is talking about the printing and binding, "is 1682 and of the documents printed in that number the following disposition is made: As soon as printed and without waiting for binding, 600 go to the Capitol for the immediate use of Members of Congress; these are the "up number" part of the "usual number."

The remaining 1082 copies are the reserve part of the usual number. Formerly it was the custom to print the "reserve" at the same time as the "up number," and then store the printed sheets in some warehouse, to be taken out and bound in sheepskin at the convenience of the Printing Office. It was often found, however, when the sheets were sought for, that signatures were missing . . ."[22]

I wonder whether when the departmental editions were printed by the GPO and supplied for the Congressional Set, such warehousing practices might not account for the discrepancies that occur between the "departmental" and "Congressional" editions of the same document which, to the eye and mind of the librarian, and here I quote from Crandall again, "is the most horrible jumbling together of contradictions and impossibilities."

In conclusion, Senate Document 332 of the 27th Congress, 2nd session, begins with the observation that:

From an early period of the Government, it appears, the subject of the printing of Congress has engaged more attention, and consumed more time, than comported with the public interest.[23]

I hope you will not think that is true of all our papers, though it may well characterize the one you have just read.

Table 1
*Congressional Printers*

*1789–1861*

| Congress/Session | | House Journal Printer/Place/Date/Collation | Senate Journal Printer/Place/Date/Collation | Newspaper Affiliation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1st Cong. | 1st Sess. | Francis Childs and John Swaine, New York, [1789] 164, [clxv]-clxxvii p. | Thomas Greenleaf, New York, 1789, 172 p. | TG = New York Journal, Advertiser |
| | 2nd | Francis Childs and John Swaine, New York, 1790, 261 p. | John Fenno, New York, 1790, 224 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 3rd | Francis Childs and John Swaine, Philadelphia, 1791, 104 p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1791, 203 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 2nd Cong. | 1st Sess. | Francis Childs and John Swaine, Philadelphia, 1792, 245 p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1791, 228 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 2nd | Francis Childs and John Swaine, Philadelphia, 1793, 167, [24] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1792 [1793], 100 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 3rd Cong. | 1st Sess. | Childs and Swaine, Philadelphia, 1793, 438, [29] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1793, 205 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 2nd | Francis Childs and John Swaine, Philadelphia, 1794, 312, [26] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1794, 114, [3], [8] p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 4th Cong. | 1st Sess. | Francis Childs, Philadelphia, 1795, 537, [1], [34] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1795, 346, vi, xxi p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 2nd | William Ross, Philadelphia, 1796, 299, [27] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1796, 175, iv, 18 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 5th Cong. | 1st Sess. | William Ross, Philadelphia, 1797, 140, [12] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, 1797, 115, xvii, x p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 2nd | William Ross, Philadelphia, 1797, 683, [52] p. | John Fenno, Philadelphia, [1798], 501, vii, 24 p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 3rd | William Ross, Philadelphia, 1798, 266, [24] p. | John Ward Fenno, Philadelphia, 1799, 222, vi, xiv p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 6th Cong. | 1st Sess. | William Ross, Philadelphia, [1800], 446, [32] p. | John Ward Fenno, Philadelphia, 1799, 336, 1, xx p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| | 2nd | William Ross, Washington, [1801], 276, [24] p. | Way and Groff, Washington, 1800, 149 ix p. | JF= Gazette of the US |
| 7th Cong. | 1st Sess. | Samuel Harrison Smith, Washington, [1802], 563, [72] p. | Way and Groff, Washington, 1801, 284, xx p. | SHS = National Intelligencer |
| | 2nd | Samuel Harrison Smith, Washington, [1803], 384,[72] p. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1802, 169, xv p. | SHS = National Intelligencer |
| 8th Cong. | 1st Sess. | Samuel Harrison Smith, Washington, [1804], 684, [88] p. | William Duane & Son, Washington, 1803, 344, 5, [1], xxi, [1] p. | SHS = National Intelligencer; WD = Aurora |
| | 2nd | Samuel Harrison Smith, Washington, 1804 [1805], 431, [69] p. | William Duane & Son, Washington, 1804, 216, iv, [1], xviii, 140 p. | SHS = National Intelligencer; WD = Aurora |
| 9th Cong. | 1st Sess. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1805, 537, 54, [67] p. | William Duane & Son, Washington, 1805, 348, 7, [1], xxix, p. | WD = Aurora |
| | 2nd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1806, 400, [58] p. | William Duane & Son, Washington, 1806, 268, 5, [1], xxv p. | WD = Aurora |
| 10th Cong. | 1st Sess. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1807, 659, 35, [117] p. | R.C. Weightman, Washington, 1807, 340, viii, [1] p. | |
| | 2nd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1808, 533, 15, [59] p. | R.C. Weightman, Washington, 1808, 274, [1], xxv p. | |
| 11th Cong. | 1st Sess. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1809, 206, [25] p. | R.C. Weightman, Washington, 1809, 100, iii, [1], xi p. | |
| | 2nd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1809, 656, [1], [46] p. | R.C. Weightman, Washington, 1809, 401, vi, [1], xxxix p. | |
| | 3rd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1810, 394, [38] p. | R.C. Weightman, Washington, 1810 253, v, [1], xxix p. | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12th Cong. | 1st Sess. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1811, vol. 1 574; vol. 2, 575-877, 161, [69], 18 p. | Roger C. Weightman, Washington, 1811, 613, xv, [1], lv p. |
| | 2nd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1812, 411, [40] p. | Roger C. Weightman, Washington, 1812, 323, vi, [1], xxxii p. |
| 13th Cong. | 1st Sess. | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1813, 320, 16, [30] p. | Roger C. Weightman, Washington, 1813, 253, [1], xxiv p. |
| | 2nd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1813, 631, 31, [64] p. | Roger C. Weightman, Washington, 1813, 400, [1], viii, xxxviii p. |
| | 3rd | A. & G. Way, Washington, 1814, 788, 11, 3, 72 p. | Roger C. Weightman, Washington, 1814, 545, xliv p. |
| 14th Cong. | 1st Sess. | William A. Davis, Washington, 1815, 767, [1], [3]-119 p. | William A. Davis, Washington, 1815, 649, 17, [2], 68 p. |
| | 2nd | William A. Davis, Washington, 1816, 566, 92 p. | William A. Davis, Washington, 1816 438, 33, 68 p. |

| Congress | House of Representatives | Senate | Newspaper affiliation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15th Cong. | E. De Krafft | E. De Krafft | |
| 16th | Gales and Seaton | Gales and Seaton | National Intelligencer |
| 17th | Gales and Seaton | Gales and Seaton | National Intelligencer |
| 18th | Gales and Seaton | Gales and Seaton | National Intelligencer |
| 19th | Gales and Seaton | Gales and Seaton | National Intelligencer |
| 20th | Gales and Seaton | Duff Green | G&S=National Intelligencer;<br>DG=U.S. Telegraph |
| 21st | Duff Green | Duff Green | U.S. Telegraph |
| 22nd | Duff Green<br>Gales and Seaton | Duff Green<br>Intelligencer | DG=U.S. Telegraph; GS=National |
| 23rd | Gales and Seaton | Duff Green | GS=National Intelligencer |
| 24th | Blair and Rives | Gales and Seaton | GS=National Intelligencer |
| 25th | Thomas Allen | Blair and Rives | B&R=Washington Globe |
| 26th | Blair and Rives<br>Tomas Allen<br>Gales and Seaton | Blair and Rives<br>Thomas Allen | B&R=Washington Globe;<br>GS=National Intelligencer;<br>TA=Madisonian |
| | Langtree and O'Sullivan | Thomas Allen | B&R=Washington Globe; |
| 27th | Gales and Seaton<br>Blair and Rives | | GS=National Intelligencer;<br>TA=Madisonian |
| 28th | Thomas Allen<br>Blair and Rives | Gales and Seaton | B&R=Washington Globe;<br>GS=National Intelligencer; |
| 29th | Ritchie and Heiss<br>Gales and Seaton<br>Blair and Rives | Ritchie and Heiss<br>Gales and Seaton | B&R=Washington Globe;<br>GS=National Intelligencer<br>R&H=Union |
| 30th | Cornelius Wendell and Packard Van Benthuysen<br>Trippen and Streeper | William Belt<br>Cornelius Wendell and Packard Van Benthuysen<br>Trippen and Streeper | WB=Union |
| 31st | John Trenholm<br>William Belt<br>John Towers<br>Thomas Ritchie | John Trenholm<br>William Belt<br>John Towers | TR&WB=Union<br><br><br>Thomas Ritchie |
| 32nd | A.Boyd Hamilton<br>William Belt<br>Robert Armstrong | A. Boyd Hamilton<br>Robert Armstrong | RA=Union |
| 33rd | Robert Armstrong<br>A.B. Hamilton<br>A.O.P. Nicholson | Beverly Tucker<br>Robert Armstrong | BT=Washington Sentinel<br>AOPN=Union |
| 34th | Cornelius Wendell | A.O.P. Nicholson | CW= Union |
| 35th | James B. Steedman<br>William A. Harris | James B. Steedman | WA = Union |
| 36th | Thomas H. Ford<br>GPO | George W. Bowman<br>GPO | GB=Union |

Table 2

| Years | Senate Bills & Res. | Senate Reports | Senate Documents | Total Sets of Senate Reports & Documents Bound/ No. Sets Sent to Interior Dept. for Distribution | House Bills & Res. | House Reports | House Documents | Total Sets of House Reports & Documents Bound/No. Sets Sent to Interior Dept. for Distribution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1851-52 | | 1400 | 1400 | | | 1520 | 1520 | |
| 1852-53 | 1000 | 1400 | 1400 | | 580 | 1520 | 1520 | |
| 1853-54 | 1000 | 1400 | 1400 | 866 | 580 | 1520 | 1520 | 928 |
| 1854-55 | 1000 | 1400 | 1400 | | 580 | 1520 | 1520 | |
| 1855-56 | 1000 | 1400 | 1400 | | 570 | 1530 | 1530 | |
| 1856-57 | 1700 | 1400 | 1400 | | 1150 | 1530 | 1530 | |
| 1857-58 | 700 | 1420 | 1420 | | 580 | 1530 | 1530 | |
| 1858-59 | 700 | 1420 | 1420 | | 580 | 1530 | 1530 | |
| 1859-60 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | | 590 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1860-61 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | | 590 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1861-62 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | | 590 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1862-63 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | | 590 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1863-64 | 2100 | 1550 | 1550 | | 1300 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1864-65 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | |
| 1865-66 | 695 | 1550 | 1550 | 902/420 | 683 | 1550 | 1550 | 1031/470 |
| 1866-67 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | 902/420 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | 1031/470 |
| 1867-68 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | 902/420 | 700 | 1550 | 1550 | 1031/470 |
| 1868-69 | 745 | 1600 | 1600 | 950/420 | 733 | 1600 | 1600 | 1079/470 |
| 1869-70 | 750 | 1650 | 1625 | 950/420 | 825 | 1650 | 1650 | 1079/470 |
| 1870-71 | 825 | 1625 | 1625 | 958/420 | 825 | 1650 | 1650 | 1087/470 |
| 1871-72 | 750 | 1625 | 1625 | 958/420 | | 1650 | 1650 | 1087/470 |
| 1872-73 | 750 | 1625 | 1625 | 958/420 | | 1650 | 1650 | 1087/470 |
| 1873-74 | 925 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 925 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1874-75 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 925 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1875-76 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1876-77 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1877-78 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1878-79 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1879-80 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1880-81 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1881-82 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 988/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1117/470 |
| 1882-83 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 960/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1094/470 |
| 1883-84 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 960/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1094/470 |
| 1884-85 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 960/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1094/470 |
| 1885-86 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 993/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1127/470 |
| 1886-87 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 993/420 | 924 | 1900 | 1900 | 1127/470 |
| 1887-88 | | 749 | 749 | | 588 | 588 | | |
| 1888-89 | 924 | 1734 | 1734 | 993/420 | 924 | 1726 | 1726 | 1124/470 |
| 1889-90 | 924 | 1795 | 1795 | 995/420 | 924 | 1774 | 1774 | 1124/470 |
| 1890-91 | 800 | 1795 | 1795 | 995/420 | Public 660<br>Private 195 | 1774 | 1774 | 1128/470 |
| 1891-92 | 800 | 1795 | 1795 | 995/420 | Public 660<br>Private 195 | 1774 | 1774 | 1128/470 |
| 1892-93 | 800 | 1795 | 1795 | 995/420 | Public 660<br>Private 195 | 1774 | 1774 | 1128/470 |
| 1893-94 | 800 | 1795 | 1795 | 995/420 | Public 660<br>Private 195 | 1774 | 1774 | 1128/470 |
| 1894-95 | | 1734 | 1734 | NA | | 1726 | 1726 | NA |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1895-96 | 1722 | 1734 | 1722 | | 1726 |
| 1896-97 | 1722 | 1734 | 1722 | 1726 | |
| 1897-98 | 1722 | 1734 | | 1722 | 1726 |
| 1898-99 | 1722 | 1722 | | 1722 | 1722 |
| 1899-1900 | [1722] | [1722] | | [1722] | [1722] |

## References


1. Lawrence F. Schmeckebier, *The Government Printing Office: Its History, Activities and Organization*, Institute for Government Research Service Monographs of the U.S. Government, 36 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1925), 2.
2. Schmeckebier, 2.
3. Schmeckebier, 3.
4. “Errors in Printing Congressional Documents” *American State Papers*, Class 10, Miscellaneous 1, No. 35. 2nd Congress 2nd Session, Feb. 25, 1793, 68.
5. Sarah Jordan Miller, *The Depository Library System: A History of the Distribution of Federal Government Publications to Libraries of the United States from the Early Years of the Nation to 1895.* Ph.D. dissertation (New York: Columbia University, 1980), 194. Available UMI 8023529.
6. Adolphus W. Greely, *Public Papers of the First Fourteen Congresses, 1789-1817: Papers Relating to Early Congressional Documents*, 56th Cong., 1st Sess., S.doc. 428, Serial Set vol. 3879, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1900), 4-5, 11.
7. *House Journal*, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 166-67*; Annals*, 26, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 784.
8. *House Journal*, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 174*; Annals*, 26, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 790.
9. H. Hale Bellot “Parliamentary Printing, 1660-1837,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 11 (1932): 95.
10. Miller, 205.
11. *House Journal*, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 171.
12. *House Journal*, 13th Cong., 2nd Sess., 171.
13. “Distribution of the Journals and Other Printed Documents of Congress” *American State Papers*, Class 10, Miscellaneous 1, No. 465. 15th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 7, 1818, 456.
14. *Annals*, Feb. 22, 1809, 1503.
15. House Journal, 15th Cong., 2nd Sess., 383. Serial Set vol. 16.
16. *Account of Printing for the Senate, 1826-47,* ledger volume, Senate Records, Record Group 46, 8e/22/12/1, National Archives, Washington, DC
17. *Motion for a new rule respecting the printing of documents*, 15th Cong., 2nd Sess., S.doc. 30, Serial Set vol. 14.
18. “Printing for Congress,” *American State Papers*, Class 10, Miscellaneous 1, 460.
19. *Report on public printing*, 15th Cong., 2nd Sess., H.doc. 139, Serial Set vol. 24.
20. R.W. Kerr, *History of the Government Printing Office at Washington, D.C. with a Brief Record of the Public Printing for a Century, 1789-1881* (Lancaster: Inquirer Printing and Publishing, 1881), 22.
21. Miller, 48.
22. F.A. Crandall, “The Public and Public Documents” *Superintendent of Documents Bulletin No. 1* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1896), 11.
23. *On printing generally*, 27th Cong., 2nd Sess., S.doc. 332, Serial Set vol. 398.

# 19th and Early 20th Century Federal Documents

## Research Avenues and Access Tools

### Deconstructing Historical Census Publications: A Primer

By Cindi Wolff

### Introduction

In 2001, the Bureau of the Census collects and publishes basic statistical data concerning the population and the economy of the Nation for the use of the Congress, the Executive Branch and the general public in developing and evaluating social and economic programs. Its major programs include the decennial and economic censuses, current and continuing surveys and reimbursable work conducted for other agencies of the government. The primary focus of this paper is the census of population, with references to selected special censuses.

Historically, the functions of the Census Bureau were carried out by a number of different agencies. Until the Department of the Interior was established in 1849 the Census Office was connected with the Department of State. The decennial censuses were handled by temporary organizations established anew for each census until 1902. At that time, a permanent Bureau of the Census was created and charged with the responsibility of the decennial census and for compiling statistics on other subjects as needed. A year later, in 1903, it was moved to the then new Department of Commerce and Labor and remained in the Department of Commerce with the establishment of the latter as a discrete agency in 1913.

### Legal Authority for Census Functions

The U.S. Constitution provides for a Census of Population to be taken every 10 years to apportion seats in the House of Representatives. However, it is important to read the full text of the Constitution:

*Cindi Wolff*
*Federal Documents Librarian*
*Doe Library*
*University of California, Berkeley*

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within each subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct.[1]

### History and Politics of the Census

The first census asked a total of ten questions: the name of the head of family; and for each household a tally of free White males 16 years and older, free White males under 16 years, free White females, and all other free persons, and slaves. However, just like the 2000 Census of Population, there was pressure to extend the inquiry beyond the simple count of people. For example, James Madison urged collecting information about occupations as part of the first population census in 1790. His request was turned down.[2]

As explained by *The Federalist Paper No. 54,* the original intent of the census was to offset any temptation either to overcount or to undercount the population to determine both representation and taxation:

"Were their [the State's] share of representation alone to be governed by this rule, they would have an interest in exaggerating their inhabitants. Were the rule to decide their share of taxation alone, a contrary temptation would prevail. By extending the rule to both objects the States will have opposite interests, which will control and balance each other and produce the requisite impartiality."[3]

The initial reason that race even appeared in the census was not due to demographic concerns, but to politics. Delegates to the Constitutional Convention eventually agreed on the three-fifths compromise, meaning that for apportionment [and, interesting enough: not taxation] purposes, a slave would count as three fifths of a person.[4]

From 1790 to 1840, United States marshals conducted the census. The law required that every household be visited and that completed census schedules be posted for public view. The federal marshals who took the census in each state made up their own forms. As such, there is a variation in the amount of detail proved. The censuses of 1790 to 1840 were censuses of households; only the names of household heads appeared on the schedule. The schedules varied considerably by each geographic area because there was no uniform format by which data were to be collected. While instructions were provided on the kind of information that was needed, each marshal determined how these data would be formatted. Some used columns to record date while others used single sheets of paper until printed schedules were provided for the fifth census in 1830.[5]

The second census of 1800 included the name of the county, parish, township, town, or city where the family resided. This information was not included in 1790. In addition, age groups of white males and white females were broken down: under 10, 10-15, 16-25, 26-45, 45 and over. Again, there were attempts to expand the types of questions asked. Thomas Jefferson, then president of the American Philosophical Society, petitioned the Senate to consider the counts of "native citizens, citizens of foreign birth, and of aliens: along with the number of free male inhabitants, of all ages engaged in business" in eight categories ranging from "men of the learned to professions" to "persons of no particular calling, living on their income."[6] A similar petition from the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences also died in committee.[7]

The first economic census was part of the Third Decennial Census of the United States in 1810, when the census of population included questions on manufacturing. After President Jefferson's Embargo of 1807 threatened the nation of much-needed manufactures, the House passed a resolution requesting a report from the Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin on how best to foster manufactures. Gallatin protested that he did not have the resources to comply with this request, but noted that the third census would allow an opportunity to collect the desired information. Congress agreed and amended the act for the third census on May 1, 1810, requiring that the enumerators render an account of manufacturing establishments and manufactures in their districts, according to specific instruction from the Secretary of the Treasury. Unfortunately, the law was passed just three months before the census was to be conducted and Gallatin gave little direction, not even providing enumerators with a standard set of questions or printed forms on which to collect information. Obviously, there have been serious doubts to the completeness of coverage.[8]

In 1820, foreigners naturalized and not naturalized were distinguished. Age groups and sexes of free colored persons and slaves, by sex, were broken down according to the number under 14 years of age, of 14 and under 26, of 26 and under 45, and of 45 and upward. Age counts of white females and of white men remained the same: under 10, 10-15, 16-25, 26-45, 45 and over.[9] The fourth census also contained provisions for a census of manufactures of 14 questions on raw materials used, number of employees, machinery, expenditures, and production. Again, the federal marshals and their assistants collected the data, and, again, the data was admittedly incomplete. In addition, 1810 and 1820 data were not comparable because household manufactures (goods produced at home) were counted in 1810 but not in 1820. And, apparent dissatisfaction with both census resulted in no census of manufacturing for 1830.[10]

The fifth census of population in 1830 included additional age groups for white persons: each 5 years to age 10 and each 10 years to age 100. The age classification for slaves and free colored persons broke down the age by sex under 10 years, 10 to 24, 24 to 36, 36 to 55, 55 to 100 and 100 years and upwards. It also included by race those who were deaf, dumb, and blind without distinction as to sex or age.[11]

Of these early censuses, the 1840 census was the most widely criticized, primarily because many considered the questions too invasive. Inquires on the employment of the population were expanded to six categories: mining; agriculture; commerce; manufactures and trade; navigation of the ocean, canals, lakes, and rivers; and learned professions and engineers. For the first time, a question on pensioners for revolutionary and military service was included; pensioners listed by name and age and a separate volume was published. Unlike other printed volumes, actual names of pensioners were published. No question on veterans appeared again in census inquiries until 1890. Inquires on the disabled were extended to include "insane and idiotic persons" as a single category, and a question as to whether they were supported at private or public charge was added. Age categories were included, but only for the deaf and dumb. New questions were added on literacy, of whites only, and on education. Enumerators were to inquire how many of the family twenty years or older could not read and write, and how many were attending school, at what level, and whether at public expense.[12] Because of the types and number of questions asked, the respondents were highly critical. Journals of the day objected to the industry questions, suspicious that "this federal prying into the domestic economy of the people" might be "a precursor to direct taxes."[13] The American Statistical Association formally protested to Congress in 1843 the errors in the printed volumes of the sixth census. One example includes the tally error of Northern "insane and idiot coloreds" which fueled the slavery debate. The "insane and idiot" [which included the senile] elderly white, one column over from the "insane and idiot coloreds" were tallied in the wrong column. Because there were few "colored" in the North and more elderly in the East, it appeared that that more Northern "colored" were insane, no doubt due to their free status in the eyes of slaveholders.[14]

In 1850, due to the inaccuracies of the previous censuses, Congress passed an act on March 3, 1849 to establish a Census Board consisting of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Postmaster General as members, for the purpose of improving the 1850 census results. The act also provided for a full-time secretary; in effect, this official functioned as the director of the census. He had to design and print schedules for the 1850 census, and to collect and publish data on manufacturing, mining, fishing, and commerce that would reflect a full view of the industrial development of the United States. Another act on the same day transferred the responsibilities of the census from the Department of State to the Department of the Interior.[15] The Census Act of May 23, 1850, formalized the provision that made for a comprehensive enumeration of "all the products of industry (excepting agriculture….) of each producer or establishment." Thereafter, regular censuses of manufactures were taken as part of the decennial population census until 1900, when the census of manufactures was switched to a five-year schedule (beginning in 1904, with every other quinquennial census of manufactures considered part of the regular decennial census). This pattern survived through the 1919 census of manufactures (taken as part of the 1920 census). In 1921, the census of manufactures was switched to a biennial cycle that continued through 1939, when it was suspended in World War II. Censuses of manufacturing resumed in 1947, with other censuses being taken in 1954, 1958, and 1963. Since 1967, a regular sequence of quinquennial censuses of manufactures has been taken in years ending in “2” and “7”; since 1949, these censuses have been supplemented by an annual survey.[16]

The 1850 census of population was the first in which the name and other data about each individual were taken. In earlier censuses, only the name of the head of the family was recorded. For the first time, the 1850 schedule inquired as to “Color: white, black or mulatto.” This racial distinction was the result of lobbying efforts of race scientists. One such theorist, Josiah Nott, lobbied senators to include inquires designed to prove his theories of mulatto hybridity and separate origins. Instructions to enumerators for the slave population read, “under heading 5 entitled ‘Color,’ insert in all cases, when the slave is black, the letter B; when he or she is mulatto, insert M. The color of all slaves should be noted.” The same instructions applied to the free population with the note that “it is very desirable that these particulars be carefully regarded,” but no specific instructions were given to how one was differentiate black from mulatto.[17] It is important to realize that the census schedules (i.e., forms) were filled out and therefore “color” decided by the enumerator until 1960.

The population schedule in 1860 was the same as those in the 1850 census. There were a few extensions such as the requirement for free inhabitants to include the “profession, occupation or trade of each person, male and female, over 15 years of age” instead of just males over the age of 15, and that the value of real estate and of personal estate, instead of the value of real estate only. An inquiry was also added to the slave schedules for the number of slave homes.[18] The 1860 Census was also the first census in which Indians were a separately identified racial category. The term was “Civilized Indians” which meant those Indians living among the general population and subject to taxation.[19] Before this census, Indians were either classified as “white” or “black”, or possibly “mulatto.” The 1860 also for the first time included information for “Chinese” or “Mongolian” but only for the state of California. The recording of the Chinese was, again, a reflection of politics, due to the concerns resulting from increasing immigration as many came as contract laborers to work on the Central Pacific Railroad.[20]

The 1870 census “color” categories included finer details for recording Mulattos and Indians. Instructions to enumerators read:

> “It must be assumed where nothing is written in this column, ‘White’ is to be understood. The column is always to be filled. Be particularly careful in reporting the class *Mulatto*. The word here is generic and includes quadroons, octoroons, and all persons having any perceptible trace of African blood. Important scientific results depend upon the correct determination of this class in schedules 1 and 2.[21]
>
> Indians not taxed are not to be enumerated on schedule 1. Indians out of their tribal relations, and exercising the rights of citizens under State or Territorial laws, will be included. In all cases, write “Ind” in the column for ‘Color.’ Although no provision is made for the enumeration of “Indians not taxed,” it is highly desirable, for statistical purposes, that the number of such persons living on reservations should be known. Assistant marshals are therefore requested, where such person are found within their subdivisions, to make a separate memorandum of names, with sex and age, and embody the same in a special report to the census office.”[22]

Schedule 1 was for population and schedule 2 was for mortality. The 1880 instructions for “color” were nearly identical.

Maps and charts were used for the first time in the 1870 census. Included were maps of the density of population, the distribution of the foreign born, of literates, of wealth as well as age and sex distribution, birth and death rates, and those with disabilities.[23]

The Census Act of 1880 provided for the establishment of a census office in the Department of the Interior and the appointment, by the President, of a superintendent of the census for the duration of the census. An important change for the 1880 census was the use of specially appointed supervisors and enumerators in place of the federal marshals and their assistants. The 1880 census marked the beginning of the modern era of census taking. The new law allowed the appointment of one or more census supervisors to be appointed to each state and territory, of which they should be residents. The number allowed (150) was twice the number of judicial marshals and provided greater local community knowledge and more direct supervision of the actual work of enumeration. The enumeration districts were not to exceed 4,000 inhabitants, unlike the 1850 census that allowed the enumeration districts to be as high as 20,000.[24]

The new population questions in the 1880 census were the relationship of each person to the head of the family or household, one on marital status, two additional questions on health dealing with temporary disability on the day of the census and one on maimed, crippled, bedridden or otherwise disabled. There was a question for the first time on unemployment during the census year. The emphasis on interest in national background was exemplified by a question on place of birth of each person as opposed to the 1870’s question inquiring whether they were foreign born.[25] In manufacturing, new inquires included the greatest number of hands employed at any one time during the year, the number of hours in the ordinary day of labor from May to November and from November to May, and the average daily wages paid to skilled mechanics and ordinary laborers. There were also special schedules for separate industries. For example, a volume on newspapers and the periodical press lists the names of newspapers in each community and *the Report on the Manufactures of the United States at the Tenth Census, 1880* includes a history of the U.S. factory system and predictions about it’s future development as well as diagrams of workers’ homes in three New England communities.[26]

## Lobbying to Influence the Census

During the 1880's, there was a marked increase in the lobbying for specific questions to be added to, refined, or dropped from the decennial census by academics, congressmen, reformers, businesses, and interest groups. A question on veteran status, last seen in the 1840 census, was updated for the 1890 census. An 1888 petition urged this addition to serve veterans and "officials" concerned with veterans' affairs and to gather "material for computing the cost of a service pension."[27] Such statistics continued throughout the twentieth century. A special act passed by Congress in 1890 required the census superintendent to collect information on the status of the farm population. The terms of this act mandated adding six new questions to the population schedule. These questions were: the number of persons who live on and cultivate their own farms; the number who live in their own homes; the number who hire their farms and homes; the number of farms and homes which are under mortgage; the amount of mortgage debt; and the value of the property mortgaged.[28]

The census of 1890 provided a separate schedule for each family. A distinguishing feature of this census was the introduction of punch cards and electric tabulating machines to process the data. The further categorization of the Black population was also reflected in this census. Bureau officials and social scientists wanted to know "[w]hether the mulattos, quadroons, and octoroons were disappearing and the race becoming more purely negro."[29] As a result, "quadroon" and "octoroon" were added to the categories along with White, Black, Mulatto, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian. The instructions read:

Write white, black, mulatto, quadroon, octoroon, Chinese, Japanese or Indian according to the color or race of the person enumerated. Be particularly careful to distinguish between blacks, mulattos, quadroons, and octoroons. The word "black" should be used to describe those person who have three-fourths or more black blood; 'mulatto' those who have from three-eighths to five-eighths black blood; 'quadroon' those persons who have one-fourth black blood; and 'octoroons,' those person who have one-eighth or any trace of black blood."[30]

Melissa Nobles, political science professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, notes that from 1850 to 1900, the census contributed directly to the formation of scientific ideas of race. And these ideas were the backbone of racial discourse that justified and sustained slavery and then de jure and de facto racial segregation. She points out that no time before or after 1890 were mulattos considered "mixed Whites." Southern law had largely settled on the "one drop of non-White blood" rule of racial membership by 1930. The definitions of non-White categories as spelled out in census enumerator instructions were identical to those of Southern race laws.[31] The mulatto category remained in the 1910 and the 1920 censuses for the same reason that it had been introduced in 1850: to build racial theories. (Census officials removed the category from the 1900 census because they were dissatisfied with the quality of the 1890 mulatto, octoroon, and quadroon data). The advisory committee to the Census Bureau finally removed the mulatto category in 1928.[32]

The 1890 census was also the first to include a count of the total Indian population using both the general schedule and a supplemental schedule for Indians living within the jurisdiction of the United States. Individuals were considers Indians if they were full-blooded, if they were enrolled by a tribe or registered at an Indian agency, or if those who knew them considered them Indians. Results concerning the number of Indians were probably not accurate since in previous censuses some were counted as white, whereas the 1890 census included as Indians all individuals having any trace of Indian blood.[33]

Along with race, the census of 1890 included agriculture, general manufactures, and mortality, and supplemental schedules for persons mentally or physically disabled, those in benevolent institutions, prisoners, and paupers. A separate census contained the population and resources of Alaska, statistics concerning mines and mining, the fisheries, churches, education, insurance, transportation, and wealth, debt, and taxation.[34] The 1890 census was the last to be administered and published by the Interior Department. The 1890 population schedules were destroyed in by a fire in the basement in the Department of Commerce building in January of 1921 that resulted in the destruction of the only copy available for researchers.[35] These were not the first 1890 census records to be lost. All the original schedules relating to mortality, crime, pauperism, and benevolence, and the special classes (deaf, dumb, blind), and a portion of the transportation and insurance schedules were badly damaged in a fire in March of 1896, and, by order of the Department of Interior were destroyed.[36]

By 1900, a fairly standard set of inquiries to be made of persons being enumerated had been established. Almost identical to 1890, they included age, sex, race, marital status, and relationship to the head of household. Also included were the social and economic inquires to birthplace and birthplace of parents, year of immigration, citizenship status of foreign born, language, literacy, school attendance, occupation, months not employed, and home or farm residence and tenure.[37] The most striking change for the 1900 population schedule was the omission of questions relating to health and dependency. Questions on health status had been part of the decennial census of population since 1830. By 1900, there were no questions regarding acute or chronic disease; whether crippled, maimed, or deformed; as well queries on insanity and idiocy. Not even "deaf and dumb" were included. Also dropped was the question regarding "whether a prisoner, convict, homeless child, or pauper."[38]

The Thirteenth Census was the first to be administered by the Bureau of Census after its permanent establishment in 1902. For the first time, not only occupation, but also the industry were asked of each employed person. When the data were compiled, a major effort was made to relate occupation to industries, and a volume on occupations, which included data from 1880 through 1910, was published.[39] In questions of race, "Mulatto" reappeared to include "all persons having some proportion or perceptible trace of Negro blood."[40] The idea of the vanishing

Indian was so pervasive that the censuses of 1910 and 1930 applied a broad definition of "Indian" because officials believed that each of these censuses would be the last chance for an accurate count. A supplemental Indian schedule collected information such as the degree of blood and tribe: "F" was for full-blooded and "M" for mixed blood.[41]

Just before the 1920 census, the Joint Census Advisory Committee was created. It formalized the long-term cooperation between the Census Bureau and the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association. The Census Bureau at this time placed a high priority on reducing the number of questions. Eleven questions were eliminated: relationship to head of household; number of years of present marriage; mother of how many children, number born and number now living; if an employee, whether out of work on 15 April 1910 and number of weeks out of work during year 1909; farm or house; number of farm schedule; whether a survivor of the Union or Confederate Army or Navy; whether blind (in both eyes); and whether deaf and dumb.[42] The racial categories for the 1920 census was the same as the 1910 census but there was no separate schedule for Indians.

In 1930, the racial categories used in the census were expanded to 10. In addition to White, Negro, Chinese, Japanese, and Other, four new categories were introduced: Mexican, Filipino, Hindu, and Korean. The mulatto category was removed. The Census definitions mirrored the racial status quo in law, science, and society. Any person with any trace of "black blood" was legally Black and subject to all the disabilities that the designation conferred. The Census enumerator instructions read:

> A person of mixed white and Negro blood should be returned as a Negro, no matter how small the percentage of Negro blood; someone part Indian and part Negro also was to be listed as Negro unless the Indian blood predominated and the person was generally accepted as Indian in the community. A person of mixed White and Indian blood was to be returned as Indian, except where the percentage of Indian was very small or where he or she are regarded as white in the community. Both blacks and mulatto persons were to be returned as Negroes, without distinction.[43]

Someone of mixed blood was "classified according to the nonwhite racial strain, or, if the nonwhite blood itself is mixed, according to his racial status as adjudged by the community."[44] Therefore, any mixture of "White" and some "Other Race" was reported according to the race of the parent who was not white; mixtures of colored races other than Black were listed according to the father's race.

During the 1920s, Mexico was a major contributor to the immigrant population. To obtain separate figures for Mexicans, 1930 census interviewers were instructed that everyone born in Mexico, or having parents born in Mexico, who was not definitely White, Negro, Indian, Chinese, or Japanese, were recorded as Mexican. In the 1940, 1950, and 1960 censuses, Hispanics were simply classed as white, but in 1970 and 1980 they appear as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or Other Spanish.[45]

Since the question of unemployment had been dropped in 1920, Senator Robert Wagner of New York pushed for a special unemployment census that was conducted in January 1931. Data was provided on sex, race, nativity, age, marital conditions, and relationship to the head of the family as well as occupation.[46] Along with volumes on agriculture, manufactures and mines and quarries, the *Census of Distribution* with information on the retail and wholesale trades and on the construction industry was published as part of the 1930 decennial census.

The 1940 census introduced many innovations, including the use of advanced statistical sampling. The New Deal and other programs required the need for more socioeconomic questions for the allocation of federal funds. More questions tended to decrease respondents' cooperation and increase tabulation effort, so questions such as parents' birthplace and veterans' status were considered for deletion to make room for new questions on topics such as income and migration. To accommodate new questions without deleting historical inquiries, six questions were administered to a 5% sample of the population.[47] The sample questions were asked of ever 14th and 29th person on the enumerator's schedule. These included the parents' place of birth, mother tongue, and veteran status. Women were asked age at first marriage, number of marriages, and number of children ever born, and for the first time, whether registered for Social Security.[48] A number of subject reports on differential fertility, education, labor force, and nativity spun off the sampling. And, in June 1947, the Population Division of the Census Bureau began the publication of a subject sub-series known as the *Current Population Reports*.

The sixteenth census is also noted for the first Census of Housing that included not merely the number and value of dwelling places, but their age, physical condition and conveniences. For the very first time, statistics for census tracts were published for the 60 cities tracted to date. These pamphlets provided data on both demographic and socioeconomic data for the population tracts in major cities. The Sixteenth Census is notable for two major works on geography: *Areas of the United States* and *Measurement of Geographic Area*.[49]

## Mid-Twentieth Century Changes

From 1950 to 1980, great strides occurred in research, evaluation, and experimentation in the Census. The 1950 census introduced the UNIVAC computer. The 1960 census used the mail exclusively for the first time, changing the sampling unit from the individual to the household. An entire household rather than an individual would report long or short form information. The 1980 census introduced the Spanish-origin question on the short form set of questions asked of everybody. The 1980 census began the debate over where to adjust census numbers based on coverage survey results. Individuals and cities filed more than 50 lawsuits.[50]

New laws and programs requiring racial and ethnic data for monitoring legislative compliance and delivery of new social services required population tabulations at the level of city blocks for redistricting and the possible creation of minority and majority congressional electoral districts. The new positive benefits of racial categorization and racial data have stimulated and sustained organized attempts to have categories protected, changed, and added. The Hispanic-origins question, for example, was added in the 1980 census in response to lobbying by Mexican American organizations, and several Asian categories were added to the 1980 and 1990 censuses in response to lobbying by Asian American organizations. Civil rights advocates took legal and census racial categories and argued that such categories had been the basis of discrimination and should therefore serve to the basis of remedy.[51] And for Census 2000, the Office of Management and Budget announced, in October 1997, the decision that for the first time in the history of American census-taking respondents could choose more than one race on their census schedules.[52] The census may be faster in the electronic age, but the historic comparisons remain complicated unless you understand the terminology and the politics behind the questions. ☆

## References


1. Article 1, Section 2, Cl. 3 of the United States Constitution as it was in 1790, before Amendments 14 and 16.
2. Atack, Jeremy and Bateman, Fred, "Nineteenth-Century U.S. Industrial Development through the Eyes of the Census of Manufacturing: A New Resource for Historical Research," *Historical Methods* 32:4 (Fall 1999), p. 177.
3. Federalist Papers (no. LIV, p. 344) quoted in Wright, Carroll D. and Hunt, William C., *The History and Growth of the United States Census prepared for the Senate Committee on the Census*, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900, p. 13.
4. Nobles, Melissa, "History Counts: A comparative Analysis of Racial/Color Categorization in US and Brazilian Censuses," *American Journal of Public Health*, 90:11 (November 2000), p. 1739.
5. Bennett, Claudette, "Racial Categories Used in the Decennial Censuses, 1790 to the Present," Government Information Quarterly, 17:2 (2000), p. 162.
6. Wright, Carroll D. and Hunt, William C., *The History and Growth of the United States Census prepared for the Senate Committee on the Census*, Washington: GPO, 1900, p. 19.
7. Ibid., p. 20.
8. Atack, p. 178.
9. Wright and Hunt, p. 26.
10. Micarelli, William, "Evolution of the United States Economic Censuses: the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Government Information Quarterly*, 15:3 (1998), p. 336 and Atack, p. 178.
11. Wright and Hunt, p. 29.
12. Rosenthal, Miriam D., "Striving for Perfection: A Brief History of Advances and Undercounts in the U.S. Census, *Government Information Quarterly*, 17:2 (2000), p. 196.
13. Wright and Hunt, p. 38.
14. Rosenthal, p. 196.
15. Wright and Hunt, p. 40.
16. Atack, p. 178.
17. Nobles, p. 1740 and Bennett, p. 163.
18. Wright and Hunt, pp. 49-51.
19. Bennett, p. 164.
20. Ibid.
21. Nobles, p. 1740.
22. Bennett, p. 166.
23. Schulze, Suzanne, *Population Information in Nineteenth Century Census Volumes*, Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1983, p. 139 and Wright and Hunt, p. 57.
24. Wright and Hunt, pp. 58-60.
25. Magnuson, Diana L., "Who and What Determined the Content of the U.S. Population Schedule Over Time," *Historical Methods*, 28:1 (Winter 1995), p. 12 and Schultz, p. 167.
26. Fagan, Michele, "A Mystery Tour Through the Lumber Room: United States Census Publications, 1820–1930, a Descriptive Essay," *Government Publications Review*, 13 (1986), p. 214. See also her bibliography on pp. 223–225 for a listing of various reports on the workplace regarding manufacturing and labor.
27. Magnuson, p. 15.
28. Ibid., p. 19.
29. Nobles, p. 1740.
30. Ibid., p. 1740.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., p. 1741.
33. Bennett, p. 167.
34. Wright and Hunt, p. 71.
35. O'Mahoney, Daniel p. , "Lost But Not Forgotten: The U.S. Census of 1890," *Government Publications Review*, 18 (1991), pp. 331–37.
36. Wright and Hunt, p. 78.
37. Schulze, Suzanne, *Population Information in Twentieth Century Census Volumes, 1900–1940*, Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1985, p. 2.
38. Magnuson, p. 14.
39. Schulze, 1900–1940, p. 48.
40. Bennett, p. 169.
41. Nobles, p. 1741 and Bennett, p. 169.
42. Magnuson, p. 17.
43. Nobles, p. 1741 and Bennett, p. 170
44. Fagin, p. 211.
45. Ibid.
46. Rosenthal, p. 200.
47. Rosenthal, p. 200.
48. Schulze, 1900–1940, p. 200.
49. Schulze, 1900–1940, p. 201.
50. Rosenthal, pp. 201–204.
51. Nobles, p. 1742.
52. Ibid., p. 1743.

# Proposed Bylaw Changes

The following proposed Bylaws changes were presented to and approved by the GODORT steering committee.

Bylaws Proposal #1 – Article VIII , Executive Committee

**A) Proposed language** (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added):

Article VIII EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

This committee is composed of the Chair, the Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary, Treasurer, GODORT Councilor, Publications Committee Chair, and the Immediate Past Chair. This committee shall act for GODORT when time constraints prevent convening or canvassing the Steering Committee. *It shall also assist the Treasurer in the preparation of the budget, ensure that the budget is based on complete and accurate information provided by all GODORT units, and conduct budget reviews as requested by the GODORT chair.* No action taken by this committee shall conflict with action taken by the Steering Committee. All action taken will be reported to the Steering Committee.

B) Additional Sections Affected by the changes (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added)

Article X. section l. (all deleted)

[Budget Committee.-This committee is composed of three members consisting of the GODORT Treasurer, the GODORT Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect, and the GODORT Past Chair, with the Treasurer serving as Chair of the Committee. The Budget Committee shall assist the Treasurer in the preparation of the budget, ensure that the budget is based on information as complete and accurate as possible from all units of GODORT, and conduct budget reviews as requested by the GODORT Chair.]

Article V Section 5. Treasurer.

The Treasurer shall perform the customary duties of this office and serve on the Executive Committee, *and* the Steering Committee[, and as Chair of the Budget Committee].

C) Rationale for the changes

The Budget Committee has not met and produced minutes since prior to 1999. The Budget Committee members (the Treasurer, Past Chair and Chair-Elect) are also on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee may delegate a subset to work on specific issues, or may work as a whole.

Bylaws Proposal #2 – Article X, Development Committee

A) Proposed language (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added):

ARTICLE X, SECTION ______ *Development Committee:*

This Committee is composed of the GODORT Treasurer and four members appointed by the Chair of GODORT to staggered two year terms. The Chair is appointed by the GODORT Chair with the approval of the Steering Committee from among the appointed members. The Committee chair shall appoint ad hoc, non-voting members with the approval of the Steering Committee, as needed to complete the committee task.

The Development Committee, working with other entities within GODORT, oversees creation and implementation of the Development Plan, with functions to include:

(1) Identifying and soliciting funds from external sources of support;

(2) Developing a list of potential individual and corporate donors, and private foundations;

(3) Researching and developing various fundraising projects for the purpose of support to the scholarship endowment and subsidizing group events, speakers and programs;

(4) Planning and implementing fund raisers for GODORT activities;

(5) Aiding the Chair with solicitations and contacts as needed;

(6) Coordinating with the ALA Development Office, as necessary.

B) Additional Sections Affected by the changes (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics language is added):

Article V Section 5. Treasurer.

The Treasurer shall perform the customary duties of this office and serve on the *Development Committee*, Executive Committee, the Steering Committee, and as Chair of the Budget Committee.

C) Rationale for the changes

GODORT is at a point in its history where we need to create and implement a development plan to present a consistent face to vendors and members alike. We need to seriously view our responsibilities as a scholarship granter and work to fully fund the endowment. This committee will provide a focal point within GODORT for coordinating solicitations, fundraisers, and developing external sources of support and donors.

Bylaws Proposal #3 – Article X, Conference Committee

**A) Proposed language** (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added.):

ARTICLE X Section ____

*Conference Committee. This committee is composed of 5 members appointed to staggered two-year terms. Three members shall be appointed by the GODORT Chair in consultation with the GODORT Steering Committee during even years and two members during odd years. Chair of the committee shall be appointed from among the committee members by the GODORT Chair with the approval of the Steering Committee. The Committee chair may appoint ex-officio member(s), as needed, for local arrangements.*

The Conference Committee plans and coordinates local arrangements for GODORT including relations with ALA and host city information. The Committee coordinates with the GODORT Immediate Past-Chair to ensure equipment is delivered as requested for meetings and programs.

B) Additional Sections Affected by the changes (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added.):

Article X Section d. **Membership Committee**. This committee is composed of [nine] *four* members appointed by the GODORT Chair to staggered two-year terms, and the immediate Past GODORT Chair. [Four] *Two* members shall be appointed in even years and [five] *two* in odd years. The Chair of this committee shall be appointed from among the committee members by the GODORT Chair with the approval of the Steering Committee. The Membership Committee shall actively promote membership in ALA and the Round Table and shall promote participation of Round Table members in ALA and Round Table activities. The Committee shall also maintain communication with state and local affiliates, assisting and/or advising with projects, interests and activities groups. The Chair of the Committee shall designate one member of the committee as coordinator of these activities.

C) Rationale for the changes:

The creation of a Conference Committee with responsibility for local arrangements would allow the Membership Committee to focus on membership recruitment and retention.

Bylaws Proposal #4 – Article XIII, Finances, Section 2.

**A) Proposed language** (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added.):

Section 2.

Dues for personal members, [and] affiliate groups, *and others* shall be proposed by the Steering Committee and presented to the membership for approval or revision at its annual meeting.

B) Additional Sections Affected by the changes (Language in brackets is deleted. Language in italics is added.):

None.

C) Rationale for the changes

This allows GODORT to add additional classes of members and establish appropriate dues.

# Report of the GODORT Liaison to the ALCTS Committee on Cataloging

## Description and Access

### Reported by Rebecca Culbertson

The ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) met twice during the 2002 Annual Meeting. The first meeting was held at the Atlanta Marriott Marquis, Marquis Ballroom IV (June 15, 2002 from 2:00 to 5:30 p.m.) and the second at the Renaissance Hotel, Z Atlanta Ballroom (June 17, 2002 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.). The second meeting was directly followed by a joint meeting with MARBI on FRBR and MARC 21. This report highlights discussion and action taken cataloging interests related to government information. For complete details, please refer to the official committee minutes at: www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/206-agen.html

If you are interested in more information about the CC:DA in general, please refer to: www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/ccda.html

Overall, CC:DA heard and discussed a number of reports including:

- ☆ A presentation by Barbara Tillett on Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
- ☆ A report from Don Chatham of ALA Editions on information relating to the publication of the new AACR, due in mid-August. It is planned to be issued in a 3-ring binder. Amendments will be complete pages with the base volume text block being reissued every year
- ☆ A report from Matthew Beacom on the Joint Steering Committee actions (see highlights below)
- ☆ Rule change proposals on cartographic materials from MAGERT. “Earth” will be capitalized throughout AACR2 (approved) and punctuation will not include a repeated “on” when recording dimensions of cartographic materials (approved)
- ☆ Revisions to “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA (approved)
- ☆ A report from Mark Watson on MARBI actions. All that would be of interest to the document community would be the Discussion paper (DP 2002-DP08: dealing with FRBR Expressions in MARC 21. This paper described the work of the JSC’s Format Variation Working Group to facilitate expression-level collocation in online systems and discusses possible approaches to achieving this collocation using the MARC21 holdings, bibliographic and authority formats.

### Joint meeting with MARBI on FRBR and MARC21

Speakers were Sally McCallum, Glenn Patton, and Tom Delsey. McCallum spoke about the relationship of MARC to AACR—MARC is independent from AACR but it does strongly support. Patton spoke about how uniform titles show relationships (but revised editions do not); also assessed the roles and functions that corporate bodies play in relation to documents. Normally catalogers describe and then add access points, but people working in a shared database have to at least look at conceptualizing works and expressions first. Delsey spoke on how FRBR is an exercise in semantics—it will help us understand the data in the format in a logical way (not a formal way). There is a substantial degree of correspondence between the MARC format and FRBR—at least 1200 data elements map well, 200 data elements could, but the attributes didn’t accommodate, and 150 data elements were considered “wild cards”.

### Highlights from the Report from the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), as reported by Matthew Beacom

The May 2002 meeting was primarily an exercise in strategic planning as a tool for shaping and coordinating the rule revisions that have been under consideration since the 1997 Toronto conference. JSC is proposing work on a “new edition” of AACR which would include: a focus on rules for online catalogs; shift in terminology and concepts from various “entries’ to headings and records; use of the FRBR model, terminology, and concepts; addition of a new section on authority control; inclusion of an introduction to explain principles, objectives, and cataloging concepts; revision of Chapter 21; and revision of Chapter 25 to incorporate expression-level headings.

Of particular interest to documents catalogers was the addition to dates or names to heads of governments (AACR 24.20C1). This began as a proposal to JSC by the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to add names and dates for official headings for the office for Canadian prime ministers and Commonwealth officials. The Library of Congress wrote a response wishing to broaden this to all heads of government covered by rule 24.20C1 and headings for heads of international intergovernmental organizations (rule 24.20C2). CC:DA tentatively felt this should be optional and asked me to ascertain how the GODORT Cataloging Committee felt about this proposal extension. I discussed this with the Cataloging Committee on Sunday morning. The “optional” portion was accepted by the Committee and I conveyed their wishes to CC:DA on Monday morning. An example of this would be an optional change from Philadelphia (Pa.). Mayor to: Philadelphia (Pa.). Mayor (1972–1980 : Rizzo).

# GODORT Awards

## James Bennett Childs Award

The 2003 recipient of the James Bennett Childs Award is Carolyn Kohler, currently the Head of the Government Documents Department at the University of Iowa Libraries. The Childs award is a tribute to an individual who has made a lifetime and significant contribution to the field of government documents librarianship.

As stated in her nomination letter, “Kohler, Carolyn—Collected Good Works” would be the first subject heading assigned if librarians could catalog her distinguished career.” Carolyn’s contributions to government documents librarianship span over 30 years. She joined the University of Iowa staff in 1968 as state, foreign, and international documents librarian. In just three years she was promoted to department head and has served in that capacity and as regional depository librarian ever since.

On the statewide level, Carolyn was instrumental in establishing the Iowa Library Association’s Government Documents Roundtable (ILA/GODORT) section and served as its first Chair in 1973-74. She chaired the Committee to Draft an Iowa State Depository Law from 1973-78 and played a pivotal role in the final passage of that law in 1978. In addition, she was a member of the Iowa State Library Depository Documents Advisory Council from 1976-1986 and served on a State Library Task Force to Study the Future of the State Documents Depository Program in 1997-98. She chaired the committee on the Iowa State Plan (for the Federal Depository Library Program) in 1983-84, and is currently working with the committee charge with updating the plan.

Carolyn takes her regional librarian duties very seriously. She is a regular attendee at the Federal Depository Library Conferences and had made several presentations at these meetings. In her fall 2001 presentation, “Regional Superseded List Revision,” Carolyn highlighted her creation of databases which regional libraries can use to evaluate GPO superseded lists and regional retention policies. Carolyn communicates electronically with Iowa’s selective depositories via Govdoc-Iowa, a listserv set up several years ago at Carolyn’s behest and hosted by the University of Iowa. Information on the listserv and other “Resources of Use to Federal Depository Libraries in Iowa” are on the Government Publications Department (GPD) web page at www.lib.uiowa.edu/govpubs/docslib.html. Carolyn is also a frequent presenter at ILA/GODORT workshops and ILA fall conference sessions. Her strong stance on maintaining access for non-university patrons comes through loud and clear in all discussions concerning “non-primary clientele.”

Carolyn has made the Government Publications Department a strong center of service within the University of Iowa Libraries. This has most assuredly helped countless faculty, staff, students, but that high level of service is consciously extended to statewide constituents as well. Carolyn was instrumental in making sure the documents department was included as a participant in the UI’s “Virtual Reference” pilot, which will begin in January 2003. Carolyn helped team-teach the SLIS documents class in 1987, has given numerous presentations on documents librarianship to library classes, and she has always welcomed library practicum students into the documents department for 40- to 80-hour practicum experiences. These practicum students have been assigned meaningful projects that both help out the department and also enable the students to envision what documents librarianship could mean to them. It is felt that the positive experience in Carolyn’s department taught these students that documents work *could* be interesting, nay, even cool and thus Carolyn has brought new faces into the documents realm, another kind of "significant contribution to the field of documents librarianship."

Carolyn's national involvement also encompasses many fields of documents librarianship. Carolyn was one of 11 American librarians invited to attend a 3-day training workshop for European Union depository librarians, held in Brussels in June 1997. A charter member of ALA/GODORT, Carolyn was elected to positions of Secretary, International Documents Task Force Coordinator (twice), and Federal Documents Task Force Coordinator. She has served on numerous GODORT committees in the past, is currently serving on the Bylaws and Organization Committee, and is the National Action Alert Network contact for Iowa. Carolyn lobbied successfully to be the host of GODORT's Government Information Technology Committee (GITCO) CD-ROM Documentation Project. Her foresight in determining the usefulness of such specialized documents databases, including early work in creating departmental Notebook files (an ancient DOS-based program), provided the foundation for this project and numerous others.

Carolyn's work style is based on working away quietly; getting routine departmental duties done in an organized and accurate manner; plus putting in long hours on complex projects, many of which she seems to volunteer for. When the results are in, once again we'll all benefit greatly from the quiet, hard work of a supremely dedicated documents librarian, Carolyn Kohler. What a job she has done!

## LexisNexis/GODORT/ALA "Documents to the People" Award

The 2003 recipient of the LexisNexis/GODORT/ALA "Documents to the People" Award is Nan Myers, Associate Professor and Librarian, Government Documents, Patents and Trademarks in the Ablas Library at Wichita State University. This award is presented to the individual, library, institution, or other noncommercial group that has most effectively encouraged the use of government documents in support of library service. This award includes a cash stipend to be used to support a project of the recipient's choice. Congressional Information Service, Inc. founded this award in 1977 and LexisNexis is continuing to sponsor it.

This award is being given in recognition of Nan's leadership in cataloging, advocacy for state and local documents, and especially in the development of the Documents Data Miner© (DDM) tool.

Nan's tireless efforts to help depository librarians avoid performing duplicative, labor intensive or confusing work as they managed all aspects of their depository collections—Item Number checking, cataloging, collection management efforts in coordinated collection development—resulted in the creation of the interactive web tool, Documents Data Miner© (DDM) (http://govdoc.wichita.edu/ddm).

Thanks to her ability to work in concert with local experts at her institution, Nan worked from 1995-1997 with experts on her campus, including faculty and graduate students of the university's departments of Electrical Engineering, Decision Sciences and Computer Science. DDM is now a partnership of Wichita State University and the Federal Depository Library Program and is linked from the FDLP desktop at www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/index.html. Work is underway on Documents Data Miner 2.

Nan has also spoken at both federal and state conferences on the strengths and pitfalls of Persistent Uniform Resource Locators (PURLS); has contributed to a toolkit for processing and cataloging federal documents located at http://www2.lib.udel.edu/godort/cataloging/toolbox.htm; and has chaired GODORT's Cataloging Committee and State and Local Documents Task Force.

All these activities are indicative of a consummate documents librarian who has dedicated a great deal of her personal time toward making the "behind the scene" lives of her documents colleagues more manageable and efficient.

## Newsbank/Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Research Grant Award

The Newsbank/Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Award was established in 1987. It is named and given in honor of Catharine J. Reynolds, a documents librarian for 38 years. Ms. Reynolds was a Regional Depository Librarian for 22 years, first at the University of Iowa and then at the University of Colorado. She was one of the first members of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer and was a founding member of the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT).

This award provides funding in the amount of $2,000 for research in the field of documents librarianship, or in a related area that would benefit the individual's performance as a documents librarian or make a contribution to the field. The Reynolds award is supported entirely by contributions from the Readex Corporation.

This year's recipient of the Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds is Gregory W. Lawrence, the Government Information Librarian at Cornell University's Albert R. Mann Library. Greg's primary specialty is government information related to agriculture. He is the coordinator of the United States Economics and Statistics System (USDA-ESS) web site housed at Cornell. This database provides searching capabilities to 300 reports and datasets from the economics agencies of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Researchers, politicians and farmers throughout the U. S. and abroad heavily use this site. Greg is in the process of creating and conducting a customer satisfaction survey based on the SERVQUAL instrument for this web site. This survey was created as a part of Greg's graduate studies for the Doctoral degree in Information Science at the State University of New York at Albany (SUNY) and will be sent to 1500 date users associated with the USDA-ESS. Greg will use the Reynolds Award stipend for travel to two national USDA data users meetings where he will conduct customer satisfaction focus group sessions. The qualitative information gathered through the focus groups will guide his interpretation of the quantitative survey data. This is important research in our field where little is known about customer satisfaction and use of databases. It is our pleasure to provide Greg with the means to complete this project and we look forward to its final results. Greg is another example of a documents librarian with intellectual curiosity and the ability to study and improve his profession with solid research. This is the kind work that gives us hope for the future of government information access and the development of new talent to carry it out.

## Bernadine Abbott Hoduski Founders Award

There are two recipients of the 2003 Bernadine Abbott Hoduski Founders Award. They are Margaret Mooney, Head of the Government Documents Department at the University of California, Riverside and John Phillips, Documents Department head at Oklahoma State University. The Hoduski Award recognizes a documents librarian who may not be known at the national level but who have made significant contributions to the field of state, international, local, or federal documents. This award recognizes those whose contributions have benefited not only the individual’s institution but also the profession.

In presenting Margaret Mooney with this award, GODORT recognizes her pioneering work in automating the check-in process for U.S. Depository materials, and her major role in developing INFOMINE, one of the first library-originated Web-based information services.

Beginning in 1984, Margaret developed a dBASE program to convert the GPO’s depository item numbers (on 3x5 index cards) and her institution’s selections to a machine-readable file. She shared this information with the depository library community, offering to share the program. She next developed an in-house GPO tape extracting program that used the SuDoc number as the matching element to extract records from the GPO tapes. In 1992, she created a completely automated documents processing program called USDOCS, a dBASE program that fully automated the check-in of depository shipments. The USDOCS program enabled titles to be put on the shelf very quickly with a minimum of staff time. Again, Margaret generously made this program freely available to any and all requestors. The USDOCS program has been used by a number of libraries, beginning with the Oregon State Library. Some libraries combined the USDOCS program with other software programs to convert their shelflists to MARC records. Margaret assisted many of the libraries in adapting the program to meet their specific needs. In her own library, Margaret used the USDOCS program to create a public access catalog for government information titles, and to extract full records from GPO cataloging to provide bibliographic records for the local catalog and the UC Union Catalog, MELVYL.

Margaret’s research identifying the average time frame for the appearance of GPO cataloging records, and her study that concluded that a SuDocs number match was the most effective means of matching library holdings to cataloging tapes, were extremely helpful to libraries beginning conversion projects.

Finally, Margaret is the coordinator and managing editor of the award-winning INFOMINE. In 1994, to fill the need for a focused index to electronic government information, Margaret created a web-based virtual library of government information sources with annotations and indexing terminology. Margaret’s creative vision, as well as her beginning database, became the basis of INFOMINE, created as separate subject databases and then merged into one database. INFOMINE now includes more than a hundred thousand entries listing Internet resources in twelve different categories. Federal, foreign and international government information sites form the third-largest category. INFOMINE has grown beyond the UC Riverside library to include contributors from a number of academic institutions.

Margaret Mooney’s many contributions to government information processing and accessing have had an impact far beyond her local institution, providing many libraries with the tools needed to enhance access to their collections, and developing one of the largest library-developed information portals in the world.

John Phillips has been working with government documents in Oklahoma since the 1960s, when he began work as a student assistant in the very same department he now leads. He rose from a junior librarian to department head and regional librarian, administering the collection, working with a large documents staff, and being extensively involved both within the state of Oklahoma and nationally. Throughout his career he has worked tirelessly to promote documents in Oklahoma.

John’s knowledge of government documents is wide-ranging and deep. He is one of the few librarians left who are “walking encyclopedias” of documents material. He can usually tell you which agency died when and what agency replaced it, where to look for obscure early agency publications, and how to decode poorly written bibliographic entries to older Congressional documents.

Oklahoma did not become a state until 1907, and much of OSU’s nineteenth century collection exists thanks to aggressive collection development on the part of John. He has a well-deserved reputation as a scavenger who is willing to go anywhere to get historic materials to enhance the OSU collection. When he learns of other libraries offering materials that may fill the gaps in his collection, he will frequently drive hundreds of miles to pick up the materials himself and these trips have resulted in much greater depth to OSU’s collection. Indeed, John is on a *quest* to build a complete collection of historic U.S. documents. Did you know that there is a naval supplement to the *War of the Rebellion*? John did, and he also knew which volumes OSU lacked. During a recent trip he bought them and shipped them back to Oklahoma from a Virginia used bookstore.

John works tirelessly to make his collection available to the citizens of Oklahoma and provides strong leadership to selective depositories in his state. Some of the activities he has recently been involved in include developing a state plan for the dissemination of electronic government information, devising instructional programs for the annual meeting of the Oklahoma Library Association’s GODORT, and organizing workshops on the Library of Congress’ American Memory and the Census’ American FactFinder. To further educate documents librarians in his state, John typically brings back handouts from the Depository Library Conferences and ALA GODORT meetings he attends as regional librarian, and photocopies enough for all the selectives in Oklahoma. Travel money is scarce for many working in small libraries, and these handouts and workshops are often the only exposure to national information these librarians receive. John has also taught the Government Documents class at the University of Oklahoma Library School many times over the past 15 years. He does this to assure that graduates in Oklahoma are fluent in documents. Many current Oklahoma documents librarians took his class are were inspired to continue in the field.

John Phillips is a life-long champion of government documents. Indeed, his work at in the documents department at Oklahoma State University has, and continues to be, a passion for him, and the citizens of Oklahoma are richer for it. He is a most deserving recipient of the 2003 ALA GODORT Bernadine Abbott Hoduski Founders Award.

## W. David Rozkuszka Scholarship

The 2003 scholarship recipient of the W. David Rozkuszka scholarship is Naomi Frantes, who is currently enrolled in the online Master of Library Science program at Southern Connecticut State University from her home in Bismarck, North Dakota. She serves as manager of State Document Services at the North Dakota State Library. Among her wide and varied responsibilities, she supervises all aspects of the State Documents Service Department, coordinates the North Dakota State Document Depository Program that includes retrieving documents from state agencies and distributing them to the state depositories as well as the Library of Congress, contributes name authority records to NACO, and promotes state documents to the public and state agencies.

Naomi’s interest in pursuing an MLS degree began when she was an undergraduate work study student in a college library, increased with her work in a variety of positions at the North Dakota State Library and culminated in her choice of the area of government documents when she was offered a cataloging position. Naomi says, “At that moment, I realized I had already found my niche working with government documents and chose to remain in my current position.” “I am passionate about the world of knowledge and want to assist people in gaining access to information.”

Naomi is particularly concerned with the range of issues surrounding permanent public access to both paper and electronic government documents. To this end, at the State Library she is involved in an exciting project to browse state agency web pages for publications and secure them for her collection in either paper or electronic format. She will be responsible for the implementation of future phases of the project such as the use of a spider to gather the electronic documents.

Colleagues speak of her professionalism, intelligence, dedication, organizational abilities, and creativity. Of particular note, as part of her somewhat non-traditional library science education, she worked with another distance student to create a cataloging system and updated database for a music collection located in California. Her professor was so impressed with the success of their project that she uses it as an exemplary service project each term for other students.

Naomi expects to complete her degree in May 2004 and has as a long-term career goal of the management of both federal and state government information and involvement in public service.

# ALA Midwinter 2003

## GODORT Highlights, Philadelphia, PA

Cindi Wolff, Past Chair/GODORT

The American Library Association Mid-Winter Conference in Philadelphia did not have the snow that many may remember experiencing during past conferences. However, the wind chills brought back many memories and cold ears. Fortunately, most of the GODORT meetings were located in the Sheraton Society Hill Hotel. Unfortunately, the GODORT hotel, the Radisson Plaza-Warwick, was not within walking distance. But, the buses from the Philadelphia Convention Center did stop at the door of the Sheraton.

Midwinter began earlier this year with Steering I beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Friday, January 24th. The morning meeting provided sufficient time to thoroughly take care of business and plan for the last minute situations which arose prior to Conference. One such crisis was discussed at length: the GODORT Budget. Tim Byrne, GODORT Treasurer, provided an update to the state of the GODORT budget. Essentially, GODORT is in the red. Among the reasons is due to the fact that GODORT did not realize any of its revenue projections, dues decreased rather than increased. *DttP* still is providing gratis advertising, and significant expenditures were incurred from reception costs and conference equipment fees. There was discussion, and as Chair Bill Sudduth pointed out “there is no lack of creativity from GODORT members” and he hopes that the membership will help to investigate the suggestions made. Dan Barkley, Sandra Peterson, and Andrea Morrison volunteered to assist the Budget Committee in the issue.

The GODORT Update session on Saturday morning was once again well attended. The State and Local Documents Task Force’s speaker, Michael Esman of the National Agricultural Library spoke about the cooperative cataloging program NAL oversees to catalog state government documents. Despite this program there are gaps of state publications in AGRICOLA. NAL would like to expand cooperation particularly with land-grant libraries so that each institution would catalog agricultural documents issued in its state.

The International Documents Task Force speaker Valentina Kalk, Office of the Publisher of the World Bank, spoke on the upcoming launching of the World Bank’s databases and it’s forthcoming e-Library. The World Bank subscription products are *World Development Indicators (WDI) Online* [database on social, economic, financial, natural resources, and environmental indicators. Time series data from 1960. 550 indicators, 207 countries, and 18 regional and income groups] and *Global Development Finance (GDF) Online* [database on external debt and financial flow data for 138 countries. Time series for 219 indicators from 1970 to 2001, with contractual obligations through 2010. Indicators include external debt stocks and flows, major economic aggregates, key debt ratios, average terms of new commitments, currency composition of long-term debt, debt restructuring, scheduled debt service projections]. The World Bank is planning to launch its e-Library, an electronic portal for libraries and institutions to the Bank’s full-text collection of books, reports and other documents in April 2003. This commercial, subscription-based tool will bring together in a fully indexed and cross-searchable database, over 1,000 titles published by the World Bank and all future titles.

Patrice McDermott, ALA Washington Office, gave an update on federal documents issues, focusing mainly on legislation infringing on privacy - the USA PATRIOT Act and the Homeland Security Act. The Superintendent of Documents, Judy Russell, also spoke at the GODORT Update and noted “with librarians as partners and customers, the GPO will develop a vision of the Federal Depository Library Program for the future and develop plans to get there.”[1] Congratulations to the Federal Documents Task Force, and it’s Coordinator, Cass Hartnett, along with SLDTF and IDTF Coordinators, Linda Reynolds and Chuck Eckman, for planning another interesting and informative opening session.

Midwinter is in many ways, the “pre-conference” for Annual in Toronto. The Awards Committee made recommendations for winners for this year’s GODORT awards. Additionally, there are now name changes for two GODORT awards: CIS Award is now the LexisNexis/GODORT/ALA “Documents to the People” Award and Readex is now Newsbank/Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Research Grant Award. The Bylaws and Organization Committee reviewed the proposed text for four changes to the Bylaws - the Executive Committee, to create a Conference Committee, to create a Development Committee, and to create more categories for dues.[2] The Publications Committee had only one meeting at the 2003 Mid-Winter, the business meeting it proved to be a long one. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the status and financial situation of *DttP*. “Notable Documents,” the GODORT Occasional Papers project, and other publishing ventures were discussed as well. The Nominating Committee met for three hours to discuss the layout of the GODORT ballot and who to approach in order to fill in vacancies on the ballot. A discussion about the extremely early ALA ballot deadlines and late notification of appropriate GODORT people (less than on week before the materials were due) took place and the conclusions were presented to the GODORT Chair and Chair-elect to be forwarded to higher levels of ALA.

The New Members Lunch was held at the Wooden Nickel in the Sheridan. Approximately, 20 people attended with 10 being potential new members. The Membership Committee also met to discuss and plan for the ALA/CLA joint reception at Annual in Toronto. The hotel in Toronto will be the Hilton.[3] Members will find a restaurant for the New Members Lunch by the end of May. Fundraising for the GODORT/AGIIG and a donation letter was discussed. A straw vote about the creation of a Conference Committee was taken and the committee supports the proposed Bylaws change to transfer of conference duties to this committee.

The GODORT Program Committee planned GODORT programs and pre-conferences for annual conferences 2003 and 2004. The pre-conference for the ALA Annual Conference in Toronto, 2003 is entitled "Good Enough for Government Work: Digitization of Government Information." This day and a half pre-conference will be held at the University of Toronto Thursday-Friday, June 19-20, 2003. Sponsored by the Government Information Technology Committee (GITCO), it features speakers who will address issues related to the digitization of government information, including developing a project vision, project management, copyright issues, technical processes, preservation and metadata. The second day speakers will offer practical advice and lessons learned on such topics as project content, timelines, technology, funding, collaboration, training, and evaluation. The GODORT Program Committee also discussed the official GODORT program for the Annual Conference 2003, entitled The People's Treasure: Six National Libraries. Please note that this program is co-sponsored by the Federal Documents Task Force and the GITCO, and that it includes information on five U.S. national libraries, and the Canadian National Library.

Approved at the GODORT Steering meeting, the official GODORT program for Annual Conference 2004 in Orlando will be on local government information, with the tentative title of "Filling Pot Holes on the Information Highway: Access to Local Government Information," sponsored by the State and Local Documents Task Force. It will feature at least one speaker on the Center for Community Partnerships, a local clearing-house for grants and research. The Federal Documents Task Force and the GODORT Program Committee are also discussing a possible program for co-ordination with other ALA groups on access to government and e-government information in Prisons, and on library services for government information to prisoners.

The GODORT Legislation Committee met four times during Mid-Winter. Legislation consisted of team reports on

- ☆ E-government the team drafted a letter to OMB regarding Section 207 of PL 107-347
- ☆ Disappearance of Government Information from the Internet: the team focused their efforts on information as a result of policy changes or "out-dated" material. A resolution was suggested which would cover the team's concerns on a notification of the withdrawal of the information, a method to retain withdrawn documents for long-term access, an appeal process, and bibliographic control.
- ☆ Homeland Security: the team worked on a FOIA expansion of the bill. The team felt that the work of the Task Force on Restrictions on Access to Government Information (RAGI) would cover the legislative aspects with their own resolution.
- ☆ Total Information Awareness: the team reported that they had just began to investigate this issue and would work in tandem with the ALA Committee on Legislation on any forthcoming resolutions.
- ☆ Federal Acquisition Regulations: the team reported that OMB received over 1500 comments regarding the proposed changes. During discussion it was learned that the only publicly available method of reviewing these comments would be through the GSA Reading Room. A resolution was suggested as means to address this matter.

Another discussion centered on the NAAN (The National Action Alert Network). The decision reached was to review the GODORT Policies and Procedures Manual and bring the PPM in line to make NAAN activation easier. Chair Dan Barkley brought the resolutions and action items that were endorsed in principle to the GODORT Business Meeting on Monday, January 27th.

Prior to ALA, the Restrictions on Access to Government Information (RAGI) compiled a draft regarding restrictions on access, focusing on post September 11 information take downs and other access issues impacted by the recent sensitivity to national security concerns. The major focus of the two RAGI meetings at Midwinter was to draft recommendations for ALA activities and policy that ALA can use in efforts to address unreasonable limitations on public access to government information in light of heightened security. These recommendations were based on the draft report and deliberations in RAGI meetings. The working draft of the Task Force's report and recommendations is available on the RAGI Web site.[4] The next step is to finalize the working draft as a discussion draft for distribution to various ALA units and partner library associations (by late February). Comments will be incorporated into the report to produce a final draft to present to ALA at the annual conference in Toronto.

GODORT Task Forces also had a successful conference in Philadelphia. On Saturday, January 25, the Task Forces met following the GODORT Update. Prior to the FDTF Business meeting, a panel of GPO personnel answered questions or concerns. John Kavaliunas, Bureau of the Census, gave an update of Census releases and products. Aimee Quinn gave a report on the status of the activities of the Work Group on Permanent Public Access to Government Information.[5] After splitting up into small groups, attendees brainstormed the top five concerns GODORT librarians need to convey to the new Public Printer of the United States. Common threads were the need for instruction and training, toughening Title 44, and more agency compliance with Title 44. Anthony Anderson, the FDTF web master, is planning on resigning his post but will continue until the Toronto conference. Volunteers should contact the current FDTF Coordinator, Cass Hartnett or incoming Coordinator, Jill Vassilakos-Long.[6] The FDTF is also seeking volunteers to support GPO's Electronic Documents Working Group.[7]

The IDTF discussed a pre-print of Jim Church's article "Archiving International Government Information on the Internet: Report from a Survey by the GODORT International Documents Task Force." Notable findings of the survey include that over 40% of IGOs have not yet formulated plans to archive Internet documents, and that nearly 60% are open to the possibility of collaborating with libraries to accomplish this. Susan White and Barb Mann will work with Jim to review the individual survey responses and develop a set of recommendations for IDTF at its next meeting in Toronto. The group will consider whether the survey should be sent to IGO's on a regular basis in order to monitor developments in the archiving arena for task force purposes. A second highlight of the meeting involved planning for a panel discussion to be held within the context of the IDTF meeting in Toronto. The focus of the panel is strategies for incorporation of international documents into library instruction programs and continuing education for librarians. The panelists tentatively will include Mike McCaffrey-Noviss (University of Toronto library school, library school course on international documents), Helen Sheehy (Penn State University, course on international relations sources), and Susan White (Princeton University, international documents seminar).

At the SLDTF business meeting there was a discussion to help NAL catalog state agricultural documents. Three people were assigned to look into which states catalog the state agricultural documents. It was decided that the Assistant Coordinator of SLDTF be the Chair of the Committee of Eight. Discussion also centered on the creation of a new SLDTF toolbox.

GODORT Committees continued their excellent work as well. The Cataloging Committee a sponsored discussion on a proposal for a grant to catalog pre-1976 federal documents. Andrea Morrison will be the project leader and will coordinate the research for the proposal. The GPO Cataloging update included news of 24 catalogers on staff and three vendors responding to the RFI's (Request for Information) for the new ILS (Integrated Library System). GPO hopes to have the new ILS in place by the end of the 2003 calendar year.

Becky Culbertson the ALCTS CC: DA Liaison reported on the issue of Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) being incorporated into AACR2r in the move toward clustering records according to 'work' grouped first by '_expression' and then by 'manifestation' (the level for current cataloging practice). She also indicated that CC: DA continues to work on guidelines to clarify 'major [title] changes' that require a new record as opposed to 'minor changes' that do not require the creation of a new record. Old Business included discussion on the proposed Preconference for ALA 2004 in Orlando. Members of the Subcommittee include Barbie Selby and Elaine Winske, Co-chairs as well as John Stevenson; Julie Wallace; and Arlene Wieble. New Business included moving the IDTF Cataloging Toolkit up a level to the Cataloging home page, 'Statement of extent' for PDF documents with a letter to GPO, CONSER "Option B Plus" (1 record for electronic serials with URL's for each aggregator), and feedback on a proposal for analytic records for non-depository ASI microfiche and IIS microfiche.

The Education Committee discussed the need to ascertain the educational needs of documents librarians in the current environment of professional turnover and organizational change. Solutions ranged from a full-scale survey effort with support from other committees and/or ALA divisions to "quick and dirty" methods of garnering opinions and suggestions from new documents librarians. The Chair, Dena Hutto, will work with a small group to explore the possibility of holding an informal focus group of new librarians at the DLC spring meeting in Reno. If this can be done, the committee will discuss the results and the need for more information gathering at its next meeting.

Additional Education Committee activities include:

- ☆ Barb Mann, Lynne Stuart, and Joyce Lindstrom will join Steve Wood on a subcommittee to develop a recommendation for continuing the government information clearinghouse and documents exchange.
- ☆ Barbara Miller will solicit comments on the 9/11 web pages developed by the committee in 2002 and add links to related information at the FDTF and other web sites.
- ☆ Beth Clausen will serve as the committee's contact person with the @ Your Library Campaign. Representatives of the campaign will attend the Toronto committee meeting with proposed materials on government information.
- ☆ The committee discussed ways of bringing the issue of includping government information in library instruction based on information literacy standards. They will explore the possibility of a program cosponsored by GODORT and other interested ALA units, as well as a tool kit.

The Government Information Technology Committee, better known as GITCO, expanded its membership in Philadelphia with the appointment of James Jacobs, UCSD, who will be serving on the committee as an intern. Ongoing GITCO Projects include the planning for the creation of the Subcommittee on Digital Imaging (SDI) web pages and the updating of the Model Web Page from a web page template to a true Model web page taking into account changes in standards. GITCO will explore developing some way of putting together a data set similar to SSTF from 1990 from 2000 data. The Ad Hoc Committee on Digitization of Government Information Report will be maintained and updated as well.

Rare and Endangered Government Publications also had a very successful meeting on Sunday afternoon. August

Imholtz described in detail the project that NewsBank/ Readex is starting to digitize the U. S. Congressional Serial Set. They will have a demonstration model up by March 2003. The first stage of the project is to digitize the first 1021 volumes (914,000 pages). August will continue to report at future meetings on the status of this work. Donna Koepp has moved the site of the Serial Set Inventory to Harvard. The URL will be added to the REGP’s homepage. The idea for a future Serial Set pre-conference was discussed and this matter will be presented to the GODORT Program Committee at Toronto. The Committee has received a request from the library school at the University of North Texas to compile a list of 10 documents that could be used as one of their requirements in their capstone class as well as being used as a training tool for text encoding projects.

The usual GODORT wrap up meeting for ALA is GODORT Business. In Philadelphia, the new Public Printer of the United States, Bruce James, gave his first presentation to GODORT membership. Mr. James outlined a three phased approach to during his tenure at GPO: fact-finding, planning process and implementation plan. First, it must be determined what the proper mission of the Government Printing Office is. Mr. James pointed out that “I can make changes…but this can’t be ‘my’ plan.” Mr. James hopes that GPO can build a plan within the family and he includes librarians as “part of the family.” He noted that there is a need to build new partnerships, but will protect and preserve the partnership with the depository libraries. Mr. James also spoke some about the Sales program. He was astounded that GPO had projected in its budget to lose $18 million in the Sales program. He says that his goal is to have GPO “run a successful business.” He also expressed concerns that GPO had very little budgeted for staff training.

And so, another successful Midwinter Meeting goes into the GODORT history. Be sure and check the GODORT web page for full meeting minutes for this and other conferences. Hope to see you in Toronto!

## References


1. Contacts: Donna Collins, Cataloging Branch, National Agricultural Library, 10301 Baltimore Ave., Beltsville, MD 20815, 301-504-6730 or dcollins@nal.usda.gov; Valentina Kalk, Rights Manager, Office of the Publisher, The World Bank, 202-522-4065 or vkalk@worldbank.org; Patrice McDermott, ALA Washington Office, 202-628-8410 or pmcdermott@alawash.org and Judy Russell, Superintendent of Documents, jrussell@gpo.gov. Thanks are also extended to the Awards Chair, Susan Tulis, for her excellent summary [heavily borrowed] that she posted to GOVDOC-L dated 02/02/2003.
2. See Bylaws and Organization Committee web page for proposed Bylaw changes under consideration <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/GODORT/bylaws/>
3. See the Membership Committee’s “Conference Tips for Toronto” via their web page <www.lib.csusb.edu/GDTMEM/member1.html>
4. Restrictions on Access to Government Information (Ad Hoc) <http://www2.library.unr.edu/dept/bgic/Duncan/RAGI.html>
5. Federal Documents Task Force on Permanent Public Access to Government Information <http://tigger.uic.edu/~tfontno/publicaccessindex.html>.
6. See FDTF web page at <http://www-lib.usc.edu/~anthonya/fdtf/in.htm>.
7. Electronic Documents Working Group (A GPO – Depository Community Project) <www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/ewgroup/index.html>


# ALA GODORT Directory 2002–2003

## Steering Committee

***GODORT Chair***
William (Bill) Sudduth
Head, Documents & Microforms
University of South Carolina
Thomas Cooper Library
Columbia, SC 29208
phone: (803) 777-1775
fax: (803) 777-9503
e-mail: sudduthw@gwm.sc.edu

***GODORT Assistant Chair/Chair-Elect***
Andrea M. Morrison
Cataloger, Government Documents
Technical Services Department
Indiana University Libraries
Main Library, Room E350
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
phone: 812-855-3723
fax: 812-855-7933
amorriso@indiana.edu

***GODORT Secretary***
Angela Bonnell
Government Documents Librarian
Milner Library
Illinois State University
201 N. School Street
Normal, Illinois 61761
Phone 309 438-2354
Fax 309 438-3676
e-mail: abonne@ilstu.edu

***GODORT Treasurer (2003)***
Tim Byrne
Government Publications Library
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309-0184
phone: (303) 492-8834
fax: (303) 492-1881
e-mail: BYRNET@SPOT.COLORADO.EDU

***GODORT Immediate Past Chair***
Cindi Wolff
Federal Documents Librarian
212 Doe Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-6000
phone: 510-642-7270
fax: 510-642-6830
cwolff@library.berkeley.edu

***Publications Committee Chair***
Bill Sleeman, Chair
Bib. Control/Government Docs. Librarian

Thurgood Marshall Law Library
The University of Maryland School of Law
501 W. Fayette St.
Baltimore, MD. 21201
phone: 410-706-0783
e-mail: bsleeman@law.umaryland.edu

***GODORT Councilor***
Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, (2004)
100 N. Lamborn
Helena, MT 59601
phone: (406) 449-9974
fax: (telephone so she can turn on fax)
e-mail: ber@initco.net

## Task Force Coordinators

***Federal Documents Task Force Coordinator***
Cass Hartnett
Government Publications
Suzzallo Library, Box 352900
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-2900
phone: (206) 685-3130
fax: (206) 685-8049
e-mail: cass@u.washington.edu

## International Documents Task Force

***Coordinator***
Chuck Eckman
Principal Government Documents Librarian
& Head, Social Sciences Resource Group
Green Library, SSRC 123A
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6004
phone: 650-723-2982
fax: 650-725-9348
e-mail: ceckman@sulmail.stanford.edu

***State & Local Documents Task Force Coordinator***
Linda L. Reynolds
P.O. Box 13055, SFA Station
Nacogdoches, TX 75962
phone: 936-468-1562
fax: 936-468-4117
e-mail: lreynold@sfasu.edu

## Standing Committee Chairs

***Awards Committee Chair***
Susan Tulis (2004)
Government Information Librarian
Southern Illinois University
Library Affairs, Mailcode 6632
Carbondale, IL 62901-6632
phone: 618-453-7108
Fax: 618-453-8109
e-mail: stulis@lib.siu.edu

## Budget Committee Chair

***GODORT Treasurer (2003)***
Tim Byrne
Government Publications Library
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309-0184
phone: 303-492-8834
fax: 303-492-1881
e-mail: BYRNET@SPOT.COLORADO EDU

***Bylaws Committee Chair***
Andrea Sevetson
PO Box 11437
Takoma Park, MD 20913-1437
phone: 301-763-5207
e-mail: asevetson@hotmail.com

***Cataloging Committee Chair***
Elaine Winske
Florida International University
Biscayne Bay Campus Library
3000 N.E. 151 Street
North Miami, FL 33181-3000
phone: 305-919-5722
fax: 305-940-6865
e-mail: winskee@fiu.edu

***Education Committee Chair***
Dena Hutto
Government Information Technology Committee (GITCO) Chair
Amy West
Government Publications Library
10 Wilson Library
309 - 19th Avenue South
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0414
phone: (612) 625-6368
fax: (612) 624-4836
e-mail: westx045@tc.umn.edu

***Legislation Committee Chair***
Dan Barkley
Coordinator, Government Information
Zimmerman Library
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1466
phone: (505) 277-7180
fax: (505) 277-4097
e-mail: barkley@unm.edu

***Membership Committee Chair***
Jill Moriearty
General Reference
Marriott Library
University of Utah
295 South 1500 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0860
phone: 801-581-7703
fax: 801-585-3464
e-mail: jill.moriearty@library.utah.edu

***Nominating Committee Chair***
Karen Russ
Documents Librarian/Assistant Professor
Ottenheimer Library
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
2801 S. University Ave.
Little Rock, AR 72204
phone (501) 569-8444
fax: (501) 569-3017
e-mail: kmruss@ualr.edu

***Program Committee Chair***
Andrea Morrison
Documents Librarian
Government Publications Dept.
264 Main Library
1320 E. 10th St.
Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
phone: (812) 855-6924
fax: (812) 855-3460
e-mail: amorriso@indiana.edu

***Rare and Endangered Publications Committee Chair***
John B. Phillips
Head, Documents Dept.
Edmon Law Library
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-0375
phone: (405) 744-6546
fax: (405) 744-5183
e-mail: bart@okstate.edu

***Schedule Committee Chair***
Cindi Wolff
Federal Documents Librarian
212 Doe Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-6000
phone: 510-642-7270
fax: 510-642-6830
cwolff@library.berkeley.edu

DttP



Government Documents Round Table
American Library Association