

Mr. BROOKS. I just feel that it may well be that you could get the same type of service just as fast, just as secure, and at less money if you used the Government Printing Office, which I know many other Government agencies with highly classified materials do on occasion use.

Mr. TIERNEY. We will submit that information, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROOKS. I don't have the figures on that, but there ought to be a careful justification on that if there is one. If it is a matter of getting the Government Printing Office to be more secure or to give you a fixed time in which to get your decisions out, maybe that can be arranged without any real difficulty.

Mr. TIERNEY. We will supply that information, Mr. Chairman.

(The information to be supplied follows:)

During fiscal year 1967, this agency procured a total of \$138,202 of printing in Washington, D.C. Of this, 83 percent was procured from the Government Printing Office; and 17 percent from the Departmental Service Office. Of the total work procured from the Government Printing Office, 71 percent was procured by GPO from commercial sources. Ninety-eight percent of the work was for over 30-day delivery. Work sent to the Government Printing Office averaged \$9.31 per 1,000 units. (A unit means one sheet, size 8 x 10½ inches, one side only, one color.)

Additional printing services (70 percent of which was classified as administratively confidential) were provided at a cost of \$258,858 in the agency's own plant in Washington, D.C., employing 26 persons who worked 990 hours of overtime. Twenty percent of the production was required the same day, 65 percent in 4 to 10 days, and 15 percent in 11 to 30 days. Cost of producing work in-house was \$4.08 per 1,000 units. (Of the work produced in-house, only 20 percent could properly be classified as "printing." The balance falls under the JCP definition of "duplicating," having been produced from typewritten duplimats.)

Approximately 20 percent of the Commission's printing for fiscal year 1967 was done by the Government Printing Office. However, cost of GPO printing equaled 35 percent of the total printing costs. Only 2 percent of the work done at GPO involved a 25-percent surcharge as "urgent or priority" work; and none was confidential or secret which would have involved surcharges of 15 percent and 30 percent, respectively.

The total cost for printing for the Commission for fiscal year 1967 was \$397,060. This shows a reduction in printing costs of \$42,786 from fiscal year 1963 (despite increases in salaries and volume of work), when total printing costs amounted to \$439,846. The reduction in the Commission's printing costs was achieved through establishment of a cold-type composition operation in 1963 which eliminated a duplicate printing of Commission decisions. Prior to establishment of the cold-type operation, decisions were printed first at the Interstate Commerce Commission in legal size typed format; sent later to the Government Printing Office where they were set in hot type and printed as advance pamphlets to the bound volumes; page type stored, and printed as a bound volume still later. Now decisions are typed in-house on cold type composing machines during the decisional and review process and initially printed and served on the parties to the proceeding in the form of advance pamphlets to the bound volumes. Camera copy is accumulated and later sent to the Government Printing Office for printing the bound volume by the offset method rather than letterpress method thus resulting in an additional savings to the Interstate Commerce Commission over the system followed in fiscal year 1963 and prior years. All of the printing in connection with decisions is administratively confidential and of the first priority. To transfer this work to the Government Printing Office would add surcharges of from 40 to 60 percent to normal Government Printing Office cost. Any unwarranted delay in the timely release of the Commission's decisions works a hardship on the industry which it regulates and could result in the loss of many hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue.

We believe the economic justification for maintaining a separate printing establishment at the Interstate Commerce Commission is clear—it costs the Government less and gives the public better service.