

# SCLL NEWSLETTER

LAW LIBRARY

NOV 24 1975

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

STATE AND COURT LAW LIBRARIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Volume 3, Number 1 - Box 28006 RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27611 - Fall 1975

## BOORSTIN TO HEAD LC

Daniel J. Boorstin, Pulitzer Prize-winning American historian, was named Librarian of Congress to fill the post vacant since the retirement of L. Quincy Mumford. After extensive hearings, the Senate Rules Committee unanimously approved Boorstin's nomination and Senate confirmation came on September 26, 1975. ■




## SCLL MEMBER HONORED

Margaret Setliff, co-founder of SCLL and immediate past Chairperson, was honored by the Hawaii Bar Association in May, 1975.

The coveted "Liberty Bell" award, presented annually to the state resident who has best served to strengthen the effectiveness of the American system of freedom and government, was presented to Mrs. Setliff at the Association's annual Law Day luncheon.

Making the presentation was State Deputy Attorney General Michael Marsh who noted that Mrs. Setliff helped organize the State law library system and spearheaded a project to install a library within the Hawaii State prison. She has been with the Hawaii Supreme Court Law Library since 1962, and is a lecturer in the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies. ■



## FTC ISSUES GUIDES

On August 8, 1975, six years after an article in *American Bar Association Journal* (55 A.B.A.J. 553) stated that "combined effort of lawbook purchasers and appropriate government intervention seem to be the only answer" to the need for protection for lawbook consumers, the Federal Trade Commission promulgated its *Guides for the Law Book Industry* (40 Fed. Reg. 33436, as corrected, 40 Fed. Reg. 36116). The Guides are the lowest of three levels of possible Commission regulation: trade regulation rules, trade practice rules, and guides. Lawbook consumers should exercise care to ensure maximum protection by the Guides.

The Guides concern four main areas: 1) Deceptive advertising; 2) Failure to disclose actual cost, frequency, and content of supplementary services; 3) Unsolicited material; and 4) Questionable billing practices. The industry product to be regulated includes virtually all forms of material "designed primarily for use by members of the law profession and by law schools," except second-hand or used material.

The introduction to the Guides states that the Guides should help the lawbook purchaser by making "accurate and truthful information readily available so (cont. on page 2)

## STANDARDS DISCUSSED AT INSTITUTE

The 1975 AALL Institute on Law Library Administration included a session for the state and court librarians to develop a set of standards for law librarians and court administrators. ■

### INSIDE THIS ISSUE....

Business meeting .....	8
SCLL Annual Conference: <i>Law Libraries and the Administration of Justice</i> .....	3
Continuing Education Data Bank ..	7
Idaho Plans Court Plan .....	9
Orange County Jail Library .....	11



## From the editor:

The *SCLL Newsletter* was intended to provide information and news to members of State and Court Law Libraries of the United States and Canada. Dutifully we page through any publication that might contain news of interest to you. A far better way of collecting information would be for you to send clippings, letters, and whatever else you come across.

In this issue, Mrs. Bethany J. Ochal contributes a report on the jail division operations of her Orange County Law Library. We hope you will find it interesting and that her circulation statistics may help you plan similar operations. For the Spring issue, Paul S. Fu has offered to tell us something about his brand new Ohio Supreme Court Law Library facilities. If we should write to you requesting some sort of information, please respond!

If you have any news or personnel changes, membership publications, new projects contemplated or completed, opinions, suggestions or subject reports, please send them along. And while we all are interested in education and erudition, a light note will be accepted gratefully.

Please give me a hand! I agreed to edit the *Newsletter* but not to write it!

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

*Karen*

## CANADA STRIKES SCLL

The Canadian postal strike has not only deprived you of your Canadian law material, it also has deprived us of the text of Rosemary McCormick's discussion of "state" and court law libraries in Canada and Tom Heitz' discussion of the Law Society of British Columbia. We certainly hope the Canadian Post Office will resolve its difficulties soon. The spring issue of the *Newsletter* will include their fine presentations, which many of us had the privilege to hear at the 1975 meeting in Los Angeles. ■

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

## FTC GUIDES (cont.)

that he can make an informed and intelligent decision whether or not to make the purchase."

Further information is available in an article by Richard Sloane, "The New Guides for the Law Book Industry," *Practical Lawyer*, v.21, no.7, p.81 (October 15, 1975). Raymond M. Taylor has written an explanation of the Guides which is scheduled for publication in the November 1975 *American Bar Association Journal*. Taylor, who has been instrumental in the formulation of the Guides, received the Commission's draft of the Guides in July, 1975. At that time he indicated that he was quite pleased with the F.T.C.'s efforts. ■

## FEDERAL BENCH BIBLIOGRAPHY

Federal Judicial Center Director Walter E. Hoffman reports that the Center is collecting a list of books and manuals that federal judges use for quick reference on the bench. The Director has asked federal judges to send information on any material they recommend. ■

*SCLL Newsletter* is published two times a year and sent free to members of State and Court Libraries of the United States and Canada. Persons interested in membership should address inquiries to:

Mr. Paul S. Fu  
Ohio Supreme Court Law Library  
30 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Libraries may subscribe to the *Newsletter* by sending order and check for \$5.00, made payable to SCLL, to:

SCLL Newsletter  
P.O. Box 28006  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Persons submitting material for publication should address:

Karen C. Sorvari, Editor  
SCLL Newsletter  
P.O. Box 28006  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611



# SCLL ANNUAL CONFERENCE: LAW LIBRARIES AND THE IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The General Session of the Second Annual State and Court Law Libraries meeting convened at 1:30 p.m., Saturday, June 21, 1975, at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, with Margaret Setliff, Chairperson, presiding. In her opening remarks, the Chairperson welcomed members to the Second Annual meeting of the association and expressed thanks to Marion Boner, AALL President, for her help with regard to obtaining chapter status for SCLL, the committee chairpersons for their help during the year, to Treasurer Bethany J. Ochal, and to Bill Rohan and Lisa Fowler for handling arrangements for the 1975 meeting. Speakers were introduced for the first part of the program: *Court Administration and Law Librarians - A Study in Symbiosis*.

Richard Chernick, an attorney with Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, Beverly Hills, California, is a member of the A.B.A. Section of Judicial Administration; Division of Judicial Administration, and Consultant to its Committee on Education in Judicial Administration.

My topic is the relationship between judicial administration and law libraries or law libraries' contributions to judicial administration.

I should at the outset disclaim any expertise in library science. I have, of course, used libraries extensively through the years and greatly respect what they represent -- a repository of knowledge in an organized and usable medium. I also recognize their primary role as a tool to further knowledge rather than as a museum of knowledge. But I am not sufficiently conversant with goals and principles of library science to presume to tell you what a library ought to be or what it ought to do.

I do have some understanding of judicial administration. My familiarity with that subject began during my law school years at the University of Southern California where I had the great pleasure to study under Dorothy Nelson, the Dean of the Law School, and I have been privileged since then to work with her and her colleagues on various projects relating to judicial administration and the administration of justice.

I have also had the opportunity to observe first hand, through my profession, the administration of justice. My experience, of course, is limited as it must necessarily be for anyone working

in the justice system, because the system, in all of its broadest aspects, is simply too extensive for any one person to have in-depth knowledge about more than one or two limited areas.

While my activities hardly qualify me as an expert in judicial administration, I have had occasion to participate in both academic consideration and practical applications of the subject of judicial administration. The contrast between the two is striking. I recently thought through my own experiences, both academically and in practice, and I was somewhat surprised to learn that positions or theories which I had espoused or endorsed while occupying an academic role, I have regularly and routinely ignored or even violated in practice. It is no secret of course that lawyers are employed to use the system for their clients. Roscoe Pound made this observation about the judicial system in 1906, in his famous speech to the American Bar Association, when he described the "sporting theory of justice." -- the approach which reduces judges to the status of umpires and lawyers to the role of players who seek to "win" in whatever fashion they can.

What surprised me about my own conduct is that I have always believed that one can work for a client and in the interest of the system at the same time. In spite of this belief, I suppose I have found it easier to ignore the system in my efforts for my client. Perhaps the reason for the failure is that there are no institutional pressures on lawyers to perform their duties with the interests of the system in mind. Because most (or all) lawyers ignore systematic considerations in their day-to-day practice, those who

(cont.on page 4)

