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LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

To the membership:

The Government Documents SIS was an enthusiastic part of the 1986 Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. We can be proud of two well-attended programs, a day-long workshop at GPO, a productive business meeting, and our attractive new SIS brochure. A well-deserved thanks to all who planned and participated in these activities.

As we head into another year of job duties and professional activities, it may be helpful to remind ourselves of the four purposes of our group, as stated in the bylaws: 1) To disseminate information on government documents to the AALL membership, 2) To further the continuing education of law librarians in the area of government documents, 3) To coordinate the activities of law librarians representing their interests to public and private groups with regard to government documents, and 4) To work in cooperation with documents groups in other associations and organizations.

We work toward the first two goals by our column in the AALL Newsletter, three annual issues of JURISDOCS, the programs we sponsor at annual meetings, and our state documents bibliographies. As for goal #3, we have Susan Tulis as a member of the Depository Library Council to represent the views of law librarians, and our Documents Action Committee ready to respond to new events and situations affecting documents. The events of the past two months at GPO regarding microfiche and budgetary concerns have made it clear that we must continue to be informed and to speak out. (See Susan's DLC summary on p. 3 of this issue.)

We have also been checking into the Coalition on Government Information which ALA is helping to organize. Bill Varga represented us at an organizational meeting held in Washington on July 29. Regarding the fourth goal, we have in recent years had an unofficial liaison appointed each year by AALL to ALA/GODORT. Veronica Maclay did an excellent job in this position last year. In order to make this an official representative position of the Association, I have sent a proposal to the AALL Executive Board, to be considered at their meeting in January. Meanwhile, Veronica has been asked to continue as liaison for another year (unofficially at this point).

We want to continue to do a good job in all four areas, as well as to be open to appropriate new activities to pursue. To be a dynamic group, we must be vocal on documents issues among ourselves and with the AALL membership and beyond.

Looking ahead to 1987, Mary Anne Royle, Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, has been busy planning for the annual meeting in Chicago. Two program proposals which she submitted have been approved. One program will provide an overview of Latin American documents. The second will be a federal documents update panel, similar to those presented in the past. You will be hearing more on these programs throughout the year.

As you will read in the minutes on the 1986 business meeting, our members have approved the inclusion of our state documents bibliographies as part of the AALL Occasional Papers series. Planning for the transfer of publishing responsibility is underway, but details are not yet finalized. The GD/SIS will continue to select authors and check on their progress, to receive a share of the profits (to
subsidize JURISDOCS), and to provide 50 free copies of the new bibliographies for distribution at the business meeting each year.

Four new bibliographies have been written in 1986 and will be available for sale soon. Copies of bibliographies for Minnesota and District of Columbia (2nd ed.) were distributed at the business meeting in Washington. Those attending that meeting will also be receiving Illinois and Ohio bibliographies by mail. All four titles, as well as our 23 previously published titles, will be advertised in an upcoming issue of the AALL Newsletter. We believe the price will continue to be $5.00 each.

We now need volunteers to tackle states that have never been done: Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and West Virginia. If you are interested, please contact me soon at: Law Library, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, IN 46383.

I'd like to close with another thank-you to all who have contributed their time and talents to GD/SYS in the past year, particularly Lynn Foster, Cheryl Nyberg, Keith Buckley, Chris Corcos, Kevin Fredette, David Batista, Mary Ann Royle, Eme House, and Susan Tulis. The continued support of our members will give us another successful year!

Sally Holterhoff

Letter from the Editor

I would like to take this opportunity to explain why this year's first issue is somewhat tardy. I decided to hold the issue until after the fall Depository Library Council meeting so that the issue would contain a timely report by Susan Tulis of this important meeting. So, while the summer news may seem a little stale, the DLC report is hot off the press. However, I certainly urge you to read the entire issue: Cheryl Nyberg has presented very full minutes on our marathon business meeting and there are also a number of interesting tidbits in the article on the Depository Workshop. I have printed the results of Gayle Edelman-Webb's survey on the automation of government documents and Keith Buckley has provided a critique of the Meese Commission's report on pornography.

As always, I would like to urge any interested librarians to submit material for the next issue of JURISDOCS. I am looking for anything from one-paragraph news notes to full-fledged articles. I will be using a deadline of February 15 and a tentative publication date of March 1 for issue #2.

Kevin Fredette
An Insider's Report on Depository Library Council

As I have said before, another DLC meeting has come and gone. Upon my return, I was asked what happened during the Fall 1986 meeting; what was decided? In all honesty, I am not sure. As you can imagine, the major topic of discussion was GPO's proposal of ceasing hardcopy distribution of dual-format titles. For the time being, that proposal is on hold, due to an October 3, 1986 letter sent from Senator Mathias, Chair of the Joint Committee on Printing, to GPO. The letter said that it is against JCP policy to not allow libraries a choice of paper or microfiche. JCP is willing to work with GPO to determine what can be done to cut costs. The better part of one day was spent discussing the budget, cutbacks, and how GPO and DLC responded to them.

The Comptroller of GPO, Joe Cannon, gave an overview of the budgetary process at GPO. GPO's total annual budget is about $800 million, but very little is appropriated by Congress. The following table shows the 3 areas that receive appropriated funds and the figures GPO is presently working with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Dollars in Thousands)</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Printing and Binding</td>
<td>66,421</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Binding</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuDocs Salaries and Expenses</td>
<td>25,981*</td>
<td>27,835</td>
<td>23,634**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sequestration)</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total after sequestration)</td>
<td>24,993*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $3 million transferred from sales program.
**Includes $1.378 million transferred from sales program.

The sales program made $4.378 million in 1985. Rather than give this money to the Treasury, Congress added a line item to GPO's budget whereby SuDocs S & E appropriations was reduced $3 million in 1986 and $1.378 million in 1987. Whatever profit sales makes in 1986 will offset the 1988 appropriations. SuDocs S & E is of most concern to us, since that is where the Depository Library program falls. In fact, within S & E, the program getting the largest sum of money is the Depository Library program ($21.967 million). Or if you break down S & E by object class, printing and reproduction gets the largest sum ($13.992 million).

Mitch Phalen, from the Documents Technical Support Group of the Superintendent of Documents, outlined why GPO responded with increased conversion to microfiche as a way of dealing with the budget cutbacks. With previous cutbacks, GPO was able to defer or eliminate discretionary activities--those services that were nice to have but not necessary and usually costly. As more cuts came, GPO had to look elsewhere. Since printing and reproduction gets the largest percentage of funds, it only follows that they would get the largest percentage of cuts.
Mark Scully, LPS, reacted by looking at the 3 areas within printing and reproduction to see what was the most obvious candidate for handling cuts. Of the three - publications distributed on microfiche, publications distributed in hardcopy and dual-format - the last area seemed most promising. It was fast, certain (publications already lend themselves to microfiche), microfiche masters already made, elimination of hardcopy does not require additional staff, storage or money. That is why GPO came up with the proposed elimination of hardcopy distribution for dual format titles.

If I was faced with a similar situation I might have proposed the same thing. It's the easiest way out for GPO. Unfortunately, it causes the most damage to the Depository Library program. Other methods of dealing with budget cuts do not have as visible results, are sometimes more labor-intensive and are usually time consuming. I do worry about GPO converting more titles to microfiche that presently exist only in hardcopy. GPO is already short-staffed in micrographics and dumping more work on them will cause the turnaround time to be even longer.

In March 1986, DLC came up with Recommendation 11 - a list of 15 categories/titles that could be converted to microfiche to save money. We were told this wasn't sufficient, so we went through the "List of Classes" and came up with additional class numbers that could be converted. (This is now known as the infamous "List of 966"). GPO has been working with this List of 966 and converting as publications come through the system. Unfortunately, this falls into the category of being labor-intensive and time consuming. So, although GPO has seen some cost savings as a result of this list, it won't produce the amount of savings needed and there is no certainty when or if the remaining publications on the List of 966 will be issued.

There is also the problem of the cost of the microfiche masters. If the agency orders microfiche copies, then the agency pays for the master and GPO pays the "rider" rate. The agency pays the bulk of the cost, while GPO "rides" along on the order for the additional copies needed for depository libraries. If the agency orders hardcopy and GPO wants to initiate microfiche, then GPO pays for the master and copies.

Prior to this meeting, DLC was asked for a list of 500 item numbers that should never be converted to microfiche. We chose to refrain from replying "until a full financial report on savings from current and previous Council recommendations is made". As an aside, we may have to do this, so I would be interested in any suggestions you might have. It was suggested that we might not want to give them specific titles, but rather guidelines as to what should always be in paper. What do you think?

If you were one of the many who wrote to your Congressmen or JCP, thanks. Although the decision has been put on hold, it doesn't mean it can't rear its ugly head again. There was an added benefit from all those letters - Congress is now aware of the depository library program and how valuable it is.

(continued on next page)
So what happens now? I wish I had an answer. I feel like we all have to wait and see. There is no doubt that something has to go. GPO has about $2 million less this year to do what they did last year. It needs to be decided what is best for the public and the program. Maybe GPO should be asking for a supplemental appropriation. I don't know if that is realistic during a time of fiscal retrenchment.

As I get more information, I will pass it on to you. I know that all of you probably wish, just as I do, that a decision would be made soon. That way we all know how to proceed. If you have comments, suggestions, whatever, I would be very interested in them. Two frustrating things did happen at this council meeting that I should mention. One, GPO did not have figures to back up their claims — it is very hard to say yes, convert this title when no one seemed to know exactly how much money would be saving in doing it. Second, there were not copies of the Fall 86 recommendations for the audience. Therefore, we spent time going over them for the audience's benefit and ran out of time. So we have not voted on all of our recommendations. Our proposed recommendations and the summary of the entire meeting will be out very soon in (Administrative Notes; v. 7, no. 19; November 1986). Please take the time to read both and submit your comments. If you did not go to the council meeting, this will provide you the opportunity to comment before we vote in December. I have not included in this report all the nitty-gritty things that were discussed during the meeting, since the summary is already in the mail. But if you have questions after reading the summary, please contact me and I will expand on the issue and try to answer your questions.

I hope the next report I give you is a more cheerful one.

Susan Tulis
Depository Library Council

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS SPECIAL INTEREST SECTION
ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JULY 8, 1986

Chairperson Lynn Foster called the meeting to order at 7:15 a.m. She reported two items of interest: the winner of the 1986 Joseph L. Andrews Bibliographical Award is a government document (Slavery in the Courtroom by Paul Finkelman, published by the Library of Congress and reviewed in 8 Jurisdocs 29 (1986)) and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings has been declared unconstitutional.

Cheryl Nyberg, SIS Treasurer, reported that the SIS has a current balance of $5,829.47. The balance last year at convention was $5,169.32, so the SIS continues to take in more than it expends.

The report of the Nominations Committee (Eme House, Susan Tulis, and Kevin Fredette) was given by Kevin Fredette: 152 ballots were returned for a 42% response rate. New officers for the 1986-87 term were announced: Mary Ann Royle from Northern Illinois is the new Vice Chair and Susan Dow from SUNY Buffalo is the new Secretary/Treasurer. The Vice Chairperson traditionally organizes the SIS convention programs for the next year so members were invited to give their ideas to Mary Ann for the 1987 Chicago convention.

Chris Corcos, Business Manager of the State Bibliographies Series, reported that 599 individual bibliographies had been sold this year, amounting to $2,995 when all
payments are received. Authors of bibs can contact Chris to find out how many copies of their title have been sold. Copies of two bibs were distributed to members attending the meeting: Minnesota and the 2d ed. of the District of Columbia. Chris added that she has received many favorable remarks from other associations and commercial publishers on the quality of the bibliographies.

Kevin Fredette, Editor of Jurisdocs, thanked members who contributed material to the newsletter, especially those people who offered unsolicited items. The three issues of volume 8 of Jurisdocs cost over $1,000, the cost fairly evenly split between postage and reproduction expenses. Costs should be about the same for volume 9, about $350 per issue. He was generally satisfied with the content of the newsletter but hoped to improve the appearance. Prospective authors were encouraged to contribute material, for some academics facing promotion and tenure, writing for Jurisdocs might be considered a rehearsal for writing for other publications, such as the Law Library Journal.

In answer to a question, Kevin reminded members that non-GDSIS individuals or institutions may subscribe to Jurisdocs for $5 per volume. He also noted that the directory of SIS members, published in vol. 8, # 2, was compiled by survey; only half of the members responded. The next survey will include all members of the SIS.

Lynn reported that the Citation Reform Committee has moved to the Reader Services SIS. David Batista invited members to participate in the Documents Action Committee. The Committee's purpose is to rapidly disseminate information and encourage action by depository librarians on current and important issues involving GPO and the depository library system. This year, Susan Tulis, a member of GDSIS and the Depository Library Council, used the Documents Action Committee to solicit responses and suggestions for titles to be converted to microfiche.

Sally Holterhoff, Vice Chair, began the discussion of new business by announcing the programs sponsored by the SIS: Making Automation Work for Government Documents, Mary Ann Royle—coordinator; Automated Legislative Information Systems, S. Blair Kauffman—coordinator; and the all-day GPO workshop. Also noted was the Dialogue with Experts, at which Susan Tulis and Sally were available to answer questions about government documents.

Lynn Foster introduced the next item of new business: a proposal by Martin Wisneski from the University of Kansas Law Library for AALL funding for a "Project to Develop a Microcomputer-Based Government Publications Record Management System for Selective Depository Libraries." Since such proposals are typically brought to the Executive Board from an SIS, the matter was referred to GDSIS for discussion.

After allowing time for the members in attendance to read the discussion document, Mr. Wisneski presented some background. The University of Kansas acquired a microcomputer and DBase II and he developed a prototype to facilitate several aspects of documents records management, including item number control, titles for weeding, and shelf list cards. With the equipment and staff available to him, Mr. Wisneski cannot proceed to a full-scale program and so is seeking financial assistance from the AALL.
A spirited discussion followed, covering (among other topics) the present availability of similar programs, the size of the grant sought (over $37,000 for 2 years), downloading of OCLC records, access to and cost of software once the program developed, the possibility of putting pressure on commercial vendors to meet the needs of documents librarians, the incompatibility of the proposed system with other circulation and cataloging systems already in place in many libraries, and the limited use of the program for libraries that catalog all of their documents.

The sense of the members in attendance was that the issue needed further study and that a survey of federal depository libraries might be most useful in identifying which aspects of a documents records management program would be of most interest to documents librarians. Administrative Notes has in the past included a survey prepared by an individual; Admin Notes is sent to all depository librarians but respondents send the survey to the individual for analysis. A motion, THAT a marketing or needs survey of depository librarians be made before the SIS takes further action on the proposal, was made, seconded, and carried.

The next major item of new business concerned the subject of finding a different publisher for the state bibliographies series, a topic that was introduced last year. This change had been suggested for two reasons: first, "Managing the sales of the bibliographies is a time-consuming and thus expensive task for the business manager and her institution," and second, the SIS is not supposed to make a profit on its publications. Lynn Foster had investigated the SIS's options during the past year and made a proposal that the SIS turn over the printing and sales of the bibliographies (both existing titles and future titles) to AALL Headquarters as part of the new Occasional Papers Series. The important features of this proposal include:

1. GDSIS would continue to solicit authors for the bibs,
2. authors would continue to prepare bibs in camera-ready form,
3. AALL would hold copyright,
4. AALL Headquarters would handle printing, sales, make standing orders available (they are not now), and make available for sale a binder in which to file the bibs,
5. AALL would provide 50 free copies for distribution at annual conventions, and
6. AALL would reimburse the SIS "an amount sufficient to support Jurisdocs."

Such conditions were agreed to orally by Frank Houdek, the Chairperson of the AALL Publications Committee. The proposal was carried as amended, with the amendment concerning the reimbursement figure, from "approximately $1,000 ... to support Jurisdocs" to "a percentage of sales sufficient to support Jurisdocs."

Before turning over the gavel to new Chairperson Sally Holterhoff, Lynn invited members to volunteer ideas and assistance for next year's convention programming, to contribute to Jurisdocs, and to sign up to sit in the GDSIS booth where the new GDSIS brochure, written and designed by David Batista, is available.
New Chairperson, Sally Holterhoff, presided over the rest of the meeting. Her first item of business was to notify the membership of her new phone number: 219-465-7838. She expressed the belief that a more dynamic SIS has raised and will continue to raise the consciousness of non-documents librarians. She then asked several members and guests to make their presentations: Steve Margeton, AALL representative to the Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Libraries Access to Automated Data Bases; Mark Scully, head of Library Programs Service of GPO; and Susan Tulis, member of the Depository Library Council.

Mr. Margeton reported that during the first three years of the Ad Hoc Committee's existence they were primarily concerned with stirring up interest and discovering what federal agencies were doing in the area of automated data bases. Presently, the Ad Hoc Committee has asked agencies to consider pilot projects for dissemination of selected information maintained on computers. The Committee will be looking for test sites once it has a list of pilot projects; several law libraries have already expressed their interest in being considered as test sites. Other interested librarians should contact Mr. Margeton.

Mr. Scully discussed the OMB circular and likely effects of Gramm-Rudman. First, Circular A-130, the OMB policy on the management of federal information resources, is concerned in part with public access (the "information safety net."). The Circular includes procedures for complying with Title 44 and, with the OMB acting as enforcer, SuDocs hopes to see a reduction in the fugitive documents problem. A-130 also now recognizes the role of depository libraries in providing government information and being a part of that safety net. Fiscal retrenchment, as imposed by Gramm-Rudman (and whatever spirit of G-R that survives the constitutional challenge) has forced agencies to distinguish between mandated functions and voluntary ones.

GPC has focused its budget reduction efforts on the largest component of its appropriations: printing and binding. To save money, GPO will increase the percentage of materials distributed to depository libraries in microfiche. Currently, 55% of the items are microfiche; that number will increase in the near future. GPO has sought guidance from the Depository Library Council on what titles would cause the least difficulty for depository libraries if they were converted to microfiche.

Mr. Scully continued with information on upcoming meetings and outreach involvement with the depository library community: in September, GPO will hold a workshop for federal librarians and in October, they will sponsor a meeting for regional depository librarians the day before the Depository Library Council meeting. SuDocs is also investigating training workshops for depository librarians by modifying off-the-shelf training kits from the ARL Office of Management Systems.

Other information: SuDocs is evaluating the cost of distributing time-sensitive material, such as the Official Gazette and the General Wage Determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act, by first class mail. All of the complaints heard by depository library inspectors concerning the denial of access to depository collections have been made against law libraries. To date, none of the complaints have
been substantiated--access has actually not been denied. An upcoming Admin Notes will include a 20+ page list of Rain Checks, both filled and outstanding. SuDocs has hopes that developments in automation, specifically ACISS (Acquisitions, Classification, Information, Shipping List System) will reduce errors by half.

Ms. Susan Tulis reported some of the highlights of recent Depository Library Council meetings: the serials-within-series survey showed a 50-50 split between librarians who liked the new procedure and those who wanted a return to the old way. GPO will continue to pull-out serials within series. Despite the massive microfiche conversion on the horizon, SOD 13 will not be revised. Depository librarians should watch out for the inappropriate conversion of materials. The cycle for selection additions has been reduced to once a year; deletions can be made throughout the year. The much-publicized closing of the House documents room has restricted the free availability of congressional documents. However, one copy of 6 separate items may still be obtained without charge. Congressional committees are also receiving fewer copies for general distribution; they are directing citizens to the sales program when their supplies are exhausted. The Depository Library Council has asked GPO to reconsider the annual selection cycle and to investigate the microfiche backlog problem (large batches of material, (hearings, for example) have not been fiched or distributed).

Having completed the very full and stimulating agenda, Chairperson Sally Holterhoff adjourned the meeting at 9:20a.m.

CHERYL RAE NYBERG
selection update will now only be sent out once a year, depositories can make deletions of item numbers at any time (on a one-year trial basis). Yvonne Loudon of Micrographics explained that it has been G.P.O.'s policy that converting new titles to microfiche takes priority over the "refiching" that is done for claims. While this may have resulted in slower turnaround time for fiche claims, Louden expressed hope that the recent addition of a fiche-to-fiche duplicator within Micrographics would speed up the process.

Joe McClane from the Inspection Team gave a lively and informative talk on the role of the depository library inspectors. He asked the librarians to think of the inspectors as "resource people" within G.P.O. McClane explained, for example, that it is the inspectors who read and try to come up with responses to much of the mail that is sent to the Superintendent of Documents. The inspectors have also developed two new transmittals. [A new List of Superseded Documents, Appendix C of the Instructions to Depository Libraries and a list of How and When to Contact the Library Programs Service, Sec. 1 of the Federal Library Manual were sent out to depository libraries this fall.] McClane reminded the librarians that the Instructions are rules and regulations which have the force of law, while the Federal Library Manual is simply a set of guidelines and recommended procedures for depository librarians.

McClane devoted the remainder of his presentation to a strongly worded, but constructive critique of certain law library admission practices. Noting that 89% of the complaints received by G.P.O. about depositaries have been directed against law libraries, McClane reminded the librarians that a clear requirement of depository status is that all patrons must have free access to the documents collection. If law libraries do not care for this requirement, then they should give up their status (and G.P.O. can request the return of the material received as a depository). McClane recalled that the legislative history of Public Law 95-261 is replete with the testimony of law librarians stating that the inclusion of law libraries in the depository system would be a boon to the general public. Now G.P.O. is beginning to receive complaints from other depositories that the law libraries are just not being very helpful to non-law patrons. This naturally leads G.P.O. to suspect that some law libraries are more concerned with getting the Federal Register and the CFR for free than they are with seeing that certain "public library type" street people are shown where it is in the library and how it is used.

But McClane also stated that he thought that certain restrictions are appropriate. The law library, for example, is certainly under no obligation to circulate the material for home use. Reference assistance, of course, depends upon factors such as staffing and time constraints. Also, access to documents does not imply that patrons have to be given free run of the whole library. Depository status does not mean that the library has to become a study hall or a flophouse for the general public. For these reasons, McClane suggested that law libraries institute a "use of the collection" policy, whereby anyone who needs to use the documents collection is allowed untrammelled access and appropriate assistance. Finally, while a sign-in log is appropriate, McClane cautioned that the inspectors frown on too many "hoop-jumping" requirements, such as requiring identification cards or letters of reference.
NOTES FROM THE AFTERNOON SESSION

Cataloging--Marian MacGilvray

Before 1976, GPO cataloguers used a manual, in-house system with its own set of rules for descriptive cataloging and subject headings. In 1976, GPO joined OCLC and began using Library of Congress subject headings and the AACR. In 1980, AACR II was in use and the Library of Congress and OCLC recognized GPO as the authority cataloguer for federal documents monographs. GPO's Cataloging Guidelines, which have been distributed to depository libraries, are used to adapt records from other sources, such as the National Agriculture Library and the National Library of Medicine.

Currently, LC searches OCLC for the GPO records and adds Dewey and LC classification numbers and LC subject headings. The amended records are added to the MARC tapes, showing GPO/DLC in the 049 field. When LC amends the GPO records, the stock number and the item number from the 037 and 074 fields are moved to the notes area.

Since 1977 GPO has participated in NACO, the name authorities project for personal and corporate authors, conferences, and uniform headings. GPO's responsibility is to establish the hierarchy of offices, bureaus, and divisions within federal agencies. GPO has established almost 60,000 headings; over 185 thousand headings have been established by the 37 participating libraries.

Documents arrive in the cataloging unit after they have been classified and added to a shipping list. As of July 1986, there were 7,000 items backlogged. Twenty-three thousand items arrived in the cataloging unit between October 1985 and June 1986; 21,881 were processed in the same period.

Cataloging staff work on the documents with the following priorities:

1. Congressional materials (hearings are done in 2-3 weeks),
2. Maps, documents mentioned in the news, census materials, presidential documents, and titles in the sales program, and
3. Everything else with the exception of technical reports, which are assigned the lowest priority.

LC's review of GPO cataloging has revealed 0.05 errors per record; 0.4 errors per record in the accepted standard.

Marketing--Janet Erickson

Four portable display units are available from regional coordinators around the country; contact them to schedule use. Other new marketing tools include map PSAs, National Library Week partners, instructor kits sent to library science schools for use by government documents instructors, bumper stickers, directional and range signs to help library patrons locate the documents collections, and another mailing to nondepository libraries, congressional field offices, and other organizations to remind them about depository libraries. A new poster is being planned and the marketing people would like to hear your ideas. GPO is investigating the possibility of having depository libraries listed in the government pages of local telephone directories; they are now looking at a pilot project to evaluate the impact of that proposal.

Local promotion of your own depository has two functions: first, to bring more people into the library and second, to increase the use of documents by patrons already using the library.
Obviously, many law libraries are more interested in the second function that the first.

**Information Exchange—Questions and Answers**

Depository Library Inspector Sheila McGarr had collected the written questions of the workshop attendees and had obtained answers to many questions from the appropriate GPO staff. Ms. McGarr, Mr. Scully, and Mr. McClane also responded to questions from the floor. The following is a selection of questions and answers exchanged during the last hour of the workshop:

Q: Why are some congressional hearings not being microfiched?
A: All hearings should be microfiched. Librarians who believe that a title has not been microfiched should bring it to GPO's attention.

Q: Do depository libraries have to insure their depository collections?
A: It is the General Counsel's opinion that they do. Guidelines for insurance will appear in transmittal #2 to the Instructions for Depository Libraries.

Q: Is one person always responsible for filling the boxes for my library?
A: No, due to breaks, vacation, sick leave, and changes in personnel, one person does not always fill the boxes for any particular library.

Q: Is there any discussion with the Library of Congress to keep the 037 (stock number) and 074 (item number) fields in the OCLC records?
A: There have been no discussions to date, but GPO might pursue the issue if asked to do so by the Depository Library Council.

Q: When will the Constitution Annotated be available?
A: Don't know; will check.

Q: We sometimes get an "Item Not Selected" response to a claim for an item that we actually do select. Why does this happen?
A: Some librarians have been using the shipping lists as shopping lists. They claim an item that they would like to have even though they do not select that item number. Since only 25 copies of each piece are held to fill claims, the library that claims an item that it should not receive may actually be taking it from a library that has a legitimate claim. To reduce this problem, the claims staff are now checking to make sure that the claiming library is entitled to the item claimed.

However, computer glitches on the printout may show that the library does not select the item number when it actually has. Or, another depository may have written an incorrect depository library number on a green item selection amendment card and dropped that item selection for another library. GPO has no way of controlling errors like this made by depository librarians around the country.

If GPO has made the error (for instance, in coding a "D" for an "A" from the green item selection cards), they will make the correction when it is brought to their attention, even if it is not during the annual selection update period. If the depository librarian has made the mistake, s/he will just have to wait for the next annual selection update to get the correction made. The documents librarian cannot obviously claim items that s/he "meant" to select before the correction is made during the cycle period.
Q: What happened to microfiche-on-demand and the unlimited claim period ideas?
A: These were Depository Library Council proposals but they are very labor intensive for GPO. GPO just does not have the resources. The microfiche on demand program is in the sales program.

Q: What questions can I ask of my regional depository library?
A: They can answer questions about the receipt of specific shipping lists and titles, Instructions for Depository Libraries, and inter-depository library cooperation, among other things.

Q: What is GPO's stand on fee-based services in depository libraries?
A: Clearly, charging fee for access to the library or the depository collection is a no-no. Fees for circulation of material is not addressed by the law. Fees charged for online searching is not a straightforward issue. If you replace paper indexes, which patrons and staff use to locate specific documents and which could have been used free by patrons, with online indexes, which patrons must pay for, you have effectively restricted or eliminated access to the documents. GPO would frown on that type of fee-based service.

Q: When did the peer review of classification work begin?
A: It was started three weeks ago (early-mid June 1986) and has already reduced the number of errors made on the shipping lists.

Kevin Fredette
Cheryl Rae Nyberg


The scope and effect of this curious set were dramatically altered on October 22 of this year when Attorney General Edwin Meese announced his intention to establish a new commission of prosecuting attorneys charged with the implementation of many of the Final Report's ninety-two recommendations. While the Attorney General's proclamation highlights the pressing need for a detailed study of the Commission's findings, it also communicates a critical policy decision by the Reagan administration: the Justice Department has now officially declared that it means to take the Final Report seriously, in spite of Meese's ambiguous comments at the public unveiling of these documents.

The writers of the Final Report apparently gave overwhelming approval to Justice Brennan's exhortations in New York Times v. Sullivan. The Commission's decision to devote nearly a quarter of the celebrated second volume to frank descriptions of various pornographic novels and films clearly demonstrates a desire for "uninhibited robust" discussion of controversial issues. Sadly absent from the Report, however, is the spirit of public debate Brennan also advocated in his 1964 decision. By purposefully manipulating the yet inconclusive sociological research on the effects of pornography to support its conclusions, the Commission capriciously abandoned the open-minded, analytical methodology of its predecessor, the 1970 Commission.

Part of the blame for the Commission's rather single-minded
approach should, admittedly, be placed on those officials who framed the Commission's goals and approved the paltry budget of $500,000. (Allowing the Commission sufficient funds to perform more in-depth studies might have seriously jeopardized the Commissioners' ability to tailor a known body of literature to their own ends). Reading the Commission's charge quickly recalls the well-proven adage, "Let me choose the questions and I win." The Justice Department was simply not interested in a major re-discussion on the impact of eliminating certain forms of communication from the zone referred to as "protected speech." Instead, the Attorney General asked that the Commission formulate "more effective ways in which the spread of pornography could be contained," adding, almost as an afterthought, "consistent with constitutional guarantees." What kind of "constitutional guarantees" did the Commissioners have in mind when they drafted Recommendation No. 75, suggesting judges sentence child pornographers to lifetime probation? Did the Commission possibly disregard the need for considered adjudication, or even the complex constitutional inquiries involved when it proposed that the F.C.C. use its "full regulatory powers . . . against providers of obscene dial-a-porn telephone services?" (Recommendation No. 35).

Both the Commission and the Justice Department would have been well-advised to confine their activities to that territory established in New York v. Ferber, i.e., child pornography. Although fifty of the ninety-two recommendations do indeed address current child pornography statutes and prosecution, the Commission has also advised that legislation be adopted raising the minimum age of performers in sexually explicit depictions to twenty-one years (Recommendation No. 38), exposing themselves once more to a thorny overbreadth problem.

The core issue raised by the Final Report is neither how to deal effectively with pornography nor how stringently prosecutors should pursue criminal and civil sanctions, but rather, has society categorically decided that limiting these kinds of speech warrants such an incredible investment of time, money and energy of the part of its law enforcement officials. Is pornography such a serious problem that the Justice Department may legitimately soft-pedal RICO prosecution of corporate crime in order to attack the smut industry? More importantly, can a society base any of its decisions on the recommendations of a panel that finds overt causal relationships between pornography and sexual violence in the absence of definitive scientific documentation, a panel that labels its predecessors as "blind" to contemporary realities when its members essentially condemn all sexual activity outside of a traditional marital setting?

The Commission's Final Report is a piece of poorly constructed, shoddy artillery in the Attorney General's zealous war on pornography. One hundred and eighty eight pages of sincere personal statements by the Commissioners cannot erase over one thousand pages of groundless assumptions, torrents of one-sided witness statements, suspiciously prepackaged conclusions, and the clumsy abuse of scientific data. When an Attorney General consults documents as irresponsible as the Final Report in making his "Supreme" constitutional decisions, Marbury v. Madison shines a little brighter as a ray of judicial sanity.

Keith Buckley
DOCUMENTS RECORDS - SURVEY RESULTS, 1986

(Prepared for the AALL Government Documents SIS Program
Tuesday, July 8, 1986, 1:00-2:25PM, Washington, D.C.)

Questionnaires mailed to 200 federal depository law libraries
Return rate = 40% (78 mail, 2 phone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>DOCS</th>
<th>INCLD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - AT (R-Base 5000)</td>
<td>A,O</td>
<td>Washington Univ., St. Louis</td>
<td>Carol J. Gray</td>
<td>M,S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRC,CAT, OPC,O,SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie</td>
<td>Karolyn Durer</td>
<td>M,S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - XT (Nutshell)</td>
<td>SRC,O</td>
<td>Yeshiva Univ., NYC</td>
<td>Bennett Ponsford</td>
<td>M,S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - XT (Quick file, keystroke)</td>
<td>SRC,O</td>
<td>Northern Illinois Univ., Dekalb</td>
<td>Mary Anne Royal</td>
<td>S (but not docs yet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbo Micro 9000- 68MB (in house software)</td>
<td>CAT,CRC, OPC</td>
<td>San Diego County CA</td>
<td>Jim Werner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - AT (Data Trek)</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Loyola Univ., Chicago</td>
<td>Paula Sennett</td>
<td>S (won't incl'd docs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG (Data Trek)</td>
<td>CAT,SRC</td>
<td>State Law Library, GA</td>
<td>Pamela Graham</td>
<td>(not operational yet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A = Acquisitions; CAT = Cataloging; CRC = Circulation; OPC = On-line Public Catalog; O = Other; SRC = Serial Record Control

2. Y = Yes; N = No; S = Serials; M = Monographs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>DOCS INCLD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - AT, 30MG (hard disk)</td>
<td>A,CAT,0,SRC</td>
<td>Catholic Univ., Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Noelia Padua</td>
<td>(not operational yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM PC - AT (Data Flex, D-Base 2)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Univ. of Kansas Lawrence</td>
<td>Martin Wisneski</td>
<td>(won't include docs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Ma in frame) (Orion - Univ Software</td>
<td>A,CAT,O,OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. Los Angeles</td>
<td>Kate Pecarovich</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeywell Mainframe, IBM PC</td>
<td>A,C,OPC</td>
<td>Univ. of Tulsa Oklahoma</td>
<td>Katherine Tooley</td>
<td>M,S PC not being used yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAC, Faxon (Univ. software, Publisher software)</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC,OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Boston College, MA</td>
<td>Darcy Kirk</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUMIN, Innovacq (Univ. software, Dealer software)</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC,OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>Pat Court</td>
<td>M,S PC not used yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS/FBR (Univ. system)</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC,OPC</td>
<td>Univ. of Illinois, Urbana</td>
<td>Cheryl Nyberg</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLCC (in house terminals &amp; software)</td>
<td>CAT,OPC</td>
<td>U.S. Senate Library, D.C.</td>
<td>Thomas McCray</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INNOVAQ:**

Innovaq, System (Alpha Micro) | A,CAT,OPC | Hastings College | Veronica Maclay | M,S |

---

1. A = Acquisitions; CAT = Cataloging; CRC = Circulation; OPC = On-line Public Catalog; O = Other; SRC = Serial Record Control

2. Y = Yes; N = No; S = Serials; M = Monographs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>DOCS INCLD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovaq</td>
<td>A,SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of the Pacific, McGeorge</td>
<td>Suzanne Miller</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovaq</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. Davis</td>
<td>Pat Piper</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovaq</td>
<td>A,SRC</td>
<td>Columbia Univ., NY</td>
<td>Kent McKeever</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovaq</td>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>S (but, not docs yet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTIS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>DOCS INCLD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Frame</td>
<td>A,CAT, OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Univ. of Florida Gainesville</td>
<td>Pat Williams</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM 4300</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC, OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Northwestern Univ., Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>Pegeen Bassett</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTIS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>DOCS INCLD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAX (IBM 4341)</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC, OPC,SRC</td>
<td>Brigham Young Univ., Provo, UT</td>
<td>Louisa Lyman</td>
<td>M,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Compatible</td>
<td>A,CAT,CRC, SRC,OPC</td>
<td>Wayne State Univ., Ohio</td>
<td>Georgia Clark</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notis</td>
<td>not operational yet</td>
<td>Florida State Univ.</td>
<td>Anne Bardolph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notis</td>
<td>not operational yet</td>
<td>Univ., of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Cynthia Larter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notis</td>
<td>not operational yet</td>
<td>Univ. of Iowa</td>
<td>Donna Hirst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A = Acquisitions; CAT = Cataloging; CRC = Circulation; OPC = On-line Public Catalog; O = Other; SRC = Serial Record Control
2. Y = Yes; N = No; S = Serials; M = Monographs
OCLC/RLIN:

**M-300 Workstations W/IBM PC's**

(Microlinx)  SRC  Seton Hall Univ.  Jean Scott  S

" (PFS;DBase III is "on hold")  Inventory Control for all Courts  U.S. Court - 10th Cir.  Catherine Eason  S,M

" (DBase III)  A  U.S. Court - 4th Circ.  Elaine Woodward

OCLC/RLIN:

**M-300 Workstations W/IBM PC's**

(DBase II, III, Symphony, soon- InMagic)  Inventory CRC, A  U.S. Court - 11th Cir.  Sue Lee

---

1  A = Acquisitions; CAT = Cataloging; CRC = Circulation; OPC = On-line Public Catalog; O = Other; SRC = Serial Record Control

2  Y = Yes; N = No; S = Serials; M = Monographs

Contribution:
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