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The findings of our compilation can be summarized rather briefly under the various headings of the questionnaire. Interlibrary loans and exchanges are two fields in which we believe this group can make a real contribution. Of the 31 libraries replying, 9 subscribe to the A.L.A. General Interlibrary Loan Code, while 22 do not. Some libraries noted that they were unfamiliar with the code. For the benefit of these and for the convenience of all we should have given the reference for this, which is College & Reference Libraries 13:350-361, October, 1952. The complete code is printed at this citation and separate reprints may be obtained from Gaylord Brothers, Syracuse, N. Y. We recommend a familiarity with this code and adoption of the printed forms specified by the code for ease in carrying on interlibrary loans. The printed forms may be purchased from Gaylord and will greatly simplify the interlibrary loan procedure, since they virtually eliminate correspondence, except in unusual cases.

Certainly the larger libraries do carry the burden of interlibrary loans and will continue to do so, but it is just as necessary for the smaller libraries, which will have little to lend but frequent occasion to borrow, to participate in a standardized interlibrary loan system. According to our replies 16 libraries either do or would lend to other libraries. We might have done well to ask how many libraries borrowed from others, but perhaps we can assume that virtually all libraries have occasion to borrow something sometime from another library. In spite of the fact that 10 libraries recommended having this group draw up its own code, we do not recommend this, since we believe the A.L.A. Code covers the necessary information.

Photostating facilities turned out to be more prevalent than we had expected, a fact of some significance to those libraries borrowing much material. Frequently the necessary portion of a book or article can be photostated and sent when the book itself might not be available for loan.
The picture of exchange practices is considerably dimmer than the interlibrary loan picture, and, we believe, should attract the attention of this group. Our terminology here was indistinct, since we are concerned wholly with exchange of duplicates, not regular, continuing exchanges of specific material, such as those handled by state libraries and law review exchanges. We are all familiar with the growing spectre of crowded shelves and bulging boxes in our storage rooms or corners. The problem of listing and disposing of this material is indeed a vexing one. Most of us, I imagine, feel vaguely guilty and would like to do something about the situation, but feel that we have neither time nor personnel to devote to it. The Committee suggests, however, that some serious thinking be done about how best to meet the problem. We think it extremely important that both large and small libraries try rather courageously to conquer this small scale Everest.

Only one of the answering-libraries participates in the A. L. A. Duplicate Exchange Union, and, in that case it is done through the general library. 14 libraries have no system and 16 have individual arrangements. Unfortunately, for all who benefit, 20 libraries send out no lists of duplicates. Of the 11 which do send lists, very irregularly, no library attempted even annual lists, and only one of these sent its list through the general library.

It is the feeling of the Committee that this group could well urge on its members participation, and by this we mean active participation, in a duplicate exchange plan. If the A. A. L. L. sets up a new organization for duplicate exchanges we shall want to cooperate fully, but if it does not, we would like to see this group sponsor a duplicate exchange program among ourselves. We recommend annual lists of law materials sent out separately from general library lists.
The basic problem after all might be partially resolved by a redefinition of the place of duplicate exchanges in our scheme of library work. If the listing of duplicates and the checking of lists received could be viewed as part of the selection and acquisition routine of a library perhaps the librarian could, with a better conscience, find the time necessary to undertake the job. In the long run useful material will be acquired and unnecessary material will be eliminated, releasing always-needed space. The initial task of organizing a system of duplicate exchanges, listing titles, and sending lists is certainly a formidable one, but the results, in most cases, are well worth the effort.

The next large division of our survey is the section on research materials. Answers here, we hoped, might indicate fields of specialization or strong holdings in particular libraries. It was gratifying and in some cases surprising to note the good spread of material available in libraries of our region. English holdings seem very substantial in several libraries, as are also Canadian. 26 libraries reported possession of the English Reports; Full Reprint, 13 held Selden Society publications, 21 had Law Reports Statutes, 13 had Australian material, and 10 New Zealand. These are only selected statistics; a complete tabulation is attached to this report. The Committee wonders if the members of our group would be interested in a union list of English materials in Southeastern law libraries? If we do want this we shall have to make careful and detailed plans for its compilation and upkeep.

Foreign holdings recorded were not impressive, but this was to have been expected. In the South and Central American field, on the other hand, we have some strong collections. 9 libraries reported material in this area. Particular mention should be made of a cooperative buying project in effect among three libraries, Duke, University of North Carolina, and Tulane, which are building up collections in this field.
Briefs are being collected by fewer than half the libraries replying, but among these are six which receive the micro-card edition of U. S. Supreme Court briefs. These six are: University of Florida, University of Miami, Louisiana State University, Duke University, University of North Carolina, and the University of Virginia.

Only two libraries reported micro-film or micro-card holdings other than briefs. These were Duke University and the University of Miami. Apparently the micro-card market is as yet virtually untapped and we may expect future growth in this area.

Another under-developed field seems to be that of practice books, though here there may have been a slight misunderstanding of the term, which, admittedly, we did not sufficiently define. The intent was to find out whether libraries were buying local practice books of other states, but some replied about books on federal practice or practice in general. Only 6 libraries had books on local practice from more than two states other than their own state. This, then, appears to be a field in which buying might be encouraged, perhaps by the compilation of a list of local practice books from each of the Southeastern states. It is suggested, too, that such a list be made up by one representative from each state and that, though it might well include some older material, items for first purchase be indicated or some brief annotations included for the guidance of the out-of-state librarian.

In the close race between CCH and PH in the tax field CCH won 20 to 17. This is mentioned only as a matter of interest and does not warrant any particular conclusion.

The next category is one the whole Committee would now cheerfully omit. In asking for information on text collections in various fields we sadly erred in failing to define "text collection", so that every
library was left floundering over what constituted a collection worthy of
checking in a special subject field. Apparently the only way in which
such a survey could be effective would be to use detailed subject bibliogra-
phies on special fields, checking individual collections against these.
Whether this would be profitable now seems rather doubtful. From the
answers received we can point out only the strong and weak fields. 4 libraries
checked nothing, but of the rest all checked constitutional law, jurisprudence,
and taxation. The weakest fields noted, those omitted by the greatest number
of libraries, were juvenile courts, oil and gas, and radio, television and
theatre. Public law, of course, should never have been listed, as it is a
far wider field than the other topics and has no generally accepted, easily
understood definition.

The category of "other research materials" might well have been
omitted, since it was poorly defined and produced too wide a variety of
answers for us to conclude anything worthy of mention.

In the final section on planning we found no special pattern. Each
library is developing on a local basis to meet its own needs, governed by
the clientele served and the research emphasis of the institution. There
was evidence of planning in very few of the libraries. One institution is
in the process of surveying itself and another is following an already worked-
out ten-year development plan. The fields of emphasis which were indicated
by some libraries include state statutes, periodical files, and particular
subjects, such as comparative law, labor, foreign law, and copyright. The
real difficulty for an organization such as ours to deal with in this field
is the fact that the development of each library depends on the research or
service emphasis of the group for which the library is maintained. It follows,
then, that, since the library must reflect a policy determined by the admin-
istration of the institution, it can do little to initiate the policy. It is
desirable, however, for all libraries to plan their development within the
limits prescribed, but an organization of libraries cannot legitimately
presume to set up these limits.

The usual lack of funds and personnel was mentioned by many
libraries in answering the last question, which was an inquiry about
services rendered or planned for alumni and law school research groups
and the bar. Two libraries have already a briefing service, 12 specified
service to alumni, 12 to the local bar, and several non-school libraries
mentioned serving law students and government officials. One library
sends a regular bulletin to alumni. This area of extended service and
public relations is one in which we can perhaps profit most from inter-
change of ideas produced by meetings such as this and the larger one of
which we are a part. The Committee has no specific recommendation here,
except the reminder that good public relations usually pays its own way.

We are submitting no formal series of proposals garnered from
your replies. We simply report the findings, with a hope that areas of
activity for this organization will occur to you, and that this first rather
weak effort to uncover fruitful areas of cooperation may be strengthened
by your interest and suggestions so that it will grow far out of propor-
tion to its beginnings.

Ruth Corry
Mary Anne Kernan
Jane Oliver
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