



## State Documents Checklists

MARGARET T. LANE

IS THE COLLECTION of state documents bibliographies and checklists in your library up-to-date? Does your state have a checklist of its official publications? This paper assumes that at least one library in each state should have such a collection of out-of-state checklists and that each state should publish a checklist of its own publications. The maintenance of a collection of checklists, the characteristics of the checklists and the compilation of state documents checklists will be discussed.

It is not possible, except in a few libraries (the Library of Congress and the Center for Research Libraries, for example), to collect all the documents from all the states. However, a collection of the bibliographic tools for identifying state documents is not only possible but highly desirable. A collection of bibliographies and checklists of state documents occupies only a few shelves, costs very little for subscriptions, new book purchases and binding, and need take a minimum of time to maintain.

In 1948, Gwendolyn Lloyd wrote that the collection and preservation of state documents had received too little attention until recent times and the bibliographic record of official publication even less. According to then current information there existed not one "complete and effective *printed* bibliographic record of official state publications."<sup>1</sup> The situation has improved since then. There are now several states which have complete bibliographic coverage in the state documents field.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, some states do not yet have current checklists of documents. Between these two extremes, there are many degrees of coverage.

The basic current bibliography of bibliographies of state publications is found in the *Manual on the Use of State Publications*, edited by Jerome K. Wilcox.<sup>8</sup> This was prepared in 1940 and was supple-

Mrs. Lane is Recorder of Documents, Office of the Secretary of State, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

mented for the period 1940-1947, by Gwendolyn Lloyd in her *Library Quarterly* article.<sup>4</sup>

Since 1948, there have been no bibliographies of state documents to supplement these earlier bibliographies, but only checklists of current documents lists.<sup>5</sup> These checklists are arranged by state and give author, title, frequency, and notes on cumulations. One of these, the 1951 list, also gives information on indexes, bibliographical detail and form of publication. Since 1963, the *Monthly Checklist of State Publications* issued by the Library of Congress has included an asterisk before the entry for all documents checklists in the periodicals section of its June and December issues. However, it must be remembered that not all documents lists are issued by official state agencies, so these specially marked items do not constitute a complete list.

These checklists and the asterisks in the *Monthly Checklist* have no doubt been used in many libraries. However, their use would be easier and more accurate if there were also reported the latest issue published of each checklist. Because there is a time lag in the issuance of documents lists, it is not always easy to determine whether a file is up-to-date. This is particularly true if the date of the checklist is for the period covered. Also, occasional irregularities in issuance, sometimes due to the preparation of a cumulation, are not always well publicized and should be noted. Moreover, some states (California for example) make a periodic check of their mailing list for a documents checklist; this could cause a library to have an interrupted subscription which would be noticed when checking holdings against the full listing of the checklist.

A regular listing of the issues of each documents list from each state is helpful in inventorying collections of such lists. The law libraries have such a checklist for legal materials in the *Law Library Journal*.<sup>6</sup> Semi-annual publication of a similar compilation of documents lists will be made in *Library Resources and Technical Services*. It will include the latest number issued in each currently published list, new titles, discontinuances, and possibly bibliographies in progress.

Another desirable feature of such a compilation is that it includes the documents guides and aids issued in the state documents field. There are not a great number of such publications, and they are not easily located. Recent examples of such publications include the California manual, the Washington studies on distribution, the Wisconsin study on documents lists, and the Ohio classification scheme.<sup>7</sup>

That several states, independently, and through questionnaires, have

### *State Documents Checklists*

found it necessary to compile checklists of documents lists indicates the need for regular publication of this type of information. Compilers of bibliographies of state documents bibliographies often make reference to the fact that supplementary information was obtained by correspondence. Although correspondence between documents librarians is to be commended, it is not the most efficient way to make information widely available.

Library literature abounds with reasons for the issuance of documents lists. In the thirties there was interest in a single bibliographic list covering all the states.<sup>8</sup> In 1951 the suggestion was made that librarians should turn their attention to promoting improvements in the *Monthly Checklist of State Publications*.<sup>9</sup> The trend, however, seems to be toward publication of more state lists. Hardin, in 1951, discussed nineteen state checklists; now there are twice that number.

The *Monthly Checklist of State Publications* is not complete enough to be a substitute for comprehensive state lists. It includes only publications received at the Library of Congress, which because of less than full cooperation from some states has incomplete coverage. There is a definite correlation between the states sending the most documents to the Library of Congress and the states which issue checklists.<sup>10</sup> Recognition of the needs of the Library of Congress and of the importance of having documents listed in the *Monthly Checklist* seems to go hand in hand with a strong state program for listing documents. Both the national and the state programs for listing state documents are essential. The *Monthly Checklist* omits some ephemeral materials which are not added to the Library of Congress collections. The monthly issues of the *Checklist* are not cumulated, which makes them difficult to use for inventorying, although for reference use, the annual index compensates partially for the lack of cumulations. State checklists are sometimes more prompt, almost always more complete, and definitely more convenient for inventorying than the *Monthly Checklist*.

Since automation is in the foreseeable future and library catalogs and bibliographic lists may soon be on punched cards or magnetic tapes, it is important to bring and keep the bibliographic records for state documents up to date. Publication of a documents checklist is one way to get this record into definitive form. Automation "input" requires that all necessary information be available and that bibliographic details be complete. It is easier to convert to a form of automation if bibliographic records are already established and have

been tested through use. The future always brings changes, but this need not be a deterrent to making a start with a state documents list now.

It is too soon after the publication of the *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* to attribute the trend toward more state documents lists to this influence. Standard seven provides that "Each state should maintain a complete collection of the documents of its own government . . ." and the explanatory materials for the standard specifically say ". . . a checklist of state documents should be published periodically by the state."<sup>11</sup> Hopefully the *Standards* will motivate even more states to publish a documents list.

An examination of the lists issued by the various states will reveal the main characteristics of the various lists and will suggest what a model list should be. Since the beginning of the Louisiana documents program in 1948, a collection of checklists of state documents from all the states has been systematically maintained. Such a collection is valuable in providing illustrations of the physical format of the different lists, their scope and bibliographic detail, and their special features—introductory pages, indexes, etc. States which do not now issue checklists would surely want to collect sample issues of documents checklists for study before launching a new publication. This paper is based primarily on an examination of the Louisiana collection of documents lists, and includes suggestions on the lists themselves as well as notes on the mechanics of producing them. However, actual samples would be necessary to make a study of the type of paper, use of color, size of type, etc. For any state already issuing checklists, comparisons can be made between its present publication and those of other states.

To some extent, the type of publication issued will depend on the available time and money and upon the purpose of the list. Sometimes, publication as a section in a local library bulletin (e.g., Indiana and Maryland), in the report of the state library (e.g., New Hampshire) or in the state manual (e.g., Maryland) is a practical, temporary solution to the problem of how to publish. A separate list devoted to documents is, however, preferred by most librarians and has in several instances (e.g., Illinois) evolved from publication as a section of another publication.\*

In comparing documents lists from the various states, those lists

---

\* In one library the documents sections from the library bulletins have been Xeroxed, and pamphlet-bound volumes prepared for shelving with documents lists from other states.

### *State Documents Checklists*

which are prepared for specific, limited purposes will not be considered. Checklists prepared for exchange purposes (e.g., Arizona), lists of documents for sale (e.g., Minnesota), lists of documents in print (e.g., Virginia), and depository lists (e.g., California) are probably not documents lists within the meaning of the term as used in *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level*, and because of their specialized use are not generally considered comprehensive documents lists. There are other difficulties in comparing the lists issued by the different states even after excluding those issued for specific, limited purposes. These arise because, although all the monthly and quarterly lists have similarities, the annual lists are sometimes cumulations, and sometimes they are the only lists and thus have the characteristics of the monthly and quarterly lists.

Monthly or quarterly lists, particularly those which are cumulated, usually have only brief prefatory remarks to avoid unnecessary repetition. Monthly lists, by their nature, give an indication of the period covered and usually include a statement on the availability of the documents and on how to order them. Those libraries following the new trend of eliminating periodicals\* sometimes include a statement to this effect in the preliminary remarks. Annual lists often include more detailed information on scope, completeness, arrangement, bibliographic details, and depository or exchange arrangements. Libraries which issue only a monthly or quarterly documents list might consider including more extensive information in one issue each year so that full information about documents in their state can be easily available.

The Wisconsin study observes that in 1957 most lists were issued quarterly, and also that annual lists are too infrequent for reference people.<sup>12</sup> Several states (e.g., Pennsylvania and Washington) have recently started monthly lists to supplement their annual lists. Several other states (e.g., California, New York and Louisiana) have been issuing monthly lists for some time with regular cumulations. There is a need both for monthly lists—to provide current information for acquisitions work, and for regular cumulations—to provide a convenient tool for inventorying, cataloging and reference use.

In compiling a monthly, and maybe a quarterly list, occasional problems arise from the pressure on the compiler to get the list pub-

\* The term "periodicals," as used by the libraries which separate them from the list of other publications, covers dailies, weeklies and anything issued less frequently than annually. Annuals, biennials, and monographic serials are not included in the term "periodicals" for the purpose of this separate listing. New periodicals are usually listed in the month in which they appear.

lished on time and because the information with which the compiler must deal is so current. A monthly publication should appear regularly and promptly each month and because of vacations, sickness and other normal interruptions, there is less time for preparation in some months than in others. The fact that the current issue of a serial must be listed immediately presents curious problems. If the title of a monthly publication is changed, it is sometimes difficult to tell whether it is an accidental change occurring only in one issue or whether it is a deliberately chosen new title. If the publication has many title changes, the compiler might even compromise with a note, "Title varies slightly," and avoid the problem of keeping up with the changes. But, when the information is new and the first one or two changes occur, it is not known how important the change is and there is difficulty in deciding upon an appropriate note. The same situation can occur with mis-numbering, but in some cases the compiler can only make a note that the numbering is irregular and use the dates issued as a substitute.

For these rather minor reasons, as well as the important advantages mentioned above, it is well to have an annual cumulation of a monthly or quarterly list. It is quite worthwhile to re-examine the entries made in a monthly list, particularly the notes, and revise them for an annual cumulation. Librarians all remember the U.S. *Document Catalog*, which, when it made its biennial appearance, superseded the *Monthly Catalog*, and the way in which the information in the *Document Catalog* amplified the information in the *Monthly Catalog*. In her revision of Boyd's book, Rae Elizabeth Rips said, "The discontinuance of the Document Catalog will be greatly regretted by librarians. . . ." <sup>13</sup> thus pointing up the need for both kinds of bibliographic listing.

In looking over the checklists from the various states, one is struck by the variety of names chosen for the lists. The most popular titles used for documents lists are of two types, "Checklist of (State) Official Publications" and "(State) State Documents." Title changes, because of the cataloging and other recording problems which they create, should not be made lightly. However, thought should be given to the possible confusion which might arise between a list of documents, called the name of the state followed by "state documents" or "official publications," with a publication which actually contains the documents themselves. For example, *Public Documents of North Carolina*, actually contains annual reports of state departments and other state documents. Kentucky, Missouri, and Pennsylvania

### *State Documents Checklists*

have recently selected titles for their documents lists and use the word "checklist" as part of the title.

The use of the word "bibliography" as part of the title is usually reserved for documents lists which cover a span of years. This is as it should be, because such lists usually include more bibliographic details and have more complete coverage than lists issued at fairly frequent intervals. "Union list" is usually not found in the titles of documents lists although some are lists of the holdings of several libraries. The Ohio list, covering 1803-1952, is described in the preface as a union list. The North Carolina list, a bi-monthly publication issued cooperatively by the University of North Carolina and the State Library, could be described as a union list, although library holdings are not given.

A definite statement as to the period of time covered by the list is usually made at the head of the list. It is important to be able to ascertain easily the coverage of a particular list. The documents included may be either those received during a specific period, or those published during a stated interval of time. Documents lists which are published more frequently than annually usually include documents received during a specific period. Annual and biennial lists of documents sometimes include all titles published during a specific year or years. If the checklist is a list of documents published, then some device must be adopted for listing those earlier documents not discovered until after the previous list had been issued. For example, South Carolina has a section at the end of each annual list, titled "Errata and Addenda." It should be noted, however, that even some of the frequently issued lists covering documents received have a separate listing of old titles recently received (e.g., Florida). Some lists include old titles in the principal arrangement, either with a statement to that effect (e.g., Louisiana and Washington) or without comment (e.g., Georgia).

In addition to the statement on the period covered, most lists include in the prefatory remarks information on the availability of the documents for use, and on the procedure for ordering them. Inasmuch as almost all the lists are compiled by library agencies, it can be assumed that the documents listed are available in the library where the list was compiled. Since the Louisiana list is not compiled in a library and the copies of the documents used in compiling the list are not available for public use, there is regularly included a list of the depository libraries in which the listed publications may be seen.

Lists of depository libraries are also included in the California and New York annual lists. A statement on how to order publications is helpful to acquisitions librarians and should be included. The lack of a statement should be interpreted as meaning that requests for publications must be addressed to the individual issuing agencies.

Another aspect of the coverage of the documents list is the scope of the documents included. In the California law, there is a detailed definition of "state publication" and a specific exclusion of the publications of the state university. In most states, the definitions of what is an official state agency, and of what is an official publication of a state agency, are taken for granted without explanation. Because a decision must be made whether to include a particular publication in a documents list, a statement of some of the criteria for making that determination follows: an agency may be considered an official state agency if it is established by law or executive order, if it is included in an officially issued list of state agencies, if it receives state funds, or if it is designated as such by the attorney general of the state. The most practical and diplomatic way of deciding whether a publication of an agency is an official publication, in borderline cases, is to ask the issuing agency itself.

The primary purpose of a documents list is to list the official publications of the official agencies of the state. This usually means the publications of the executive and legislative branches of the state government. A number of the lists omit the court reports from the judicial branch of government, no doubt because they are used and shelved with other legal materials in the library compiling the list and not with the documents collection (e.g., California and Kentucky). Most states which omit the court reports do include the court rules issued by the courts (e.g., Florida) and the publications of the judicial council or the court administrator (e.g., California).

A table on materials included in documents lists is given in the Wisconsin study.<sup>14</sup> This table covers regular and periodic reports of state agencies, ephemeral publications of state agencies, printed matter, mimeographed material, publications of educational institutions, reports of legislative committees, materials for which there is a charge, and legislative documents. A number of states include the publications of state colleges and universities in separate lists at the end of the main list (e.g., Indiana and West Virginia). Other states omit educational institutions entirely (e.g., Maine, Michigan and New Mexico). Agricultural experiment station publications are also sometimes ex-

### *State Documents Checklists*

cluded. Pennsylvania and Washington exclude such publications without making a specific statement to this effect.

Examination of the checklists shows that special sections on federal and local documents are sometimes included in addition to the usual official state publications (e.g., Nevada). Sections on non-official publications of state-level agencies are found in the Nevada, Rhode Island and Wisconsin lists. Connecticut has a separate list, distributed to the libraries which receive its documents list, which includes selected U.S. documents and government publications of states other than Connecticut.

Another important aspect of coverage is the question of completeness. The Wisconsin study has two tables on this problem.<sup>15</sup> Table 3 indicates in each case whether the list includes a clearcut statement on inclusions and exclusions, and quotes the statements. Table 4 tabulates the devices used to make sure the list is complete, *viz.*, depend on issuing agency, check through central agency which is depository, check through central agency which approves publication, have law requiring listing, use persuasion and persistent urging, and check for gaps in continuations. Although the question of completeness is, for most states, an acquisitions problem, almost all states (Iowa and Ohio are exceptions) issue as complete a list of documents as possible.

In most states, bibliographic control of documents is achieved after the documents are published rather than at the time of publication. That is, most states do not have a state printer, a publishing service, or a central sales office which issues a catalog; thus control at the source is not possible. In the absence of control at the source, the completeness of the documents list depends upon the faithfulness of the agencies in depositing the documents, if there is a legal requirement to do so, and ultimately upon the diligence of the compiler in securing copies of the documents.

The method of arranging a documents list, the form of author entry, and many bibliographic details for a documents list are outlined by A. F. Kuhlman in his "Rules for Preparing Checklist Bibliographies of American State Publications."<sup>16</sup> These rules in general recommend standard cataloging practices, and indicate certain exceptions to be followed in state documents lists. Compilers of documents lists will also find useful information in the prefaces or introductions to the major, retrospective bibliographies.

Comment on the fullness of titles given for the documents in the

documents lists is not possible without examination of the documents themselves or comparison with the entry in some other publication (the L.C. *Catalog* or the *Monthly Checklist*). The majority of the lists seem to give reasonably complete titles. The South Carolina list gives a short title. The Florida and West Virginia lists are called "short title" checklists. The Kentucky and Virginia lists, both issued annually only, are examples of very complete bibliographical detail. A smaller size type is used for the extensive notes, which include the name of the editor, the chairman of the commission, etc. The North Carolina bibliography, 1749-1939, which also has very complete detail, mentions in the preface that for some important or rare works a more complete imprint and fuller collation is given than that recommended by Kuhlman.

Statements giving an explanation of the arrangement of the body of the list are found more frequently in annual listings than in those which are issued monthly or quarterly. This is probably because an annual listing cannot be scanned as easily as a shorter list. A note on arrangement is given in each California monthly list because a special arrangement by call number is used. The arrangement of the items in a documents list is related to the question of whether or not the list has an index.

Almost all of the documents lists enter all publications under the corporate author, but most are so arranged that a quasi-subject order is achieved. Likewise, most of the lists are issued without an index. Lack of an index is to some extent compensated for if the list is alphabetically arranged to bring out the subject indicated by the name of the agency. Various methods are used to bring out this subject, e.g., inversion of the author entry (Iowa), key word capitalized (New Hampshire), or underlined (Rhode Island), or arrangement by the key word without any form of emphasis (Connecticut). Some compilers use cross-references within the body of the list (e.g., Missouri and New York). Lists arranged strictly by corporate author and without an index place the burden on the user of knowing the exact names of the agencies. That is, the user must check Board of Health, Department of Health and other such variations unless he knows exactly which form is used.

The Rhode Island list for 1953-55 is arranged according to the state government departmental set-up as found in the *Rhode Island State Manual*, and has an index to departments. The New Jersey list for 1945-1960 arranges special studies by year of publication in the order

### *State Documents Checklists*

in which they were received at the State Library, and the annual reports in a separate section in the order in which they are classified in the State Library. An approach is possible either through the subject index or by date.

The author entry used in most lists seems to be the one established in the authority files of the library compiling the list, or in the published author headings for the state. None of the monthly or quarterly lists mention the authority followed for the author entry. Author headings for the official publications of a number of states have been published, or are available as theses. These should be used by compilers of documents lists if they have been prepared. The Missouri list has a statement deploring the lack of an author heading list for the state and expressing hope that one will be compiled. The South Carolina list states that it uses as the author entry the name of the agency as it appears on the publication. In this connection mention might be made of the practice of including some reference to the establishment of the different agencies. In the North Carolina list, 1749-1939, and the Virginia list, 1916-1925, such information is supplied. This practice is not followed in lists issued monthly or quarterly, although it is recommended by Kuhlman.

Most states use the form entry, "Laws, Statutes, etc." for laws issued by the different state departments. This is standard cataloging practice, and is followed in the *Monthly Checklist*. In the Louisiana list, such statutory compilations are entered under the issuing department and indexed under "Laws, Statutes, etc." This is done deliberately because the list is used as a "thank you" to the agencies at the end of each month, and this arrangement is convenient for the agencies. However, the Library of Congress, which also uses its list as a "thank you" by offering a free subscription to contributing agencies, enters statutory compilations under "Laws, Statutes, etc." Kuhlman recommends the form heading entry.

Several states (e.g., California, Illinois and Louisiana) include excerpts from the statutes on documents as part of the documents list. California also includes in the annual issue the depository contract and the disposal policies for depositories.

Many of the lists are accession lists compiled by the state agency which maintains the most complete collection of documents in the state. They are lists of documents received by a particular library. However, some of the lists are prepared with information taken from lists of publications supplied by the state agencies. For example, the

South Carolina list includes this caveat, ". . . in some instances the lists furnished by the agencies have not been entirely exact." In Louisiana, lists from state agencies are also available for information. In Wisconsin, questionnaires to state agencies are used.

It might be noted that the Louisiana lists from state agencies, which are specifically provided for in the law, are considered more helpful as a double-check on what has been received than as a bibliographic record. The bibliographic minutiae of volume, number, series, etc., are perhaps an undue burden to expect state agencies to assume. The fact that the lists are required provides an excellent opportunity to send a reminder about the documents program to the state agencies on a regular basis. It has been the experience in Louisiana that when a reminder is not sent, only a handful of agencies will observe the requirement of sending the list. It is also true in Louisiana that the number of documents received increases appreciably twice a year when the reminder is mailed and the agency lists are submitted. Since 1957 the Louisiana documents list has included a list of agencies which reported that no publications had been issued for the period covered by the list. Although some difficulties are encountered in compiling this list because of the conflict between documents reported as published during the period and documents actually received, a series of consecutive listings of an agency under the heading of "no publications issued" is of reference value. The Rhode Island list, 1935-1955, includes agencies in its list with the note, "none," when no publications appeared.

Other negative information, *viz.*, notes on regular publications which have skipped an issue, suspended or ceased publication, as well as notes on title changes, frequency changes, etc., is as important to library records as the positive mention of a new publication. Such negative information is found in some state documents lists and should be included in more lists. For examples, see no. 11 of the Tennessee list at pages 5 and 94 and no. 29 of the Louisiana list at pages 10 and 11. This negative information is seldom secured from the publications themselves, but must be obtained through correspondence or telephone calls with the issuing agencies.

Pennsylvania and Washington, which recently started their monthly lists, have adopted the practice of omitting periodicals \* from those lists. This results in a very short monthly list for Pennsylvania, sometimes as few as eight items. The Washington list for June 1965 had

\* See note above for special meaning of "periodicals."

### *State Documents Checklists*

forty-nine items. Eliminating periodicals follows the practice of the *Monthly Checklist*, which since 1963 has included periodicals in a separate section of the June and December issues. Ohio, which does not have an annual cumulation, has a listing of periodicals as a supplement to the December issue. California also eliminates periodicals from the monthly lists.

The practice of eliminating periodicals from the monthly list is a useful expedient and a practical alternative to complete monthly listing of documents. Louisiana and New York make complete monthly listings, followed by semi-annual and annual cumulations, respectively.

Preparing frequent issues of a documents list, cumulating the lists on a regular basis, and having an index, at least to the cumulated issue, are all highly desirable goals. All this is possible with the use of cards, and reproduction of the lists and indexes directly from the cards. Both California and Louisiana use Acme cards and panels for mounting the cards. Remington Rand has similar equipment called Flexoprint. The Acme cards have a keylock punched at the bottom of the card which permits them to be mounted so that the typing is properly exposed. The number of lines of typing exposed is controlled by hidden "fillers" which are inserted as the cards are mounted. The idea is the same as that used in L.C.'s shingled-card publications but the Acme panels are simpler for an amateur, although more expensive initially.

The use of cards has many advantages. The speed and ease of issuing the list are increased over conventional methods. Separates and the principal information for serials are typed only once. The workload is spread over the entire month because cards are prepared daily as publications are received. The typist works only with cards, learns only one form, and retypes only one card, if an error occurs. Last minute items can easily be inserted in their proper place. Cumulations can be prepared with a minimum of effort. Proof-reading is reduced and retyping errors are minimized.

An explanation of the card method of producing the Louisiana list will illustrate how it is possible to include all publications, including periodicals, in the monthly list and produce a semi-annual cumulation and index with a fair degree of promptness.

All entries for serials are prepared on two separate cards. The "head card" gives author, title and frequency. The "holding card" gives volume, number, date and paging or number of issues. Head cards are re-used month after month, with the holding card supplying

the current information. All the bibliographic information is given in the conventional order, except that the frequency follows the title instead of being part of the collation. It is not apparent from the published Louisiana list that the entries are on two cards, or even that cards are used in compiling it at all.\* It is necessary to make some brief reference on the holding card to identify it with the head card to which it applies. This reference, which is hidden information and not exposed when the cards are mounted, can be either a very abbreviated author and title, or a call number if the list uses such numbers. Monographic publications are complete on a single card and require no hidden references to another card. When it is time to prepare a cumulation all the cards are ready, with the exception of the holding cards for the dailies, weeklies and monthlies which must be cumulated. These are quickly prepared since there is only a single line to be accurately typed.

California has also adopted the card system although the number of documents published there each month makes necessary a limitation on the length of the list, and periodicals are excluded from the monthly lists. The card system, and the use of two cards for serials, would be worthwhile even for those libraries which exclude periodicals from their monthly lists. The periodicals excluded do not include annuals, biennials and monographic series. Head cards for all these could be prepared, and index cards as well, and re-used from year to year. Even the periodicals excluded from the monthly list repeat in each annual compilation, so that head cards would be useful for them, too.

California includes an author-title-subject index in its monthly list. In Louisiana, which has a shorter monthly list, an index is not considered necessary except in the semi-annual list. Both California and Louisiana prepare the index entries on cards. In Louisiana, the index entries are typed on the head cards as tracings are on a catalog card, but are never exposed. Then a separate card is typed for each index entry. The adoption of the call number arrangement in the latest semi-annual list in Louisiana permits the typing of the complete index entry at the time the publication is received. Index cards are prepared on a regular basis, so that at the end of the six months' period only a few cards need to be typed for the publications received on the last day of the period. Index cards for serials are re-used in the same way the head cards are.

---

\* A "fifth light" eliminates the shadow caused by the overlapping cards.

### *State Documents Checklists*

The preparation of the index on a regular basis, as the list itself is being compiled, spreads the work over a longer period, avoids the bottle-neck of work in preparing the index after the list is complete, and eliminates a delay in publication caused by waiting for the index. A wait for the index is inevitable if the index references refer to page numbers or to a "closed" system of numbering. If a closed system is used for numbering the list, that is, by serial number, the list cannot be numbered until the last item is in its correct place. On the other hand, if a flexible numbering system, for example a classification scheme, is used, the insertion of the last few items does not affect those previously listed and indexed.

The actual index entries themselves are of interest because they are not the usual subject headings found on catalog cards. There are several reasons for this. The index entry avoids the use of the name of the state, inasmuch as the list itself is state-oriented. Some subdivisions of the subject headings are not necessary because the documents list is smaller in scope than a general library catalog.

The Oregon list for 1961 was supplemented by an index published separately in 1962. This index used Library of Congress subject headings for the majority of headings, and H. W. Wilson subject headings in a few instances. The foreword suggests that some of the Oregon depository libraries might find the subject headings helpful in cataloging Oregon publications, or in placing some of them in a vertical file by subject.

A quite satisfactory index can be compiled by inverting titles to bring out the subject. The addition of individual authors is important for use within the state where they are known by name and because some documents are cataloged under the individual author in a public catalog. An index entry should also be made for each corporate entry. This state agency entry should be under the significant word to avoid a series of entries under board, department and state.

The Florida list, 1942-1951, presents an interesting approach to subject indexing. It is divided into two parts; Part I lists the documents under the corporate entries, and Part II is an alphabetical classification by subject. For agricultural subjects, the subject headings are those used in the *Agriculture Index*; for educational subjects, those used in the *Education Index*, etc. The complete bibliographic citation is not included under the subject in every instance.

Another subject approach to state documents, aside from that provided through indexes in documents checklists, is through catalog-

ing. California, even though it has an indexed list, nevertheless states in its *Manual* that checking the list in lieu of cataloging or check-listing is not recommended.<sup>17</sup> Several reasons are given which are applicable to any state. In most states cataloging is necessary because the documents list is not indexed. In Louisiana sets of Library of Congress catalog cards are distributed with the new documents sent to depository libraries. The sets of cards are purchased under the cards-with-books program which is a wholesale plan for ordering and purchasing cards.<sup>18</sup>

The task of compiling a checklist can be described in a few words—it is simply a matter of making a list of state documents. The actual compilation involves many different problems, a few of which have been discussed in this paper. Some of the answers to the problems will come from local library practices because the documents list is a reference tool for the library which compiles it and is a part of the bibliographic resources of the state. The list must, therefore, fit into the state picture. At the same time, the documents list will be used out of state, and should not be so unique and local that others find it a burden to use. If possible, each state should have a monthly or quarterly list to supply timely information about documents and should publish a cumulation and an index with authors, subjects and titles periodically as a convenience to users. And each state should collect and examine the documents lists of other states (keeping the collection up to date by means of the checklist proposed earlier), profit from the ideas other states have adopted, and pride itself on its own publication.

### References

1. Lloyd, Gwendolyn. "The Status of State Documents Bibliography," *Library Quarterly*, 18:192, 195, July 1948.
2. See article by James B. Childs in this issue.
3. Wilcox, Jerome K., ed. *Manual on the Use of State Publications*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1940, pp. 75-91.
4. Lloyd, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-199.
5. Arranged in chronological order these are:
  - Hardin, Ruth. "United States State Publications," *College and Research Libraries*, 12:161, April 1951.
  - Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library. *The Preparation and Distribution of Periodic Lists of Official State Publications*. (Informational Bulletin, no. 167) Madison, 1957. pp. 2-4.
  - New York State Library. Legislative Reference Library. *Current Checklists of State Publications*. Albany, 1962.

## State Documents Checklists

Tennessee State Library and Archives. "Current Checklists of State Publications, as of May 1, 1962," *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 6: 357-359, Fall 1962. (Also issued in mimeographed form with summary and with column headed "Publications Received From.")

The following bibliography includes state documents lists with other state documents materials, but is not arranged by state:

Wilcox, Jerome K. *Bibliography of New Guides and Aides to Public Documents Use, 1953-1956* (SLA Bibliography, no. 2). New York. Special Libraries Association, 1957. Continues the series published for some time in *Special Libraries*, 40:371-377, Nov. 1949; 40:406-412, Dec. 1949; 45:29-36, Jan. 1954.

6. Holbrook, Frances Karr. "Checklist of Current State, Federal and Canadian Publications, Revised to June 1, 1965." *Law Library Journal*, 58:[326]-340, August 1965.

7. California Department of Finance, Organization & Cost Control Division, *California State Publications: Manual for Acquisition, Processing, Use*. 2d ed. rev. by California State Library. [Sacramento] 1961. Various Paging, 1st ed. (1957) compiled by Documents Committee, California Library Association.

Houk, Judith Ann. *Classification System for Ohio State Documents*. Columbus, Ohio State Library, 1962. 27 p.

Kraus, Joe W. *Notes on Virginia State Publications*. 2d ed. Richmond, Virginia State Library, 1960, 23 p. "First issued in 1956."

Moberg, Barbara. *Oregon's Documents Depository Laws and Policies, Past and Present*. Prepared for Oregon State Library's Workshop for State Documents Depository Libraries, February 26, 1965. [Salem], Oregon State Library, 1965, 9 p.

Washington State Legislative Council. *Distribution of State Publications*. [Olympia] 1961-62. 2 v. Preliminary staff report. 14 p.; Part II, Summary, proposal and pertinent Washington statutes. 18 p.

Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library. *The Preparation and Distribution of Periodic Lists of Official State Publications*. (Informational Bulletin, no. 167) Madison, 1957. 12 p.

8. Kuhlman, A. F. "The Need for a Comprehensive Check-list Bibliography of American State Publications." *Library Quarterly*, 5:32-33, January 1935.

9. Hardin, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

10. The December 1964 issue of the *Monthly Checklist* reports the number of documents sent to the Library of Congress in 1964. When arranged numerically, the states which do not publish a checklist (marked here with an asterisk) fall toward the end of the list.

1398 Calif.	521 N. C.	320 S. C.	*178 Alas.	*119 N. D.
982 N. Y.	513 Texas	316 Ind.	169 Ariz.	*113 Wyo.
891 Mich.	502 Ore.	*308 Okla.	167 Colo.	110 Hawaii
765 Wis.	468 Fla.	295 Mass.	166 Iowa	95 Utah
692 Ill.	457 Ga.	284 W. Va.	159 N. M.	* 91 Idaho
671 Va.	453 Ohio	241 Md.	*158 Ala.	* 91 Neb.
639 Conn.	420 Pa.	233 Mo.	*153 S. D.	73 R. I.
595 Tenn.	397 Minn.	204 Ark.	150 Nevada	58 N. H.
559 Wash.	372 N. J.	204 Maine	*140 Miss.	* 49 Vt.
558 La.	367 Kansas	180 Kent.	122 Mont.	37 Dela.

MARGARET T. LANE

11. American Association of State Libraries, Survey and Standards Committee. *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1963, p. 9.
12. Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 12.
13. Boyd, Anne Morris. *United States Government Publications*. 3d ed. Rev. by Rae Elizabeth Rips. New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1949, p. 42.
14. Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-10.
16. Kuhlman, *op. cit.*, Appendix B, pp. 52-58.
17. California Department of Finance, Organization and Cost Control Division, *op. cit.*, p. 4-1.
18. Treyz, Joseph H. "The Cards-with-Books Program," *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 57: 433-434, May 1963.