

REFERENCE

Proclamation Notices in Commonwealth Government Gazettes

Sue Milne

High Court of Australia Library

Did you know that the "Special" notices in the gazettes typify notices that have failed to meet the deadline to be published as a government notice? Thus you will find proclamations from the Governor-General concerning commencement dates of Acts published as either a Special Gazette or a General Notice gazette. The Special Gazette can therefore be viewed as taking the form occasionally of a "Stop press" notice.

Library of Congress Joins the Research Libraries Group

In January 1993 the Library of Congress, founded in 1800 to serve as the US Congress's parliamentary library, became a member of the Research Libraries Group (RLG). The RLG is a not-for-profit membership corporation of 125 universities, archives, historical societies, museums, and other institutions devoted to improving access to information that supports research and training. RLG owns and operates the bibliographic utility RLIN (the Research Libraries Information Network).

Also in January, the RLG launched Eureka (not URICA!), a new search interface to the RLIN database. Eureka has been designed for easy integration into existing local online library information networks. It is accessible from any terminal or personal computer with VT100

terminal emulation; telecommunication options include the Internet, SprintNet and the RLIN X25 network, among others.

Griffith Law Review

The *Griffith Law Review* was launched in 1992 as a semiannual publication of the Law School, Griffith University. Of particular interest are those areas of law on which Griffith University places special emphasis, including commerce and administration, environmental science, ethics, international business, Japanese law, justice administration and legal education.

Chaplin v Australian Mutual Provident Society or Australian Mutual Provident Society v Allan? Another problem of citation

Colin Fong

Allen Allen & Hemsley, Sydney

Following on from Nicholas Pengelley's article: "Smith v Jones or Jones v Smith? A problem of citation" (1993) 1(1) *Australian Law Librarian* 33, I would like to point out another problem when the names of the parties change, depending on the citation.

The problem arises when the names of the parties vary between one set of court proceedings and the next appellate level of proceedings. One of the parties may drop out and another party's name may be substituted. Take for example: *Chaplin v Australian Mutual Provident Society*

or *Australian Mutual Provident Society v Allan*. The Privy Council decision was reported at (1978) 52 ALJR 407 as *Australian Mutual Provident Society v Allan* and at (1978) 18 ALR 385 as *Australian Mutual Provident Society v Chaplin*. Fortunately the *Australian Case Citator* 1973-1980 provides a see reference from *Chaplin v Australian Mutual Provident Society* (1977) - see *Australian Mutual Provident Society v Allan*.

I would suggest that not in all instances will you find a see reference. For someone who is writing about a case, which version do you give them? Obviously, if there is an authorised or official reported version of the case, that is preferred. As neither ALJR nor ALR is "official" for Privy Council decisions, my guess would be to stick to the ALJR citation due to its seniority in publication.

Here are a few more to think about.

1. *Adamson's* case is cited in the index to (1979) 143 CLR 190 as *Reg v Federal Court of Australia; Ex p Western Australian National Football League (Inc)* yet in the index to (1979) 53 ALJR 273 as *Adamson, In re; Ex p Western Australian National Football League (Inc) and West Perth Football Club (Inc)*. The CLR citation would be preferred, although it is commonly known as *Adamson's* case.
2. *Donoghue v Stevenson* [1932] AC 562 is usually cited as mentioned, yet at page 562 the citation has *M'Alister (or Donoghue) v Stevenson*.
3. *Leon Laidely Pty Ltd v The Transport Workers' Union of Australia* (1980) 3 ATPR 40-147 is designated as such in the index to that volume, yet when you use the *Consolidated Case Table* for 1974-1989 in Volume 11 ATPR, the case is under *Laidely (Leon) Pty Ltd v The Transport Workers' Union of Australia*.
4. Looking for *Paul Dainty Corporation Pty Ltd v National Tennis Centre Trust* (1990) 22 FCR 495 in the ATPRs, you have to look under

Dainty (Paul) in (1990) 12 ATPR 41-029. There is no cross reference from Paul.

From the discussion in the above items 3 and 4, I think legal publishers should cite the full name of companies as they are known by the first names, even though the company name may have been a person's name. I would make an exception for initials preceding company surnames, e.g. in citing *Shaddock's* case (*L. Shaddock & Associates Pty Ltd v. Parramatta City Council [No.1]* (1981) 150 CLR 225) I would drop the *L* which precedes *Shaddock*. In the *Australian Legal Directory 1992* (Australian Document Exchange Pty Ltd), the entry for Arthur Robinson & Hedderwicks was under Robinson Arthur & Hedderwicks despite the fact that in previous years it was under Arthur..... Fortunately the entry was rectified for 1993.

Some of the above problems may be overcome by the use of online services, CD ROMs and products such as the newly launched *Australian Case Citator* and the *Australian Legal Monthly Digest* on disk.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bound volumes

- v. 5 parts 3 & 5; 1877
- v. 124 parts 6, 13-25, 27-30; 1978
- v. 125 parts 1-9, 11, 12, 14-21, 23; 1979

CONTACT: ANN MILLER

Government Publications Librarian
Borchardt Library - La Trobe University
BUNDOORA VICTORIA 3083
Telephone: (03) 479 2943
Fax: (03) 471 0993

Available free; recipient to pay transport

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

The lease on the ALLG's Melbourne PO Box ran out on March 30, 1993. Please address all correspondence to:

Box E40
Queen Victoria Terrace
Canberra ACT 2600