Congressman Robert A. Young

Subcommittee Chairman Favors Buying Over Leasing of Public Buildings

This month’s interviewee is Congressman Robert A. Young (D-Mo.), whose work as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds directly affects courthouses and facilities occupied by federal judges. The decisions of this subcommittee go to the parent House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the subcommittee’s recommendations carry great weight. In this interview, the congressman explains the review process, how the subcommittee operates, and why he was selected to serve on it.

Congressman Young, who is serving his fifth term in the House, has a reputation as a strong supporter of federal construction of office space, as opposed to long-term leases, and he frequently travels to personally inspect courthouses and their facilities.

Congressman Young began his political career on the state level by serving in both the Missouri House of Representatives and the Missouri Senate. This background, and his experience as a builder, made him a natural choice for membership on the House Public Works and Transportation Committee.

Every two years, the Judicial Conference recommends additionaljudgeships to Congress. Simultaneously, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the General Services Administration commence preliminary assessments of increased space needs for the requested judgeships. When an omnibus judgeship bill is reported from either congressional judiciary committee, cost estimates are prepared that include estimated expenditures for space. Would you describe the role your subcommittee plays in this process?

Once any new judges are appointed or the courts need increased space, they usually go to the General Services Administration. I think we have five regions throughout the whole country, and when those bills look like they are going to pass, then GSA has to get busy to try to find some space for the new courts. When they determine that the cost for new space exceeds $500,000, they must get a prospectus made up and submitted to our Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee; then, after we hold a hearing, GSA presents testimony to
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one foot in the present and one in the past.”

The cure for that kind of behavior, Judge Godbold continued, is “to ask ourselves regularly: ‘Why do we do this in this manner?’ ‘Could we do it better?’ ‘Do we need to do it at all?’”

One possible way to break with established practice, and thus save time, Judge Godbold said, is to write less, and do it faster.

“I want each word [I write] to be polished and to shine,” he noted. “But in a proper scale of values for case decisions, by too many cases, maybe this emphasis on style and perfection is wrong.”

Judge Godbold also suggested that district courts might rely less on the written word. An example of writing overuse, he said, was a habeas case where a side issue—whether the testimony of the state trial judge should be taken live or by deposition or affidavit—produced four sets of briefs, punctuated by two written motions for extensions and two written extension orders. The issue was decided eight months after it was raised. “The dispute could have been solved in 10 minutes by calling the lawyers in and having the judge decide it.”

“If a district court is drowning in paper,” he said, the court will have to ask itself if that has happened “because the judges permit it, or require it, or find themselves unable to break free of the quicksand.”

Chief Judge James R. Browning of the Ninth Circuit also started with the proposition that “the constantly rising volume of litigation will not go away.” He noted that in the last quarter century, the caseload of most federal judges has doubled or tripled, despite increases in the number of judges.

“Thus far,” he said, “the difference has been bridged...primarily by the adoption of innovative techniques. But the upward trend in filings continues unabated. The problem will not go away. We must continue to develop more efficient ways of managing our affairs—through greater decentralization, improved organization, better planning, improved case management, vigilant monitoring of the processing of cases, more effective use of advancing technology, development of workable alternatives to the judicial resolution of disputes. And we must do this in such a way that management does not intrude upon the performance by judges of their essential task of judging, but instead frees them to judge more effectively.”

One radical change that would have a dramatic timesaving effect—discretionary review in the court of appeals—is being circulated for comment by the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council’s senior advisory board, Judge Browning said. He also noted the widespread efforts in courts throughout the circuit to promote alternative dispute resolution programs.

“The ‘good old days’ are gone,” Judge Browning concluded. “They will never return again. An ever-growing share of our people are seeking to protect their interests and vindicate their rights in federal court. If the benefits our society derives from the federal court system are to survive, we cannot assume that any of our practices are beyond improvement.”

Chief Judge Spottswood W. Robinson III of the District of Columbia Circuit also noted the relentless increase in that court’s caseload. Among the steps implemented to handle the crush, he reported, were a civil appeals management program and a screening program to detect jurisdictional problems earlier in the appellate process.

Chief Judge Harrison L. Winter of the Fourth Circuit noted at his court’s circuit conference that “the caseload...after a brief respite, is again on the rise.” The court has been successful, he said, in eliminating “bottlenecks” in the appellate process. That has meant that “the supply of cases mature and ready for argument rose sharply during the last 12 months.”

The load has required 15 judges a month, and since the circuit has only 11 active judges, and two senior judges “who continue to work substantially full time,” the gap has been filled by district judges in the circuit who serve by designation.
Chief of AO Bankruptcy Division Appointed

Francis F. Szczebak has been named chief of the Bankruptcy Division of the Administrative Office.

The appointment was announced in June by Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., former AO deputy director.

Mr. Szczebak, who has held a variety of posts at the AO since 1978, assumed his new post in July. He is a graduate of Defiance College in Defiance, Ohio, and Suffolk University Law School, and holds an L.L.M. degree from George Washington University.

Filing Up Again in Most Appellate and District Courts

A large majority of the courts of appeals received more cases this year than last, an Administrative Office report shows.

This report, Federal Judicial Workload Statistics, prepared by the AO’s Statistical Analysis and Reports Division, covers the 12-month statistical year ending last March 31. It shows that the Federal Circuit had the largest increase in new cases in the period surveyed, a rise of 150 percent. The court’s terminated cases rose by 40 percent.

The second-largest increase was in the District of Columbia Circuit, where 33 percent more cases were filed than in the previous period.

The Second, Third, Fifth, and Seventh Circuits all reported slight decreases in new cases filed for the 12-month period. Terminations did not equal filings in the appeals courts. Excluding the Federal Circuit, terminations rose 1.5 percent and filings were up 6.4 percent.

The report also found that the number of civil cases filed in all the district courts rose by 3.3 percent during the period studied. The courts terminated 12.5 percent more civil cases than they did in the earlier period. The number of criminal cases filed in the district courts rose 8.3 percent in the period, more than offset by an 8.9 increase in terminations of criminal cases in that same time.

Filing in the bankruptcy courts rose 1 percent during the period, while terminations increased by 6 percent.

Judicial Evaluation Guidelines Approved by ABA House of Delegates at Annual Meeting

Before journeying to London to meet with the membership of the Law Society of England and Wales, members of the American Bar Association met in Washington, D.C., to consider pending issues, including some of significance to the federal judiciary.

Starting in 1982, a major effort was launched by the ABA to develop guidelines for evaluating state and local judiciary. The redrafting of these guidelines, after extensive meetings and debates for the next three years, emphasized that they were not meant to be hard rules for judicial performance or conduct, or a substitute for polls, but, rather, guidelines for an evaluation process. This was necessary, the special committee on evaluation of judicial performance said, to assure fairness and to accomplish the ABA’s goal—high-quality performance by judges. The committee developed redrafts to meet objections of both lawyers and the judiciary after failing to achieve approval at the midyear meeting of the House of Delegates last February, and the revised guidelines were approved in July.

A proposal that the guidelines include federal judges was defeated after the Conference of Federal Trial Judges argued that the federal judiciary is already specifically covered by the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, as well as by procedures established by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Class actions again had the attention of the House when the sections of litigation and antitrust law pushed to amend rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. One of 40 proposals would amend the rules relating to requirements for certifying class actions and would allow federal judges to use their discretion in excluding individuals from a class. Opponents of aspects of these proposals believe that the changes suggested would allow cases to be certified as class actions that would, under present rules, be disallowed. The Antitrust Law Section has consistently opposed this change. The House took no action but did authorize the sections to present their recommendations directly to the Advisory Committee on the Rules of Civil Procedure.

Chief Justice Burger attended both the Washington and London sessions. In London, where programs were designed for the common interest of both the United Kingdom and the United States, several issues were discussed and vehemently debated by representatives of the ABA and the Law Society. Elicitng the most interest was the discussion of international terrorism, presided over by former vice president Walter Mondale. Other panelists included Britain’s home secretary, Leon Brittan, FBI Director William Webster and his counterpart in England, Scotland Yard Chief Sir Kenneth Newman, and counsel to the State Department Abraham Sofaer, a former federal judge in the Southern District of New York. The panelists and many in the audience agreed that immediate and drastic steps must be taken to end terrorism and to prevent repetition of recent incidents such as the hijacking of a TWA plane in Athens.

See ABA, page 8
interested in nuclear energy and the use of fossil fuel. So that all fits in pretty well. My area has McDonnellDouglas, Emerson Electric, Monsanto, and Mallenkrodt Chemical Co., and a lot of the research and development comes through the Science and Technology Committee. Those, then, are two natural committees for me, particularly as they relate to the middle part of the country and the things that are important in my area.

**Does your whole subcommittee meet en banc?**

Yes, but in a subcommittee like this, because it doesn’t necessarily attract headlines, it’s Mr. Shaw and I most of the time. But we call out and get the members to attend if we think they have an interest in a specific matter. But it is really more of a housekeeping type of activity. It’s very important, and I am sure that when we are through you will realize that this is a very important subcommittee, but if you ask most of the members they would hardly recognize what the subcommittee does. When we found out the number of federal buildings that we have under our jurisdiction, we realized it was incredible. We are paying rent of $1 billion a year for leased space in commercial buildings. Now if that doesn’t shake the public up, I don’t know what will. But Mr. Shaw and I feel that if we can get Uncle Sam to buy these buildings or if we get him to lease them for 10 years with an option to buy them after the end of 10 years, it becomes a part of the federal inventory and we get out of paying these ridiculously high lease costs. Most of the state legislatures have a capital-improvements budget, where you set aside $40 million to build a new state office building so that you are not in leased space. One of the things we have talked about is that GSA starts seeing the building needs, then they think, “Well, it’s easier and it hardly shows up in the budget to go out and lease space.” We’ve just never been very comfortable when you take a look at a 20-year lease that is going to cost the government $40 million to $50 million at the end of that 20-year period and all you have is rent receipts. It’s hard now, particularly in the budget crunch we have all the time, but we’re fighting constantly to get more general revenue money so that we can have GSA build a building and move the people out of leased space. So that’s kind of the thing that Mr. Shaw and I are thinking about—whether we can accomplish that. It’s a big process and will take many years.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959 includes language providing that approval of the House committee would not be necessary for “any alteration and acquisition authorized... the estimated maximum cost of which does not exceed $200,000.” That amount was increased to $500,000 in 1972, 13 years later. Is it now timely, in view of the high degree of inflation, to substantially raise this amount again?

I have no problem with that. We had talked about raising it to $1 million before they’d have to get our approval, but I don’t know of anybody who has really complained to us about it. It’s just that with all the other things we have to do we just really haven’t had time to address it, but I would have no problem with
that. I don’t think it hurts to have us take a look at those sorts of appropriations, though, so the $1 million seems kind of small. Just so they don’t start moving it where the legislature doesn’t have some control. But I would have no basic problem increasing that amount because of inflation and things like that to $1 million or any other figure that would seem reasonable.

Once a prospectus has been approved, how is it funded?

That’s not really part of my business, but I would assume that most of this would go right on to the appropriate House appropriations subcommittee, and in this particular situation Congressman Neal Smith from Iowa is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary. He looks at that. He recently saw some figures on some of the prospectuses and he thought whether we were getting much for our dollar on a couple of the items in the Washington area. I think he felt that GSA could have reached a better agreement with the lessors, and I understand he just released the funds on one particular building because he just thought that the price was too high. So he had his staff reevaluate that lease, and I assume that they figured out that was about all they could do. At least there is that sort of check on what we do, but the money would come from the appropriations subcommittee.

Do you work closely with the House Appropriations Committee?

Closely enough. Maybe there should be a closer relationship because they’re paying the bills and we’re authorizing the leases.

I understand that GSA forwards all prospectuses for a given fiscal year for all three branches of government in January of each year. How do you determine when you will consider a specific prospectus, and do you consider all of the judicial branch prospectuses at the same time?

The staff look over the prospectuses before I ever see them, and they kind of cull them out—the ones that they think would need a closer review or at least should be brought to the subcommittee members’ attention. It works out that way, and we do not consider all the judicial branch prospectuses at one time. A lot of the judiciary is in federal buildings. That is very, very helpful. You’ve got small towns where the building is old or something like that—that’s when we get involved. Under my chairmanship I’ve established an open-door policy with GSA so they are able to come in here and make an appointment and go over those items that are really critical.

Is your subcommittee constituted in such a way that emergency action can be taken if needs are critical?

Yes, and we work very closely with GSA.

If GSA simply does not have sufficient money to complete a necessary building, can your subcommittee help?

Yes. We can move on an emergency basis because our staff is rather small and GSA has already gathered together the information from the agencies. So our subcommittee doesn’t have to go back out in the field and make a determination of how many employees there are, and whether they are using the guidelines set by the president to keep within 135 square feet per employee. Generally, that’s the figure the president has asked us to keep to, and so they have all that documentation ready for us and then we can recheck it if we want. I think we’ve had a good relationship, particularly as a Democrat working with a Republican administration. The heads of the GSA, when they are appointed, usually come in and we have a talk, and I think we understand each other right from the start. I’m not hard to talk with. We are very accessible—as much as we can possibly be—and then I think that if they don’t have sufficient money, we can make a case with the appropriate appropriations subcommittee, and then we can also help them make a case before the Office of Management and Budget.

Have you ever had really strong differences with GSA, say, over whether something was too extravagant?

When I first came in, during the Carter administration, I was not chairman. I became chairman when President Reagan became president in 1981, so I don’t know how the relationship with the subcommittee was before that, but we’ve had a good relationship with GSA and we disagree with them on many things. Now, were the 20- and 25-year leases signed back with Carter and Ford and Johnson? I don’t know because I didn’t think I had to go back that far, but GSA just started bringing in lease after lease with 20-year expiration dates and I said there’s no way, unless it is an absolute emergency, that I’ll approve or authorize any 20-year lease. Bring me something else back. I prefer five- and at the maximum 10-year leases. That would be the maximum of what we are approving right now, a 10-year lease, and we keep asking them to try and get options to buy the building.

With the idea that it would give you another review?

No. We try to encourage building new buildings or buying existing buildings. That’s our goal. We could authorize $500 million tomorrow on new buildings in San Francisco, Oakland, Houston, Dallas—some of the areas where we are paying such high rents per square foot. That would be one of my goals—to have the administration in power give us more money to have GSA build new build-
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Yes. This subcommittee could be gone from Washington all the time—and I think it would be beneficial to the taxpayers—but you have to make roll call.

The judicial branch, like other entities in the government, now pays rent to GSA. Is it a waste of time and money to have one agency paying another?

I don’t know the answer to that question. With GSA being the government’s landlord there is an economy of scale. Meaning they are so large they can bargain with a landowner more effectively because they are not just moving in a group of people. If you have 150 judges trying to get space for themselves and their staffs, they’re all off on their own different agendas. If they have to adhere to GSA, the GSA person has more clout to deal with the landlord. Plus GSA does all the maintenance and they are more cost-effective because they are larger and they do all of the rental and the housekeeping as well. It seems to be about the only system that can work—that GSA has to charge the tenant out of its own fund because those funds are coming from another appropriation process.

Do you pay rent here?
No. Just for supplies and things like that. In the Capitol, Congress does not pay rent. In fact, we own the place.

Do you ever get calls or questions directly from the judges?
There is a proposed courthouse and federal building in Los Angeles that we have approved, and some of the judges are not completely happy with the housing that they might have in the future. They are going to build in that area a new federal courthouse for federal employees. The judges don’t want to leave the old courthouse but we’ve agreed with the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, who is from Los Angeles, that it won’t be that inconvenient to the judges to have two different buildings that they have to operate under, because it is my impression that the older, more senior judges will stay in the older facility in downtown L.A. and the newer judges will move into the new facilities. So I think their concern is not well-founded. I can understand their wanting all to be in one building but it just doesn’t seem possible to work it out. We’ve had correspondence from one judge and we’ve answered and just said we disagree.

I have had a phone call from the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Burger. He wants a new administrative office building for consolidation of all of the administrative employees of the judicial branch. They are in about nine different places throughout the whole Washington area. So I agreed with the Chief Justice and I agreed that we ought to build them a new building. So we passed that out of my subcommittee to the full committee and it is now waiting final action in the House of Representatives. It’s going to be the newest federal building after the Library of Congress and the Hart Senate Office Building. It will be the latest one in the Capitol complex.

A chief judge, John F. Nangle came to Washington to ask for improvements at the federal courthouse in St. Louis. And being from St. Louis I was very familiar with the courthouse and could understand some of the problems. He felt they were subject
Four New Publications Available from Center

The Center recently published *Attorney Fee Petitions: Suggestions for Administration and Management*, by Thomas E. Willing and Nancy A. Weeks.

Building on Prof. Arthur Miller’s seminal report, *Attorneys’ Fees in Class Actions* (Federal Judicial Center 1980), the authors use a case-management perspective to review cases, statutes, local rules, and other materials affecting judicial management of attorney fee petitions.

The report follows a three-part approach to the fee application process, covering establishment of guidelines at the pretrial phase, the fee applications—including the steps involved in applying the lodestar method—and consideration of alternative approaches to the troublesome problem of simultaneous negotiation of attorney fee issues and the merits of the litigation. With regard to the pretrial phase, the authors explore alternative uses of nonjudicial personnel to handle routine aspects of the fee application process. They also discuss techniques for streamlining the repetitive aspects of managing attorney fee applications and disputes, such as use of standardized formats to simplify decisions about market rates and use of local rules to establish a standard process for discovery and settlement.

---

A new edition of *The Sentencing Options of Federal District Judges* is available now for distribution.

This work, by Anthony Partridge of the Center’s Research Division, was published in 1979 and last revised in June 1983. The current revisions reflect recent legislative changes—such as the repeal of the Youth Corrections Act and enactment of the Fine Enforcement Act—as well as administrative and case-law developments. The new edition is current to April 30, 1985.

Copies of the work will be distributed to district judges, full-time magistrates, probation officers, and public and community defenders, as well as to other persons in the judicial branch who have requested previous editions. Copies will also be provided to the Department of Justice for the use of government attorneys.

---

Another recent publication is *Visiting Judges in Federal District Courts*, by Donna Stienstra of the Center’s Research Division, prepared to assist courts that occasionally need the temporary services of a judge from another district or appellate court.

Based on information gathered from clerks in 18 district courts, this report describes the methods some districts use to ensure that a visiting judge’s stay is satisfying and produc-
The Source

The publications listed below may be of interest to The Third Branch readers. Only those preceded by a checkmark are available through the Center. When ordering copies, please refer to the document’s author and title or other description. Requests should be in writing, accompanied by a self-addressed, gummied mailing label, preferably franked (but do not send an envelope), and addressed to Federal Judicial Center, Information Services, 1520 H Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005.


“The Insanity Defense.” In Annals of United States and England, exchanged ideas, and questions came from members of the audience, who represented other nations. Lord Chief Justice Lowry of Northern Ireland delivered the keynote address.

Discussed at length during a meeting at the Notre Dame Law School Center in London was what is being done to assure continuing judicial education, where it is being done, and whether it is being done effectively. Participants from Italy, Ireland, and Australia, as well as those from the


Rep. Rodino to Receive Award at Court Conference

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger will present an award to Congressman Peter W. Rodino, Jr., chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, at the second annual Judicial Conference of the United States Court of International Trade. The conference will be held on Oct. 23. Chief Judge Edward D. Re has announced it will take place at the World Trade Center in New York City, beginning at 9 a.m.

Those interested in attending should register before Sept. 20 by contacting the Office of the Clerk, U.S. Court of International Trade, One Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10007.
Nominations
Ferdinand F. Fernandez, U.S. District Judge, C.D. Cal., July 19
Stephen H. Anderson, U.S. Circuit Judge, 10th Cir., July 23
Ralph B. Guy, Jr., U.S. Circuit Judge, 6th Cir., July 23
Clen H. Davidson, U.S. District Judge, N.D. Miss., July 23
Robert B. Maloney, U.S. District Judge, N.D. Tex., July 23
David B. Sentelle, U.S. District Judge, W.D.N.C., July 25
Brian B. Duff, U.S. District Judge, N.D. Ill., Aug. 1

Confirmations
Wayne E. Alley, U.S. District Judge, W.D. Okla., July 10
Claude M. Hilton, U.S. District Judge, E.D. Va., July 10
James D. Todd, U.S. District Judge, W.D. Tenn., July 10
Donald E. Walter, U.S. District Judge, W.D. La., July 10
J. Frederick Motz, U.S. District Judge, D. Md., July 11
Roger T. Miner, U.S. Circuit Judge, 2nd Cir., July 19
Roger L. Wollman, U.S. Circuit Judge, 8th Cir., July 19
Richard H. Mills, U.S. District Judge, C.D. Ill., July 19
Roger G. Strand, U.S. District Judge, D. Ariz., July 19
John M. Walker, Jr., U.S. District Judge, S.D.N.Y., July 19

Appointments
Charles C. Lovell, U.S. District Judge, D. Mont., May 10
Howell Cobb, U.S. District Judge, E.D. Tex., May 17
Joseph H. Rodriguez, U.S. District Judge, D.N.J., May 22
Sam B. Hall, Jr., U.S. District Judge, E.D. Tex., May 28
George F. Gunn, Jr., U.S. District Judge, E.D. Mo., May 29

Edith H. Jones, U.S. Circuit Judge, 5th Cir., May 30
Ann C. Williams, U.S. District Judge, N.D. Ill., June 3
Kenneth F. Ripple, U.S. Circuit Judge, 7th Cir., June 10

Elevations
Donald J. Porter, Chief Judge, D.S.D., July 1
Maurice B. Cohill, Jr., Chief Judge, W.D. Pa., July 2

Senior Status
Miles W. Lord, U.S. District Judge, D. Minn., May 20
Myron H. Bright, U.S. Circuit Judge, 8th Cir., June 1
Jack Miller, U.S. Circuit Judge, Fed. Cir., June 6
Leland C. Nielsen, U.S. District Judge, S.D. Cal., June 14
Andrew W. Bogue, U.S. District Judge, D.S.D., July 1
Lee P. Cagliardi, U.S. District Judge, S.D.N.Y., July 17

Deaths
Thomas P. Thornton, U.S. District Judge, E.D. Mich., July 1
Harry Phillips, U.S. Circuit Judge, 6th Cir., Aug. 3

Noteworthy
Less Time. The time convicts spent in state prisons dropped to a record low in 1982, the Justice Department has found.

The department's Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that the median confinement was 1.8 years. It based its findings on an examination of the sentences of 157,000 released prisoners in 29 states and the District of Columbia in 1982, the most recent year for which records are available.

Less Crime. Serious crime dropped again last year, but violent crime rose slightly, the FBI reported in its annual crime survey.

All serious crimes—murder, rape, robbery, theft, and burglary—dropped for the third consecutive year, to the lowest level since 1978. There were 11.8 million such crimes in 1984.

Violent crime increased by 1 percent. The number of rapes and assaults rose, but murders and robberies declined.

Four Pakistani judges visited the Federal Judicial Center for a day-long briefing on Center activities during a six-day trip to Washington recently. The guests were (l. to r.) Chief Justice Janid Iqbal of the Lahore High Court, Chief Justice Abdul Karshi of the Sind High Court, Justice Ali Qazi Basha of the Peshawar High Court, and Justice Mumna Mumra Mirza of the Baluchistan High Court. Each of the courts is the highest in its state.
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tive for both the visitor and the court. It covers issues such as selecting and preparing the visiting judge’s caseload, arranging for his or her travel and accommodations, providing an orientation to the court, and the impact of a visitor on court staff and facilities.

Appended to the report are a list of 10 “essential ingredients” for a visit and two visiting judge checklists developed by one district court.

The Center recently published The Roles of Magistrates: Nine Case Studies, by Carroll Seron. The report, a follow-up to an earlier Center study on the same topic (The Roles of Magistrates in Federal District Courts, FJC 1983), takes a detailed look at nine district courts’ use of magistrates for pretrial case management. Three approaches to the use of magistrates are identified: (1) In some courts, magistrates play the role of peers, or “additional judges,” in court administration and case management; (2) In other courts, they are viewed as specialists who become experts in particular areas of the docket, such as Social Security or prisoner cases; and (3) in still other courts, they are considered members of a team and are given discretionary responsibility for the pretrial phases of case processing.

The report also examines the extent to which the outcome of magistrates’ work is questioned by lawyers, finding that magistrates’ reports and recommendations generally are not challenged. The author concludes that magistrates are making a significant contribution to case management and conservation of judicial time, and that this contribution can be further enhanced if the bar and court staff are educated about the potential roles of magistrates.

* * *

Copies of these reports can be obtained by writing to Information Services, 1520 H St., N.W., Washington, DC 20005. Enclose a self-addressed, gummed label, preferably franked (but do not send an envelope).