

0391431

~~G 81~~  
~~1958~~ 10/1  
~~9/11~~ 2

KFH421.5  
L35  
A25  
58-1  
c.2

REVISION

OF STATE

OR TERRITORIAL

STATUTES

HENRY T. AWANA  
Research Assistant

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

OCT 10 1958

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Report No. 1 - 1958

Robert M. Kamins, Director  
Legislative Reference Bureau  
University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii

## SUMMARY

Keeping state or territorial statutes up-to-date constitutes a problem in many jurisdictions. As a solution to this problem, the state of Wisconsin adopted a program of continuous statutory revision in 1910 and some form of the Wisconsin plan has been undertaken by at least 27 other states. The functions of revision and compilation necessary to maintain a body of laws in up-to-date form, and also to eliminate the problems and difficulties associated with bulk revision, are performed by either (1) commissions, (2) legislative service agencies or (3) revisors appointed by the legislature, attorney general or supreme court.

Each plan for continuous revision must provide, at a minimum, for incorporating recent legislative changes into the existing body of statutes. Revisional plans of most states require a thorough and systematic examination of the laws, seeking to cull out obsolete or duplicating provisions and to improve the editing--but not the substantive content--of the entire compilation. One such approach is "topical" revision, under which each major area of the revised laws is worked upon in turn.

Many revision agencies perform related functions, i. e., bill drafting, bill examination and legislative research. Although a few revisors may make recommendations on basic legislative policy, programs of revision are generally limited to the "form" of the law. The staffing and functions of state agencies performing continuous revision, as well as the appropriations received by them, are examined in this report.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary . . . . .	ii
I. Introduction: Statutory Revision . . . . .	1
II. Continuous Statutory Revision Agencies . . . . .	4
Permanent Revision Commissions . . . . .	4
Revision by Legislative Reference Agencies . . . . .	6
Other Revisors of Statutes . . . . .	6
III. Some Factors Involved in a Revision Program . . . . .	11
Functions . . . . .	11
Staff . . . . .	12
Compensation . . . . .	13
Appropriation . . . . .	13
Scope of Revision . . . . .	14
Appendix: Summary of State Programs for Continuous Statutory Revision	
Table I. Agency, Revision Program, Appropriation . .	18
Table II. Staffing and Revisor's Salary . . . . .	20
Table III. Functions of Revision Agencies . . . . .	
other than Revision . . . . .	22
Sources of Data Included in Appendix . . . . .	24
Statutory References to State Revision Agencies . . . . .	25
Bibliography . . . . .	26

## I. INTRODUCTION: STATUTORY REVISION

Publication of a new revision of the statutes of the Territory of Hawaii, the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1955, makes timely the consideration of means of keeping this revision up-to-date. Although the Revised Laws were approved by the legislature in 1957, they are no longer complete or current, for the statutes enacted by the same legislature are not included in the three-volume revision but exist as another source of territorial law, the Session Laws of Hawaii 1957. However, provision is made for the publishing, after each regular session, of a cumulative supplement to the 1955 Revised Laws which will include all session laws.<sup>1</sup> Responsibility for the preparation of the cumulative supplement is placed on the secretary of Hawaii, or any other territorial officer or employee designated by the governor.

The latter provision of the law makes possible the appointment of a revisor of statutes. What would be required before a territorial office of revisor of statutes is established, and whether such an agency would be feasible in Hawaii, may perhaps be determined after an examination of the practices of the several states in which statutes are under continuous revision.

**STATUTORY REVISION**      Revision of state or territorial statutes takes two basic forms. The approach heretofore employed in Hawaii, as in the preparation of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1955, is bulk revision--that is, revision after long intervals of the entire body of statutes.

Bulk revision is ordinarily done by a commission since revision of the entire body of a state's law in a reasonable time

(usually between two sessions of the legislature) requires the work of more than one man. The difficulties in bulk revision are largely those relating to personnel. It is hard to obtain for temporary periods the services of people competent to revise large blocks of the statutes. There is also waste motion in setting up and training the necessary clerical force. The most satisfactory method of handling a bulk revision required the establishment of a large number of committees of experts, legal and non-legal, to whom drafts of appropriate blocks of the statutes may be referred. But even if the groundwork is carefully done, there normally results a feeling of helplessness on the part of any legislature which is presented with a bill several thousand pages long which purports to revise the entire body of statute law.<sup>2</sup>

From the experience of other jurisdictions, as the preceding quotation indicates, it appears that bulk revision has not proved fully satisfactory. Consequently, several states have superseded this method by continuous revision as an attempt to keep statutory law in current status, i. e., keeping statutes constantly up-to-date and compiled in their proper order.

Continuous revision is founded upon the idea that statutes once revised ought to be kept that way. It is a device for simplifying and clarifying the existing statutory law, and making it ready, available and accessible to all, and particularly in keeping it so by regular publication of the general statutes, skillfully indexed, annotated and cross-referenced.<sup>3</sup>

To the lawyer and other persons engaged in legal research, continuous revision results in an important, practical improvement--it becomes relatively easy to locate statutory provisions in any subject matter area. Furthermore, it avoids much of the awkwardness inherent in bulk revision, where the sheer physical volume of work creates difficulty for revisors and legislators alike, and requires a lengthy period for editorial work and printing.

# FOOTNOTES

1. Revised Laws of Hawaii 1955, sec. 1-4.

2. John E. Conway, "Statute Revision for North Dakota," North Dakota Law Review (January 1954).

3. Franklin Corrick, The Establishment and Operation of the Office of Revisor of Statutes in Kansas (1938), p. 3.

## II. CONTINUOUS STATUTORY REVISION AGENCIES

Statutory revision as a continuous and permanent function, first adopted by Wisconsin in 1910, has now been undertaken by at least 28 states. The scheme of revision differs among the several states, but generally, a full continuous revision program includes revision, compilation and enactment. Under the Wisconsin plan, for instance, the revisor of statutes is charged with not only purely revisional operations but also functions of compilation. His revisions are enacted as law, and not merely as prima facie evidence of it. Such revisions would otherwise cause further confusion if they did not replace prior enactments for then they would add to, rather than reduce, the sources of law.<sup>1</sup>

The successful functioning of programs for continuous statutory revision is evidenced by the fact that none of the states that have effectuated such programs have abandoned them. The various state programs differ in several respects, however, one of which is the nature of the agency having the responsibility for the revision function. Classified by type of agency, state programs can be placed in one of three groups: (a) those utilizing a permanent and separate revision commission--8 states; (b) those which include revision functions as part of a legislative reference service agency--9 states; and (c) those appointing a revisor of statutes within an agency other than a legislative service agency or revision commission--11 states.<sup>2</sup>

PERMANENT REVISION COMMISSIONS	Nine states--Colorado, Delaware, Louisiana, Nevada, New Jersey, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia and Washington--have permanent commissions
--------------------------------------	--

for the revision of statutes. The Colorado Committee of Statute Revision is composed of the chief justice of the supreme court, the attorney general and four members of the legislature; it appoints a revisor of statutes and other assistants who are all attorneys at law. The Delaware Code Commission is composed of the executive director of the Legislative Reference Bureau and another attorney-at-law appointed by the governor.<sup>3</sup> The justices of the state supreme court make up the Nevada Statute Revision Commission which employs a director. The New Jersey Law Revision and Legislative Services Commission, which consists of four members of the senate and four members of the assembly, also employs a director.<sup>4</sup> The Tennessee Code Commission is comprised of the chief justice of the supreme court, the attorney general and three other members appointed by the chief justice; the Commission is empowered to employ necessary legal and clerical assistants.<sup>5</sup> In Vermont, the Commission to Revise Statutory Law consists of the chief justice of the supreme court, a superior judge who presides in a county court, the state librarian and two gubernatorial appointees; it is authorized to enter into a contract to revise the Vermont statutes.<sup>6</sup> The Virginia Code Commission is authorized to enter into a contract with a reputable person for the work of codifying and revising the statutes.<sup>7</sup> The Washington Statute Law Committee, consisting of ten lawyers, employs a code revisor who may be any lawyer or law publisher employing competent lawyers.<sup>8</sup>

The Louisiana State Law Institute is a quasi-public organization charged with the direction of the revision of the Louisiana Revised Statutes. It consists of at least 44 members, including the attorney general, the executive counsel to the governor, the chairman of each of the judi-



ciary committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, 12 members of the judiciary, the president of the state bar association and 15 practicing attorneys, the dean and three faculty members from each of the three Louisiana law schools, the officers of the Institute and any Louisiana member on the Council of American Law Institute. In addition to being the revision commission, the Institute is also the law reform and legal research agency of the state. As the law reform agency, it considers the substance of the law and makes recommendations involving changes in policy.<sup>9</sup>

**REVISION BY  
LEGISLATIVE  
REFERENCE  
AGENCIES**      The general purposes of legislative reference agencies are to provide information, research, bill drafting and related legislative services. Along with these functions, continuous statutory revision has been placed within the legislative reference agencies of the following eight states: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine, Ohio, Oregon and South Carolina. The director of the legislative reference agency becomes in effect a revisor of statutes, or he may employ a qualified person to perform the duties of a revisor. Reports, recommendations and bills to effect revisions are submitted regularly in most of these states for approval or enactment by the legislature.<sup>10</sup>

**OTHER  
REVISORS OF  
STATUTES**      In 11 other states, the legislature has placed the statutory revision function under a revisor of statutes, or person performing the duties of a revisor, appointed as follows:

1. by the legislature or a legislative committee--Massachusetts, Missouri, North Dakota;
2. by the supreme court--Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota;

3. by the attorney general--Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina;  
or

4. by the attorney general and supreme court--Wisconsin.

In most of these states, in addition to the primary function of revising, classifying and codifying the laws, the revisor also performs services such as bill drafting, statutory research and similar functions of assistance to the legislature or other governmental agencies. In Florida, for instance, the person performing the revision duties is an assistant attorney general who is also responsible for publishing the biennial report and editing the opinions of the attorney general, preparing the index to the legislative journals and drafting bills for legislators and government agencies.<sup>11</sup> The Kansas office of the revisor of statutes performs the following functions: (1) bill drafting, (2) statutory research, (3) serving as secretariat for the state legislative council, the interstate cooperation commission and the motor vehicle reciprocity commission, (4) filing state administrative rules and regulations and (5) preparing blanks, docket books and forms sufficient for at least the first 10 days of each legislative session.<sup>12</sup> The revisor of Minnesota undertakes bill drafting for legislators, the governor and government agencies and does a limited amount of legislative research.<sup>13</sup>

The Mississippi revisor, being an assistant attorney general, is called upon to advise various state agencies, write opinions, and handle cases and other legal matters.<sup>14</sup> The revisor of Nebraska serves as the reporter of the supreme court.<sup>15</sup> In North Carolina, where the revisor is a member of the staff of the attorney general, he is ex-officio secretary of the General Statutes Commission which is composed of nine lawyers representing the legislature, the law schools, the bar and

bar associations. This commission considers suggestions for revision and the revisor does the necessary research and drafting for the commission. (The revisor prepared approximately 300 bills for introduction during the 1957 session of the North Carolina General Assembly.)<sup>16</sup>

The revisor of Wisconsin is one of the state commissioners on uniform laws and serves on the judicial council; he edits for publication the state departmental administrative rules.<sup>17</sup>

Other functions of revision agencies are shown in Table III of the appendix to this report.

## FOOTNOTES

1. John M. Kernochan, "Continuous Statutory Revision and Compilation," American Bar Association Journal, (November 1950).

2. For statutory references to state revision agencies, see page 25, below.

3. The Delaware Reference Bureau provides office facilities for the use of the Code Revision Commission and the necessary expenses of the members of the commission are paid out of the funds appropriated to the bureau. Revision is not an integral part of the bureau although it has this association with the commission. Actually the work of revision is done in the secretary of state's office and is limited to the correcting of typographical errors. (Letter from Henry J. Ridgely, executive director of Delaware Legislative Reference Bureau, December 19, 1957.)

4. With the New Jersey legislature in almost continuous session since 1947, it has been impossible for the Commission to carry out the function of continuous revision of statutes by a systematic method. (Letter from Charles Def. Besore, chief counsel and executive director of Law Revision and Legislative Services, December 11, 1957.)

5. The Tennessee Code Commission is being assisted in maintaining the Tennessee Code by a private publisher, the Bobbs-Merrill Company. (Letter from A. B. Neil, chief justice of Tennessee supreme court, November 18, 1957.)

6. Act 91, Laws of Vermont 1957, requires a contract with the Equity Publishing Corporation, Oxford, New Hampshire.

7. Under this authority the Virginia commission entered into a contract with the Michie Company for the preparation of supplements to the Code of Virginia 1950; the Code was also prepared by that company. (Code of Virginia 1950, 1956 Cumulative Supplement, p. 5.)

8. The Washington Statute Law Committee consists of a member of the legislative council, the state law librarian, the chairman and one member of the judiciary committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, three members designated by the bar association and a member appointed by the governor. (Revised Code of Washington, c. 1.08.)

9. Letter from J. Denson Smith, director of Louisiana State Law Institute, December 13, 1957, and Louisiana Revised Statutes 1950, ss. 24:201 to 24:256.

10. The Illinois Reference Bureau and the Indiana Legislative Bureau have statutory authority to carry on revision, but have not undertaken

it as a formal operation for the work is satisfactorily performed by private agencies. In Illinois, whenever a change in a section is made, no matter how small, the bill making such amendment must set forth the section in its entirety with the change indicated. This, in itself, eliminates the necessity for much revision required in other states. (Letters from Illinois Legislative Reference Bureau, November 7, 1957 and Indiana Legislative Bureau, November 5, 1957.)

11. Letter from Charles T. Henderson, assistant attorney general of Florida, November 14, 1957.

12. Letter from Franklin Corrick, Kansas revisor of statutes, December 11, 1957.

13. Letter from Esther J. Moellering, special assistant revisor of statutes of Minnesota, November 19, 1957.

14. Letter from Lester C. Franklin, assistant attorney general of Mississippi, December 9, 1957.

15. Letter from Walter D. James, Nebraska revisor of statutes, November 13, 1957.

16. Letter from F. Kent Burns, North Carolina revisor of statutes, November 13, 1957.

17. Letter from James J. Burke, Wisconsin revisor of statutes, November 13, 1957.

### III. SOME FACTORS INVOLVED IN A REVISION PROGRAM

Before establishing a continuous statutory revision program, whether the revisor or person in charge of revision is to be under a commission, legislative service agency or some other governmental unit, consideration must be given, at the least, to the following basic factors: functions, staff, compensation, appropriation and scope of revision. These subjects are briefly examined in turn.

**FUNCTIONS** In addition to purely revisory duties, it is possible for the revisor to be made responsible for the performance of other functions related to legislation, as the discussion on the preceding section indicates. However, the work of revisors should be differentiated from that of law reform agencies, such as the law revision commissions of California and of New York. These agencies are primarily concerned with the substance of the law and give their consideration to changes in basic legislative policy.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, although there are views to the contrary, it appears vital that a revisor, whose services are technical like those of persons employed in bill drafting and legislative reference work, keep apart from policy and its political implications. Without the continuity in office which only a strictly non-political status allows, the benefits of prolonged revisional experience may be lost.<sup>2</sup> One writer has declared the only absolute requirement of continuous revision to be: "Wherever the revision function is located, it must be so located that the bench and bar and the public have confidence that the person doing the revision job is free from political control."<sup>3</sup>

The preceding summary of state programs indicates that many of the revision agencies are responsible for legislative bill drafting. This combination of revision and bill drafting is obviously appropriate. A revisor of statutes develops skill in stating the law in clear and concise language. He becomes deeply experienced in statutory form and style. He thus is peculiarly qualified to draft bills to fit neatly into the existing body of law.

Related legislative reference work is also within the purview of a revisor; he may be called upon to undertake research reports, spot research and counseling for legislators, bill analysis and examination. However, although the revisor because of experience and closeness to the statutes should do work in the field of bill drafting and legislative counseling, it would probably be wise to limit this extra work to the legislative session, leaving him free during the interim period to devote his time exclusively to the function of revision. (See the Appendix, Table III.)

**STAFF** Staffing needs of a revision agency depends largely upon the extent and scope of revision and the number of additional functions that it is required to perform. In Wisconsin, where the revisor carries on topical revision and does not undertake legislative reference or service assignments as a regular function, the staff, in addition to the revisor, includes an assistant whose principal assignment is indexing, an editorial worker who prepares printers' copy, one clerk and one stenographer. Where revision is but a portion of the work of a large legislative agency--such as the office of the Legislative Counsel of California--a large staff of professional employees (25 in California) and as many clerical positions may become necessary. Generally, most of the revisors are assisted by one or two specialists and a clerical staff of not more than four. (See the Appendix, Table II.)

**COMPENSATION**      Salary paid to revisors or persons in charge of revision programs differs among the various states, the lowest annual amount being \$ 2,400 for each of two code commissioners in Delaware. The legislative counsel of California receives \$ 19,000; the Wisconsin revisor of statutes, \$ 11,000. The \$ 7,500 paid to the Kansas revisor each year is supplemented by another \$ 2,000 for the performance of his duties as the secretary for the Legislative Council. Similarly, the code commissioner of South Carolina receives an augmented salary because of his additional duties as director of the Legislative Council which amounts to \$ 10,200. Information from 20 states indicates that the average annual salary for revisors of statutes would be a little over \$ 10,000. (See the Appendix, Table II.)

**APPROPRIATION**      An appropriation for continuous revision must provide for the cost of personnel, operations and printing. The amounts appropriated annually to the various state revision agencies recently have ranged from \$ 2,500 to \$ 113,700. Among the states for which data is available, the lowest appropriation was made by Virginia for 1956-57. (However, in the same state \$ 17,400 was appropriated for 1957-58.) The amount at the top of range is that for the Washington Statute Law Committee, the actual appropriation being \$ 227,579 for the 1957-59 biennium, allocated as follows: printing, \$ 75,000; salaries, \$ 127,579; and operations, \$ 25,000.

Some other appropriated amounts for an annual period are: Colorado, \$ 40,000; Florida, \$ 75,000; Maine, \$ 38,000; Minnesota, \$ 55,848; North Dakota, \$ 23,000; South Carolina, \$ 19,000; Wisconsin, \$ 30,000. Although it would appear reasonable to surmise that the smaller amounts



may not include printing costs, this is not always true. In Delaware, for example, the \$10,000 appropriated for the 1957-59 biennium covers printing costs. (See the Appendix, Table I.)

#### SCOPE OF REVISION

Perhaps the most determinative factor of the extent to which a revisor can undertake any of the additional functions previously described, and one which also governs staff needs, is the scope of revision. Generally, continuous revision must at a minimum be carried on at what may be termed a maintenance level, i. e., incorporating legislative changes; but other maintenance steps would provide for the correction of errors, the elimination of obsolete, unconstitutional, impliedly repealed, duplicated and useless provisions. More thoroughgoing revision also brings together the laws and parts of laws that relate to the same subject. Where the latter is performed in a systematic manner with all the maintenance activities, the most desirable method of continuous revision is achieved. This is known as topical revision, which has been described as follows:

Topical revision, involving the thorough application of the principles of statute revision to individual subjects, furnishes the means through which a continuous revision system can accomplish the true aims and purposes of revision. The subject may be eminent domain, general corporation law, removal and vacancies, administrative procedure, or any other of the many subjects dealt with in statute law.

The revisor, after selecting the subject, gathers, together all the statutory provisions that relate to the subject and carefully studies the annotations to those statutes. He examines the statutes of other states, and consults persons who have a special knowledge of the subject. On the basis of this information, he drafts a clarified, harmonious statute in which the details and technical aspects of the subject are simplified, modernized and unified. He will restrict the changes to the matters of detail,

avoiding controversial matters or questions involving the policy of the law, since policies are for the legislature to settle. Revision deals with details, not fundamentals.

Topical revision bills, limited to a single subject, constitute an ideal method of revision. The revisor has sufficient time to become thoroughly familiar with the subject, and to draft and redraft the bill until it approaches perfection. The legislature is not required to accept the bill on faith, but has ample opportunity to examine its contents and pass intelligent judgment upon it. Through such bills, over a period of years, the most important and most often used statutes will be made plain, certain, and accessible.<sup>4</sup>

Topical revision is undertaken in the following states: Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont and Wisconsin.<sup>5</sup> The other states carry on continuous revision at various maintenance levels. Whichever scheme is employed, minimum maintenance or full topical revision, the main advantages of continuous revision are attained: the statutes are kept current and the cumbersomeness and indigestibility of bulk revision are eliminated.

## FOOTNOTES

1. There is no such law reform agency in Hawaii, although the purposes of the Commission to Promote Uniform Legislation are related. The Commission examines subjects for which uniformity of legislation in the several states and territories is considered desirable. (Revised Laws of Hawaii 1955, SS. 1-45 to 1-47.)

2. John M. Kernochan, "Continuous Statutory Revision and Compilation," American Bar Association Journal (November 1950).

3. John E. Conway, "Statute Revision for North Dakota," North Dakota Law Review (January 1954).

4. Robert K. Cullen, "Advantages of a System of Continuous Statutory Revision," Missouri Law Review (April 1945).

5. Topical revision will probably be undertaken in Washington after its present restoration program is completed. Many lawyers in that state considered the Revised Code a drastic departure from the language of the session laws upon which it was based. As a result, the interim activities of the revisor's office have been largely confined to the restoration of session law language to the Revised Code. (Letters from Richard O. White, Washington code revisor, December 5, 1957 and February 3, 1958.)

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF STATE PROGRAMS FOR  
CONTINUOUS STATUTORY REVISION

Table I. AGENCY, REVISION PROGRAM, APPROPRIATION

STATE	AGENCY	PROGRAM	APPROPRIATION
ARIZ.	Legislative Council	Maintenance	Included in general appropriation for Council
CALIF.	Legislative Counsel	Maintenance	Included in general appropriation for Counsel
COLO.	Statute Revision Committee	Maintenance	\$40,000 (annual); includes printing
CONN.	Legislative Commissioner	Maintenance	\$200,000 for printing and \$15,000 for 1958 Revision
DEL.	Code Revision Commission	Maintenance	\$10,000 (1957-59 biennium); includes printing
FLA.	Attorney General	Maintenance	\$75,000 (annual) average
KAN.	Revisor of Statutes (Supreme Court)	Topical	\$78,120 (1957-58); includes \$25,150 for 1957 Supplement to Kansas General Statutes
KY.	Legislative Research Commission	Topical	\$50,000 (annual); \$50,000 revolving fund for printing
LA.	State Law Institute	Maintenance	\$50,000 (1957-58). Included in general appropriation for State Law Institute
MAINE	Legislative Research Committee	Maintenance	\$66,000 (1957-58); includes printing. \$38,000 (1958-59)
MASS.	Recodification Counsel	Maintenance	\$25,000 (1957)
MINN.	Revisor of Statutes (Supreme Court)	Maintenance	\$45,608 (1957-58) \$55,848 (1958-59)
MISS.	Attorney General	Maintenance	\$Included in general appropriation for Attorney General and for public printing
MO.	Revisor of Statutes (Legislative Research Committee)	Topical	\$125,000 (1957-58). Included in general appropriation for Committee

Table I. Agency, Revision Program, Appropriation (Cont'd)

STATE	AGENCY	PROGRAM	APPROPRIATION
NEB.	Revisor of Statutes (Supreme Court)	Topical	\$45,000 (biennial)
NEV.	Statute Revision Commission	Maintenance	\$131,189 (1955-57). Operations expenses for 1955-56 totalled \$62,252, of which \$58,051 was for salaries
N. J.	Law Revision Commission	Maintenance	Annual payroll approximately \$72,000
N. C.	Attorney General	Maintenance	\$20,954 (1957-58)
N. D.	Legislative Committee	Topical	\$23,000 (1957-59)
OHIO	Legislative Service Commission	Maintenance	\$450,000 (1957-59). Included in general appropriation for Commission
ORE.	Legislative Counsel	Topical	Included in general appropriation for Counsel
S. C.	Legislative Council	Maintenance	\$19,000 (1957)
S. D.	Supreme Court	Topical	\$21,000 (annual)
TENN.	Code Commission	Maintenance	No information
VT.	Statutory Law Commission	Topical	\$120,000 (1957-59)
VA.	Code Commission	Maintenance	\$2,500 (1956-57) \$17,400 (1957-58)
WASH.	Statute Law Committee	Maintenance	\$227,579 (1957-59); includes \$75,000 for printing, \$25,000 for operations, \$127,579 for salaries
WIS.	Revisor of Statutes (Attorney General, Supreme Court)	Topical	\$30,000 (annual)

Table II. STAFFING AND REVISOR'S SALARY

STATE	REVISION	STAFF	REVISOR'S ANNUAL SALARY*
	Professional	Clerical	
ARIZ.	Revisor (who is part of the Legislative Council staff)	Council staff	No information
CALIF.	Legislative Counsel and staff (25 attorneys)	23	\$19,000 (Legislative Counsel)
COLO.	Revisor, Assistant Revisor	1 (8-10 when temporary staff included)	No information
CONN.	Staff of Legislative Commr.'s Office - 5	3	No information
DEL.	Two Commissioners	No information	\$2,400 (each commr.)
FLA.	Asst. atty. gen. and 3 assistants	9	\$10,000 - \$12,000
KAN.	Revisor, 2 asst. revisors, 1 associate revisor, 1 assistant	4	\$7,500 (plus \$2,000 as sec'y of Legis. Council)
KY.	Revisor, 2 attorneys	3	\$7,300 - \$9,300
LA.	Research Coordinator (who is part of State Law Institute) which includes at least 4 researchers	2	\$8,400
MAINE	Director of Legis. Research, Asst. Director	2 (have technical duties)	\$9,000 (Director)
MASS.	No information	No information	No information
MINN.	Revisor, 3 legal specialists	4	\$12,000
MISS.	Revisor (who is part of staff of Atty. Gen.)	5 (Atty. Gen. staff)	\$8,000
MO.	Revisor, asst. revisor, bill drafter	2	\$10,500

Table II. Staffing and Revisor's Salary (Cont'd)

STATE	R E V I S I O N   S T A F F		REVISOR'S ANNUAL SALARY*
	Professional	Clerical	
NEB	Revisor, asst. revisor	3	\$8,500 (includes duties as sup. ct. reporter)
NEV.	Director, 2 asst. revisors	8-15	\$15,000
N. J.	Director, counsels, 2 counsel assistants	7	\$15,600 (director) \$10,200 (counsel) \$8,400 (counsel asst.)
N. C.	Revisor (who is part of staff of Atty. Gen.)	1	\$5,000 - \$6,700
N. D.	Revisor (who is part of staff of 3 of Legis. Comm.)	1-3	\$7,200
OHIO	Research atty. (who is part of Legis. Service Comm.)	Comm. staff	No information
ORE.	Legis. counsel and 2 attorneys	3	\$10,500 (Legis. Coun.)
S. C.	Code Commr. (who is also Director of Legis. Council), 3 attorneys	3	\$10,200 (combined salary as Code Commr. & Director of Coun.)
S. D.	Revisor, 1 legal specialist	2	\$9,000
TENN.	(Private contract)	---	---
VT.	(Private contract)	---	---
VA.	(Private contract)	---	---
WASH.	Revisor, 3 assist. revisors	4	\$12,000
WIS.	Revisor, asst. an editorial asst.	2	\$11,000

\*Or person responsible for revision



Table III. FUNCTIONS OF REVISION AGENCIES  
OTHER THAN REVISION

State	Bill Drafting	Recommends Substantive Change	Research Reports	Legislative Research and Counseling	Other
ARIZ.	x	x	x	x	Reference library
CALIF.	x	-	x	x	Legal analysis
COLO.	x	-	-	-	Bill examination
CONN.	x	-	x	-	---
DEL.	-	-	-	-	---
FLA.	x	-	-	x	Atty. Gen. biennial reports, Atty. Gen. opinions, index to legis. journals.
KAN.	x	-	-	x	Secretariat to 3 state commissions
KY.	x	-	x	x	Reference library
LA.	x	x	x	-	---
MAINE	x	-	x	x	---
MASS.	x	-	-	x	Counsel for the Senate and House
MINN.	x	-	-	x	---
MISS.	x	-	-	x	Atty. Gen. duties
MO.	x	-	x	x	Reference library

Table III. Functions of Revision Agencies  
Other than Revision (Cont'd)

State	Bill Drafting	Recommend Substantive Change	Research Reports	Legislative Research and Counseling	Other
NEB.	x	-	-	-	---
NEV.	x	-	-	-	---
N. J.	x	-	x	x	Bill examination
N. C.	x	-	-	-	---
N. D.	x	x	x	x	Reference library
OHIO	-	x	x	x	Reference library
ORE.	x	-	-	x	---
S. C.	x	-	x	x	Reference library
S. D.	x	-	-	x	---
TENN.	-	-	-	-	---
VT.	-	-	-	-	---
VA.	-	-	-	-	---
WASH.	x	-	-	-	---
WIS.	-	-	-	-	Dept. admin. rules

## SOURCES OF DATA INCLUDED IN APPENDIX

### 1. Letters received by the Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, from:

ARIZ. Harry M. Weakley, revisor of statutes (November 8, 1957)	MISS. Lester C. Franklin, assistant attorney general (December 9, 1957)
CALIF. Ralph N. Kleps, legislative counsel (November 6, 1957)	MO. Edw. D. Summers, revisor of statutes (November 14, 1957)
COLO. Charles M. Rose, revisor of statutes (December 9, 1957)	NEB. Walter D. James, revisor of statutes (November 13, 1957)
CONN. Ellen B. Burns, research associate Legislative Commissioner's Office (November 4, 1957)	NEV. Russell W. McDonald, director Statute Revision Commission (November 18, 1957)
DEL. Henry J. Ridgely, executive director Legislative Reference Bureau (December 9, 1957)	N.J. Charles Def. Besore, chief counsel and executive director Law Revision and Legislative Services (December 11, 1957)
FLA. Charles Tom Henderson, assistant attorney general (November 14, 1957)	N.C. F. Kent Burns, revisor of statutes (November 13, 1957)
KY. Dee A. Akers, revisor of statutes (January 31, 1958)	N.D. William J. Daner, code revisor (December 11, 1957)
KAN. Franklin Corrick, revisor of statutes (December 11, 1957)	OHIO John F. O'Brien, research attorney Ohio Legislative Service Commission (November 7, 1957)
LA. J. Denson Smith, director Louisiana State Law Institute (December 13, 1957)	ORE. Sam R. Haley, legislative counsel (November 13, 1957)
MAINE Samuel S. Silsby, Jr., assistant director Legislative Research (November 4, 1957)	S.C. L. G. Merritt, code commissioner (November 14, 1957)
MASS. Ralph V. Clampt, recodification counsel (December 18, 1957)	S.D. Leo D. Heck, revisor (November 12, 1957)
MINN. Esther J. Moellering, special assistant revisor of statutes (November 19, 1957)	VT. Hazel W. Chisholm, assistant Legislative Reference Bureau (December 10, 1957)
	WASH. Richard O. White, code revisor (December 5, 1957) (February 3, 1958)
	WIS. James J. Burke, revisor (November 13, 1957)

### 2. Report of the Legislative Auditor, 1955-56, Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau, December 1956.

### 3. The Book of the States 1956-1957, The Council of State Governments, Table 1, Permanent Legislative Service Agencies, pp. 122-128.

STATUTORY REFERENCES TO  
STATE REVISION AGENCIES

1. Arizona Code, S. 41-1304.01, added by Arizona Session Laws 1956, C. 129, S. 5.
2. Deering's California Government Code Annotated, S. 10242.
3. Session Laws of Colorado 1951, C. 259.
4. General Statutes of Connecticut 1949, C. 159.
5. Delaware Code of 1953, Title 1, C. 2 as amended by Laws of Delaware 1953, Vol. 49, C. 347.
6. Florida Statutes 1953, SS. 16.43 to 16.53.
7. Illinois Revised Statutes 1953, C. 63, SS. 25 to 32.
8. Indiana Statutes Annotated, SS. 60-1701 to 60-1716.
9. General Statutes of Kansas Annotated 1949, 1953 Supp., SS. 77-301 to 77-307.
10. Kentucky Revised Statutes, SS. 7.120 to 7.140.
11. Louisiana Revised Statutes 1950, SS. 24:201 to 24:256.
12. Laws of Maine 1947, C. 392.
13. Annotated Laws of Massachusetts, SS. 3-51 to 3-55.
14. Minnesota Statutes 1949, C. 482.
15. General Laws of Mississippi 1944, C. 264.
16. Missouri Revised Statutes 1949, C. 3.
17. Revised Statutes of Nebraska 1943, reissue of 1952, SS. 49-701 to 49-720.
18. Statutes of Nevada 1951, C. 304; Statutes of Nevada 1953, C. 280
19. New Jersey Revised Statutes, Cum. Supp. 1953-54, Title 52, C. 11.
20. Session Laws of North Carolina 1947, C. 114.
21. North Dakota Revised Code of 1943, 1949 Supp., SS. 46-0311 and 54-3501.
22. Ohio Revised Code Service Annotated, 1956 Cum. issue, SS. 103.11 to 103.23.
23. Oregon Laws 1953, C. 492.
24. South Carolina Acts and Joint Resolutions 1954, No. 697.
25. Session Laws of South Dakota 1951, C. 177; Session Laws of South Dakota 1957, C. 168.
26. Public Acts of Tennessee 1953, C. 80.
27. Laws of Vermont 1957, Act 91.
28. Code of Virginia 1950, C. 8.
29. Revised Code of Washington, C. 1.08.
30. Wisconsin Statutes 1955, C. 43.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. E. E. Brossard, "Revisor of Statutes," Wisconsin Blue Book (1929), p. 494.
2. John E. Conway, "Statute Revision for North Dakota," North Dakota Law Review (January 1954).
3. Franklin Corrick, The Establishment and Operation of the Office of Revisor of Statutes in Kansas (April 1938).
4. Robert K. Cullen, "Mechanics of Statutory Revision--A Revisor's Manual," Oregon Law Review (December 1944); and "Advantages of a System of Continuous Statutory Revision," Missouri Law Review (April 1945).
5. John M. Kernochan, "Continuous Statutory Revision and Compilation," American Bar Association Journal (November 1950).
6. Allen M. Mitchem, "A Revision of Statutes for Colorado," Dicta (May 1951).
7. "Legislative Service Agencies," The Book of the States 1956-1957, The Council of State Governments (1956), pp. 117-128.
8. Law Revision Agencies, Illinois Legislative Council (January 1949).
9. Report to the Forty-sixth Regular Session of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, Statute Revision Council (1951).
10. Six Methods for Keeping Permanent Statutes Current, Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii (May 15, 1952).