time study; and an interesting explanation of how break-even analysis can be used to compare costs of different library procedures.

In addition to suggested readings taken from the literature of both libraries and industry, the chapters are followed by a series of related problems. Better organized and more readable than its predecessor, the new edition also contains figures, charts, and illustrations that are clear and understandable. Since more than 25 percent of the volume is in tabular, graphic, or chart format, this clarity is essential. The only error detected was a mix-up in the explanation of the symbols used in operations analysis.

Scientific Management of Library Operations was a valuable primer on work analysis in libraries when it was first published. The second edition is much improved and even more deserving of attention by managers, library system analysts, and students.—Jordan M. Scepanski, Vanderbilt

University.

Neill, S. D. Canadian Libraries in 2010. Vancouver, B.C., Canada: Parabola, 1980. 144p. ISBN 0-920758-10-X.

This publication is essentially three essays held together by a methodology. An annotated, personalized bibliography constitutes 60 percent of the pages, but probably 90 percent of the content. The title is misleading. I can find no evidence that statements are confined to Canadian libraries since Neill discusses libraries existing only in an open society. Libraries and librarians stand "for freedom of good thinking, in the sense of individuals being well-informed, equally informed, and in time" (p.42). Statements made are sufficiently broad to apply to any nation with such aspirations. The predictions, if that is what they are, have little nationalistic base except that Canadians will still be publishing in 2010, and there probably will be a union catalog of the publications.

Although Neill wanted to be objective, he admits his predictions arise out of the "matrix of ideas and facts" from his readings, from which he produced his 140-item bibliography with "Quotations and Comments . . . to Allow You to Make

Your Own Argument" (p.61). Selecting quotations from the twelve volumes of Toynbee's A Study of History for this purpose may be a bit presumptuous. In any event, the reader can be envious of the quantity and quality of the literature that was reviewed to glean the quotes. There is an index that covers the broad topics of the predictions and the bibliography. Often it is difficult to see the relationships this historian-philosopher-librarian-educator makes between his selected quotations with annotations and his predictions covering such subjects as status of women, community participation, community information, censorship, automated information, etc. Nevertheless, it is a noble effort of the author to reveal his sources and method of putting his statements together.

To describe institutional functions thirty years hence results in a spirit of negativism. To offset this negativism, Neill added a second part on "what ought to be done to meet the predictions made in the first part" (p.6). This readable addition leads to the conclusion that "We must make the profession a unity above the collection of institutions which it inhabits or uses" (p.46). The changes in philosophic attitude we accept now will make differences

in our future.

To bolster his arguments, and presumably to make the content more Canadian, a previously published review (in part from the *Annual Review of Canadian Libraries*) of the major studies commissioned by the Canadian provinces between 1933 and 1976 is included. Since few in the United States, and perhaps also in Canada, have had access to these studies, it is professionally gratifying to find reassurance that librarians have been and continue to search for the means to keep our civilization open and free.

In summary, Neill has produced a view of our complex institutional base in very readable language. The publication's value lies in its philosophical insight rather than the logic of the predictions. The latter may be the subject of amusement thirty years from now, but the former will still be part of our existence.—

Vern M. Pings, Wayne State University.