

a method of recording, and we therefore urged the sponsor of the bill to amend it in order to include microfilming. This was done and there was every expectation that the amended bill would pass, but unfortunately, it did not. Since microfilming and photostating are now almost the only means of recording found in Maryland courthouses, they will surely have to be dealt with within the near future. It is our hope that House Bill No. 354 can be revived at the next session."

On February 1, 1954, the Archivist wrote in reference to this bill to the Honorable Thomas E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who replied as follows:

"Dear Mr. Radoff:

"By carbon of this letter I am asking Dr. Everstine to prepare House Bill No. 354 of the 1954 session *as amended* [italics supplied] so I may reintroduce it for you in the coming session."

Unfortunately, through a misunderstanding in the office of the Department of Legislative Reference, the bill was reintroduced and passed, but not as amended. All that has been accomplished, therefore, is that we have removed any doubts as to the effectiveness of the law passed in 1949 but omitted from the Code of 1951. We now have on the books a law which regulates the form and character of documents which may be recorded by photostat, a method of recording used in a third of the counties, but none regulating the form and character of instruments which may be recorded by microfilm, the method of recording in use in two-thirds of the counties of Maryland. At this writing, steps have been taken to have this law properly amended during the 1955 Session. Whether now or later, the existence of microfilm as a method of recordation must be acknowledged.

OPINIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

We have all become so used to the substitution of microfilm for original records, both in business and in government, that it seemed worthwhile to raise the question whether our laws which require the maintenance of original records for three or more years at great expense in storage space might not be satisfied by the maintenance of microfilm copies for a like number of years. As the following opinion indicates, the Attorney General of Maryland is not convinced of the totality of this modern metamorphosis.