

magazine system, because it was more compact, more easily controlled (an extensive check-out system is not needed and the file order is fixed), the rolls can be economically duplicated and misfiles are obvious, and it could be indexed for manual or machine search, making reference to such a numerically arranged roll file as rapid as reference to other microforms.

The Clerk felt that the microfilm system should prove acceptable to the records users before his photostatic system of recording was abandoned, and he proposed a parallel run. The volume records were to be restricted unless a positive demand for them was made. The parallel run was to be for one year, and would require no additional personnel.

It was decided that the Comptroller's authorization for the expenditure of funds to implement the proposed system could be obtained on the basis of the comparative costs of recording, and that it would not be necessary to place a price on space or personnel. The Assistant Records Administrator, therefore, wrote to the Comptroller outlining the advantages of the system and recommending that the expenditure be allowed. The established cost of photostatic paper, chemicals, binders, and roller-shelving required to continue the photostatic system was compared to the estimated cost of film and the rental of microfilm equipment for 1966. The photostatic system would cost \$23,786, and the microfilm system, \$6,757. By projecting this saving through 1970 and allowing for an increase of 25 books each year, it appeared that \$100,000 could be saved by recording only on microfilm. The Comptroller approved our recommendation and authorized the expenditure on November 3, 1965.

The microfilm equipment was delivered and tested, and the parallel run began as planned. Although several minor changes have been made, the system operates essentially as designed. The change from photostatic to microfilm recording for the land records in Prince George's County has been well received, although not without some tense moments. A representative of the photographic paper vendor caused consternation among the Clerk's office staff by solemnly declaring that "the image would catch the measles and fade out." The uproar was quieted when it was pointed out that no deterioration has been found in silver positive film and that the 35mm film still made to satisfy legal requirements was designed for book print-out, if necessary. Despite such