or custombuilt equipment calls for a certain increase in size and weight of machines, but its usefulness has been demonstrated. The time-delay system has been designed specifically to eliminate certain disadvantages such as the need for expensive double-system recorders; synchronous motors; re-recording in the laboratory; the sound-picture gap; and the cutting off of "unconcerned" picture or sound in splicing.

The method preferred by Mr. Wunder, which involves the adaption of a tape recorder for film use, requires additional recordings and still leaves the picture-sound staggered on the projection film and does not take care of eventual cuts and splices. Mr. Wunder's idea is good, but it is not a new idea. In fact, similar methods have been in use for almost 30 years, while the time-delay system has been specifically designed to overcome the disadvantages of the double system.

It is my personal opinion that the time-delay-equipped camera can be regarded as its own sound process laboratory able to deliver a ready-to-edit, trouble-free film.

I have been gratified by the response to my paper. So far, I have received six letters from readers of the *SMPTE Journal*. A television station wishes to purchase a set of time-delay adaptors for newsreel work. I appreciate these expressions of interest, and especially I appreciate criticism, such as Mr. Wunder's, for the opportunity it affords to evaluate the time-delay system by comparison with other systems.

December 30, 1963

H. Dussault
11 St. Jude Blvd.
St. Zotique, Soulanges
P.Q., Canada

Dear Sir:

I have read Mr. Dussault's interesting paper, "Time-Delay System for Sound-Picture Syncing." It seems very similar in many respects to the one developed by me and patented under No. U.S. 2,729,454, January 3, 1956.

The patent "related to sound motion-picture film and projection thereof and in particular motion-picture film wherein each picture frame carried its own soundtrack and wherein a picture and sound relating to the picture are projected simultaneously." The system was designated Simultaneous Sound-Track and Picture System or STAP System. Mr. Dussault's Disc-O-Sound Delay System seems to have basic similarities to the STAP System. In the Disc-O-Sound Delay System the elements of the delaying mechanism are incorporated into the recording camera or projector, while the STAP System uses an independent or additional delayer recorder.

An important advantage of the STAP System is that

there is no need to introduce any modification to present sound recording on film equipment (optical or magnetic). The system has been tested successfully, first with one Cine-Voice camera and later with one Auricon Pro-600 camera, without modifications.

The arrangement provides for quick audio playback to check errors and unwanted sounds after each take and for full recording of all takes for future references or use, should the optical recording spoil by overmodulation, too low contrast developing, burning off of lamp, etc. The original recording on tape still remains. It also permits fast and accurate editing of the track and the picture of the original film. (Once a negative is edited it should be printed in projection sync to obtain release prints.)

The system is ideal for newsreel work and for low cost productions where no background music is to be used. Another advantage is that commercials can be taken off kinescope productions without interfering with the program.

For a good many years I worked on the idea of producing a film such as that obtained through the STAP System. In the early days I tried a disc, a drum and a tape loop, ending up, however, by using a recorder capable of producing both the delaying effect and a recording on tape to permit immediate playback after each take to detect errors or unwanted sounds.

Herewith is an example of one of the early tests made by the author; it's an enlargement of one take with a Cine-Voice camera.

February 17, 1963.

Max Mejia Vides
Juan Mora 445 Col. Costa Rica
San Salvador, El Salvador, C.A.

Erratum

Rudolf A. Stampfl and William G. Stroud, "Automatic picture transmission TV camera system for meteorological satellites," *Jour. SMPTE, 73:* 130–134, Feb. 1964.

On p. 133, caption for Fig. 8 (due to rearrangement of page make-up for forms at press time, engravings were transposed after clearance by the authors, to cause the cloud photograph reproductions to be wrongly identified):

For: **(left below) reproduced on Muirhead D700 S; (below) reproduced on Fairchild Scan-a-Fax.**

Read: **(left below) reproduced on Fairchild Scan-a-Fax; (below) reproduced on Muirhead D700 S.**

Addendum: The following Discussion was omitted from the pages of the February *Journal:*

Discussion

LeRoy M. Dearing (L. M. Dearing & Associates): What could you tell us about the spectral response of the particular storage vidicon on the APT camera?

Dr. Stampfl: The sensitivity of cameras used to televise cloud pictures from outer space is adjusted to reject the blue light and to have maximum sensitivity in the near infrared. This region lies in most cameras at 0.5 microns. This camera carries a filter which rejects the blue and lets the near infrared pass, approximately from 0.5 to 0.75 microns.

Addendum

J. Robert Mann, Jr., and Norman Leigh, "Electrical installation techniques for a large film production center," *Jour. SMPTE, 72:* 863–868, Nov. 1963.

These acknowledgments and credit were omitted from the paper:

Acknowledgments: Architects for the MPO Grand Central Studios were Herbst & Rusciano of New York City who were responsible for the design of the entire project and its many special facilities. Julius Goldfarb was Professional Engineer for the project.