

Proposed Revisions, PH22.2 and PH22.3 35mm Film Usage in Camera and Projector

TWO REVISED American Standards are published on the following pages for 3-month trial and criticism. All comments should be sent to Henry Kogel, Staff Engineer, prior to August 15, 1953. If no adverse comments are received, the two proposals will then be submitted to ASA Sectional Committee PH22 for further processing as American Standards.

The Sound Committee's proposed revisions are primarily a simplification of the titles and an addition of a tolerance to the specification of distance between sound and picture.—*H.K.*

Standards PH22.39, - .53, - .86 and - .87 35mm Screen Brightness; Resolving Power of 16mm Projector Lenses; Dimensions for Magnetic Sound Tracks

THE FOLLOWING proposed standards were approved as American Standards on April 16, 1953, and are published on the following pages as approved:

PH22.39-1953 (Revision of Z22.39-1944), Screen Brightness for 35mm Motion Pictures.

PH22.53-1953 (Revision of Z22.53-1946), Method of Determining Resolving Power of 16mm Motion-Picture Projector Lenses.

PH22.86-1953, Dimensions for 200-Mil Magnetic Sound Tracks on 35mm and 17½mm Motion-Picture Film.

PH22.87-1953, Dimensions for 100-Mil Magnetic Coating on Single-Perforated 16mm Motion-Picture Film.

PH22.39 was published for comment in the May 1952 *Journal*. Addition of the note on outdoor theaters was and is the only change in the 1944 standard.

The revisions of PH22.53 were not of major proportions and so were not published. Slight changes were made in paragraphs 2.2 and 3.1 and a new section, 3.1.1, was added to amplify a provision previously stated in paragraph 3.1.

The two new proposals, PH22.86 and PH22.87 were published for trial and comment in the July 1951 *Journal*. One serious objection was made to the 35mm-17½mm proposal which formed the basis of a paper which was delivered before the 70th Convention at Hollywood in October 1951 and published in the February 1952 *Journal*. After full discussions, the objection (an alternate proposal for four tracks instead of three) was voted down. There was also one objection to the 16mm proposal based on a fear that the magnetic coating might produce excessive wear in the guide rails. This was viewed, however, as a problem in design and manufacture, not standardization, and the objection was withdrawn. Editorial changes were made in both standards and therefore the approved standards published here differ slightly from the drafts as first published.—*H.K.*