proach to many accepted practices is welcome. The seventy-six pages of appendixes add little to the informational value of this work. In fact the community-college profiles of the site-visit locations are so brief they appear bland.

In total, the book is a good survey of current practice. It is an acceptable resource in the field and should be viewed by information practitioners inside and outside of the community college. Many inferences to the profession as a whole can be gained.—*Judith Sessions, Mt. Vernon College, Washington, D.C.*

Boss, Richard W., and Marcum, Deanna B. **"The Library Catalog: COM and On-Line Options."** *Library Technology Reports* (September–October 1980). Chicago: American Library Assn., 1980. 114p. $40 single issue. ISSN 0024-2586.

Because many libraries, large and small alike, are currently planning or implementing COM or online catalogs, a *Library Technology Reports* on the subject seems particularly timely. This survey was conducted in mid-1980 and is fundamentally sound and helpful despite some errors and omissions.

Like most *LTRs* this one includes both general theory/practice sections as well as evaluations of specific vendors and their products. Although to those with considerable expertise, the theoretical sections may appear to contain little new information, they are nonetheless lucid and relevant and have the advantage of being available in a single, well-organized volume. "Characteristics of an Ideal Catalog," "Questions about COM Catalogs," "Elements in the Design of an On-Line Catalog," and "A Possible Course of Action" are of particular interest. The bibliography could be longer but serves as a useful guide to the tip of an emerging iceberg.

Because it reflects the expertise and biases of its authors, the report is slanted toward turnkey systems at the expense of other services provided by commercial vendors and those of bibliographic utilities. As a case in point, the introduction contains a list of advantages of the turnkey approach but fails to suggest shortcomings.

It should also be noted that "Evaluation of COM Catalogs" focuses on a few well-known reports while failing to even cite dozens of other valuable articles. Likewise, "Other On-Line Catalog Planning" overlooks the vital work performed at Ohio State University, University of Illinois, Washington Library Network, et al.

On the practical side, the contention that COM is not economically viable for collections of under 25,000 titles may not ring true to the many smaller libraries that use COM cooperatively for both local catalogs and resource sharing. With the introduction of roll fiche and the enhanced storage of the ROM IV and Dual Track mechanized viewers, the authors' statement that one roll film cannot accommodate more than 100,000 full entries is also refuted. Interestingly, both the Autographics Micromax 800, a pioneering roll-fiche reader, and ROM III are given detailed, positive reviews. (For reviews of other readers and reader-printers consult the March 1980 *LTR*.)

Although the vendor information is generally sound, such statements as "BNA is a relatively new vendor of COM catalogs" (it was one of the first) arouse some suspicion. More troubling is the omission of some vendors, most notably Universal Library Systems of West Vancouver, B.C. Their popular ULISYS system has been used as the basis of an online catalog at Mission College, California, for five years.

In any event this is still a highly recommended guide if used in conjunction with existing literature and information supplied by vendors, utilities, and informed colleagues.—*James R. Dwyer, University of Oregon, Eugene.*

American Library Association. Resources and Technical Services Division. Filing Committee. **ALA Filing Rules.** Chicago: American Library Assn., 1980. 50p. $3.50. LC 80-22186. ISBN 0-8389-3255-X.

United States. Library of Congress. Processing Services. *Library of Congress Filing Rules.* Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1980. 111p. $5.00. LC 80-607944. ISBN 0-8444-0347-4.

Both the American Library Association and the Library of Congress recently issued new filing rules after almost a decade of thoughtful and educated work, especially by John C. Rather and Joseph A. Rosenthal.

The two sets of rules have many similarities, including the same ancestor: