there were proof of serious improvement, and not the mere modification of a formula.

[494] (*3*) Opposition Proceedings. The commonest ground on which patents are invalidated by the courts is that the infringer has brought up new evidence that the invention had been made by someone else before the patent application. Hence many countries provide that a patent application, or a summary of it, shall be published before final issue, to invite objections from interested parties. Only citations of prior publication should be accepted, said SAB, to keep the proceedings cheap and *ex parte*, nor should the date of application be revealed. Further interference proceedings would still be possible, but reduced by this easier substitute. Such proposals were approved by NPPC and NAM,[474] were the subject of study by Federico,[484] and were embodied, together with Revocation proceedings, in a preliminary draft for the 1952 revision of the patent code. Then, on advice of the patent bar *et al.*, it was dropped with the other controversial proposals. But the subcommittee's report of 1960 endorses it.[485]

[495] (*4*) International Search Cooperation. We have proposed above (¶ 440), this utterly logical arrangement for doing once instead of many times, the colossal task of searching the world's patents, literature and practice to determine if an invention be new. Questions of whether or not to grant the patent, and on what terms, could still be easily decided by each country separately, according to its own laws and preferences. We have told how many European countries are proceeding to carry this through; why should not the U.S.? It threatens some jobs for patent attorneys and examiners, but the Patent Office has proved its preference for efficiency by working on reclassification of patents and mechanization of searching (sec. (*8*) below). It would seem logical to divide international patent searching between the chief industrial nations according to the fields in which each is preeminent, e.g., giving chemistry to a German office, various specialities to France, electricity to the U.S., papermaking to Canada, etc. A recent report by the Senate subcommittee [486] describes this and other kinds of international cooperation, and says, "The desirability of more actual administration of patents on the international level through international organizations becomes evident."

[496] (*5*) Nullity Proceedings From Government. These are similar to Opposition proceedings, but allowable up to a year after grant of a patent, and with the Government paying for the suit. The Patent Office would be empowered to cancel an improper patent, after hearing. A draft law for this purpose is in Federico's Study 4 for the subcommittee.[484] Stedman,[215] NPPC.

[497] (*6*) From the evils of Bogus patents, based on Collusion between litigants (¶ 285), or on various other deficiencies, no one remedy offers, but a number of those here proposed would help, here and there. Against collusion might help especially Opposition proceedings (*3*), Nullity proceedings (*5*), Compulsory licensing (*12*), and a Patent Administration (*18*). Patents of Addition, used in various countries with provision for settlement of interferences between the basic and the additive patents, and Petty Patents (*10*) might also help.