

302. Russell, Bert: *The Improvement of Our Pat. Sys.*; *JPOS* 15:666-80, 1933, p. 669.
303. The applications exclude those not paying fees. There were 1,053 employes, Examiner Asst. and higher, on May 31, 1959, and we assume that 90% of their time was concerned with judging patents. The Comr. cites 78.5 applications disposed of per examiner asst., a congruent figure. D. L. Ladd: Comr. Ladd Revs. the Kintner Mgmt. Surv. Rept.; *JPOS* 44:363-78, 1962, esp. charts.
304. Pat. Lag, an article in *Wall St. Jol.* Aug. 28, 1961, describing the hopes of Comr. Ladd to mechanize pat. searching, says a primary examiner can now handle only 80 pats. a year, but formerly 160. *Do.* in N 479.
305. Quoted without date by Edwards (N 252) p. 218, note 45.
306. Russell, N 302, p. 670.
307. Ladd, N 271, his note 14, from the Polaroid Cp.
308. Geniesse, E. W.: *The Examination System in the U.S. Pat. Office*, Study 92 of the pres. ser., 1961, 181 pp.
310. Frost, N 221, p. 61, with reference 243 to the Subcom'ee's *Hearings*, Oct. 10-12, 1955, pp. 162, 198.
311. From Federico's data (N 20) in *JPOS* 38:326,7, weighting equally the Appeals and Dist. Courts, for 1948-54.
312. Senate Subcom'ee on Pats.: *Review of the Am. Pat. Sys.*, Rept. No. 1464, Jan. 30, 1956, 16 pp., gives the time as 3 years 5 months; p. 6. For ¶ 397, pp. 2,3.
313. Forkosch, M. D.: *Economics of Am. Pat. Law*; N.Y. Sch. of Law, *Contemp. Law Pamphlets*, ser. 4, No. 2, 1940, 72 pp., p. 24ff. cited; same in *N.Y. U. Law Qly. Rev.* 17:157-99 and 406-35.
314. Frost, N 221, his p. 66.
315. Jewett, F. B.: *Are Pats. Suppressed? Record Fails To Support Charges*; *Pub. Interest*, N 134, pp. 31,2.
316. Quoted by Stern, N 321, 4th p.
317. Acc. to Folk, N 204.
318. Meinhardt, P.: *Invs., Pats. & Monop.* Lon., 1946, 352 pp.
319. Frost, N 221, pp. 28-30.
320. Bush, Vannevar: *Proposals for Improving the Pat. Sys.*, Study No. 1 of the pres. ser., 1956, 30 pp., p. 17,18 and 27,8.
321. Stern, B. J.: *Restraints upon the Utilization of Invs.*; *Annals of Am. Acad.*, November 1938, 19 pp.
322. Vaughan (N 254) gives a whole chapter to "Suppression of Pats." (pp. 227-60), but includes many kinds of action, with no clear case under our definition.
323. Barber, B.: *Science and the Social Order*, 1952, chap. 10.
324. Sanders, B. S., J. Rossman & L. J. Harris: *The Nonuse of Patented Inventions*; *PTCJRE* 2:1-60, 1958; p. 21,2.
325. *Soviet Union Rev.*, May 1931.
327. Edwards, N 252, pp. 227ff., says these companies were so charged in a named civil action then unsettled (1947). If this be *U.S. vs. GE*, tried in 1953 in the Circuit Court in N.J., the issue appears not to have been tried, perhaps because fluorescent production was by then sufficient. 82 Fed. Sup. 753, 1949; 95 Fed. Sup. 165, 1950; 115 Fed. Sup. 835. 1953.
- Bright, A. A. & W. R. MacLaurin: *Econ. Factors Influencing the Development and Introduction of the Fluorescent Lamp*; *Jol. of Pol. Ec.* 51:429-50, 1943.
- Bachmann, N 127, p. 60, citing Bright, N 229, p. 387, but generally rejecting the claims of suppression.
328. By Oberlin Smith who did not build it. Begun, N 114, p. 2.
329. Begun, S. J.: *Magnetic Recording*, 1949, Chap. I, Hist., p. 2.
- O'Brien, Robt.: *Magnetic Tape Reels off Changes in Way We Live*; *Life*, Aug. 19, 1957, p. 74ff.
- Hearing before the Senate Com'ee of Pats., on Renewal and Extension of U.S. Letters Pat., on S. 1301, Mar. 10, 1932, 43 pp.
331. Sanders *et al.*, N 324, pp. 39 and 7.
332. Gilfillan: *Soc. of Inv.*, N 49, chap. 5: *The Hard Starting of Fundamental Invs.*; examples in pp. 98-100.
333. Plessner, Max: *Ein Blick auf die grossen Erfindungen des 20. Jahrhunderts, I: die Zukunft des elektrischen Fernsehens* (the future of television), 1892, 93 pp. Remarkable prevision and detailed plans for television, sound records on glass or paper, facsimile telegraphy, writing and reading machines, using a selenium photo-cell.
- Gilfillan, S. C.: *The Future Home Theatre*; *Independent* 73:886-91, 1912, *il.*, on wired television and home talkies, and the great importance of the former.