

milling royalties paid by Government contractors through September 30, 1964, (2) the continuing rebate of one half of the prime contractor's future share of such royalties, add (3) the grant of royalty-free licenses in the contractor's 12 chemical milling inventions and 5 inventions on which patent applications have been filed.

We believe that difficulties arise as to the Government's license rights because of varied interpretations given the definition of the term "subject invention" contained in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) patent provisions. Although the ASPR definition of a subject invention was revised during our review to mean any invention made " * * * in the course of or under this contract * * *," the Government is still confronted with the difficult task of establishing whether a nonsubject classification by a contractor is justified. We therefore proposed that the Department of Defense amend the ASPR patent provisions to provide a broader and more definitive description of the term "subject invention" and to establish a presumption that any invention made during performance of a contract, which relates to the subject matter of the contract or to work incident to or required under the contract, is a "subject invention."

We also proposed that the Department consider a further amendment of the ASPR patent provisions to provide that both the military services and the Comptroller General of the United States have the right of access to records necessary to determine whether any invention of a contractor is a subject invention or to determine compliance by a contractor with the requirements of the patent rights clause.

The Department of Defense informed us that our proposed change in the ASPR, along with other proposed changes dealing with patent administration, had been considered by the ASPR Patents Subcommittee and that the Subcommittee's report was scheduled for consideration by the full ASPR Committee. When final action is taken by the ASPR Committee, the Department will advise us of any changes in the regulation.

[Index No. 20—B-158427, April 12, 1966]

REVIEW OF SAFETY CONDITIONS IN CERTAIN STORAGE AREAS PRIMARILY IN THE SOUTH BUILDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D.C., DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

We noted that trash was permitted to accumulate in storage areas; printed matter was stored in a manner that obstructed sprinkler coverage; corridors and aisles were used for storage areas, thus impeding the movement of fire-fighting equipment; extension cords were used unsafely; broken bulbs and unprotected lighting fixtures created fire hazards; employees smoked in areas highly susceptible to fire; "No Smoking" signs had not been posted in areas where they should have been posted; and inspection and maintenance of fire extinguishers were inadequate not only in storage areas but elsewhere in the South Building, so that many of the extinguishers were of questionable usefulness. We have included in the report photographs taken during our review in 1964 showing the conditions of some of the storage areas in the South Building.