

DEAN S. EDMONDS
FRANK E. BARROWS
W. BROWN MORTON
NERTON W. SAGE
WILLIS H. TAYLOR, JR.
ERNEST H. MERCHANT
GEORGE E. MIDDLETON
MORRIS D. JACKSON
R. MORTON ADAMS
RAYMOND F. ADAMS
LESLIE B. YOUNG
DANIEL V. MARONEY

COUNSELLORS AT LAW
165 BROADWAY
NEW YORK
WASHINGTON OFFICES
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING

RAYMOND B. CANFIELD
BALDWIN GUILD
ANDREW A. ARNOLD
S. HOWELL BROWN, JR.
LOUIS D. FORWARD
R. STANLEY MANSFIELD
GEORGE E. FAITHFULL
DONAL F. MCCARTHY
HAL E. SEAGRAVES
JOHN ROKIE
JOHN T. FARLEY
CURT VON BOETTCHER, JR.
JAMES B. CHRISTIE
JAMES W. LAIST
CYRUS S. HAPPOOD
ROGER T. McLEAN
HAROLD A. TRAVIS
KENNETH E. MURRAY
HARRY E. DOWNER
CARL E. RING

D4947

October 16, 1939

Mr. Frederick Laist, Vice-President
International Smelting & Refining Co.
25 Broadway, (Room 1720)
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

Re: Johnson et al. Application
Ser. No. 178,352, For: Method
of Producing White Lead

Enclosed are copies of an amendment just
filed in the above-mentioned application in response
to the Office action of April 22, 1939.

Very truly yours,

James W. Laist

Enc.

copy sent to Mr. Case - 17 Oct. 1939

r

PNYC00008486

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

In re application of)
GUTHARD E. JOHNSON and)
REGINALD C. BOWMAN and)
WILLIAM J. KNOX, JR.) METHOD OF PRODUCING WHITE LEAD
Serial No. 178,352)
Filed December 6, 1937)
Div. 56 - Room 4725)

New York, N. Y., October 13, 1939

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D. C.

S i r:

This is in response to the Office action of April 22, 1939.

This communication is being filed following an interview with the Examiner in charge of the application, at which interview the communication was presented informally and discussed. Applicants' attorneys wish to thank the Examiner for his courteous consideration of the case at the interview.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 11 have been rejected as based on an insufficient disclosure. The Examiner questions what is meant by the term "excess carbonation". The word "excess" is used in this application in its usual chemical significance to mean carbonation in a greater amount than is required to introduce only enough carbonate for complete reaction with the material with which the carbonate reacts. In the case of the particular process described and claimed, excess carbonation means carbonation in excess of that required to maintain the bicarbonate concentration of the anolyte at the value desired for the production of a white lead product of desired

PNYC00008487

N11449.01

composition. It is submitted that the meaning of the term "excess carbonation" is readily apparent from the specification. In view of the common usage in chemical parlance of the term "excess", it is believed that no definition is required in the specification of the meaning of this term. It is therefore believed that claims 2, 4, 5 and 11 are based on an ample disclosure.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 11 have been rejected as unpatentable over Johnson et al. The claimed process is an improvement on the Johnson et al. process. The claimed process involves excess carbonation of the catholyte followed by controlled addition of an alkali to the anolyte to establish the desired bicarbonate ion concentration in the anolyte. The process of Johnson et al. involves controlling the carbonation of the anolyte so as to introduce only the amount of CO₂ desired. Precise control of the carbonation step is very difficult to achieve in practice. Applicants have greatly simplified the procedure by incorporating an excess of CO₂ in the anolyte and then adjusting the bicarbonate ion concentration by adding an alkali to the anolyte. This method of controlling the bicarbonate ion concentration in the anolyte is much easier to carry out than the Johnson et al. method of controlling the carbonation operation closely, and it is a more precise method than that of Johnson et al.

The other methods suggested in the Johnson et al. reference for controlling carbonate ion concentration involve deficient carbonation followed by the addition of carbonate salts. This procedure is the opposite of the claimed method. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 2, 4, 5 and 11 are patentable over Johnson et al. and should be allowed.

The Rosenstein patent does not appear to have any bearing on this application. Rosenstein describes a process

for removing hydrogen sulphide from petroleum products. He discloses nothing of the slightest pertinence to this application except the bare statement that sodium hydroxide will react with sodium carbonate to produce bicarbonate, and that this reaction may be used to prevent a solution from becoming too alkaline. There is no disclosure of any method for controlling bicarbonate ion concentration.

It is believed that the claims appearing in this application are patentable over the references and should be allowed. Favorable reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorneys for Applicants