These patents are made of record.

It is not clear what is meant by "time" at line 22, page 3, in "time-intervals" in connection with same page, lines 10-19, referring to cadence and the use of the device at 2 which would apparently effectually prevent anything like cadence. It appears that the operator strikes a letter on keyboard 1 and then copies what appears on keyboard 2 before striking another key. And even if such operation can go on in cadence, it is not clear how the one de-coding the message can do it with the same cadence. It is also not apparent how the decoding and coding cadences can be the same even though the coding and decoding operator may be the same person.

Page 7, line 7, "bench" is questioned.
Page 10, line 2, should not "so" be -- to --?
Last line, "contact" should be -- contact -- so it is thought.

Page 15, line 2, "march" is questioned. Line 3 from bottom, should not "a" before "contact" be changed to -- one --
Page 16, line 2, should not "112" and "14" be respectively -- 114 -- and -- 85 --? The other numbers in this sentence are questioned.

The claims are rejected as drawn to matter not clearly disclosed as set forth above.
No art more pertinent than that of record has been found after diligent search and inquiry.

EXAMINER.