INDEX.

1. An art, a process, which is useful, is as much the subject of a patent, as a machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, 533.
2. The distinction between this case and *O'Reilly* v. *Morse*, 15 How. 62, stated, 534.
3. It appears from the proof in these causes that Alexander Graham Bell was the first discoverer of the art or process of transferring to, or impressing upon, a continuous current of electricity in a closed circuit, by gradually changing its intensity, the vibrations of air produced by the human voice in articulate speech in a way to cause the speech to be carried to and received by a listener at a distance on the line of the current; and this discovery was patentable under the patent laws of the United States, 534.
4. In order to procure a patent for a process, the inventor must describe his invention with sufficient clearness and precision to enable those skilled in the matter to understand what his process is, and must point out some practicable way of putting it into operation; but he is not required to bring the art to the highest degree of perfection, 536.
5. Bell's fifth claim under his patent of March 7, 1876, No. 174,465, is not confined to the magneto instrument, or to such modes of creating electrical undulations as could be produced by that form of apparatus, 537.
6. Bell's fifth claim under his patent of March 7, 1876, also covered his invention of an apparatus to make useful his discovery of an art or process for electrical transmission of speech, and this invention was patentable under the laws of the United States, 537.
7. The discovery and invention patented to Bell by his patent of March 7, 1876, were not described in the publication made by Charles Bourseul in Paris in 1854, nor in the publication in Germany in 1861–63 respecting the experiments and inventions of Philipp Reis, nor in the publication in Germany in 1862 of what are known as the Reis-Legat experiments; and they were not anticipated by the experiments of Dr. Van der Weyde in New York in 1869, nor by the invention of J. W. McDonough of Chicago in 1876, nor by the invention patented in the United States to C. F. Varley of London, June 2, 1868, nor by the invention patented to said Varley in England, October 8, 1870, 539–545.
8. For reasons stated in its opinion the court holds that the alleged in-

vention of the telephone by Daniel Drawbaugh prior to Bell's discovery and invention patented to him March 7, 1876, is not made out, 546–567.

9. For reasons stated in its opinion the court holds that the charge of a fraudulent interpolation in Bell's specification after the filing of it in the Patent Office, between February 14 and February 19, 1876, is not sustained; and that not a shadow of suspicion can rest on any one, growing out of the misprint of the specifications in the Dowd case, 567–570.
10. The authority conferred by the special act of Massachusetts "to incorporate the American Bell Telephone Company," authorized the corporation organized under § 3, Mass. Stat. 1870, c. 224, to select its corporate name, and made the statutory certificate provided for by § 11 of that act conclusive proof of its corporate existence, 571.
11. Section 4887 of the Revised Statutes does not invalidate an American patent which bears a different date from that of a foreign patent for the same invention, but only limits its term to the term of the foreign patent, 572.
12. Letters-patent No. 186,787, dated January 30, 1877, granted to Alexander Graham Bell for an improvement in electric telephony, is a valid patent, and the fifth claim under it was not anticipated by the Schellen magnet, 572.