

*Brackett, R. & H. Woburn, Mass., decing and polishing leather, March 18.
 Brewer, Charles P. Salem, Ohio, fastening leather straps, January 16.
 Briggs, Cornelius Roxbury, Mass., extension-tables, September 9.
 Badlam, Edward Potadam, N. Y., piano-forte, Oct. 25.
 Badlam, C. F. Berlin, Prussia, Anastatic printing, October 26.
 Bruce, J. W. Hingham, N. Y., type-casting, June 7.
 Bartlett, Nelson Bellevue, Ill., portable-bath, Sept. 23.
 Baker, J. H. Columbus, Ohio, tooth-extractor, Nov. 8.
 Brown, James Newark, N. J., firemen's hats, Nov. 1.
 Bogardus, A. Abm. Newark, N. Y., tailors' measure, November 29.
 Bliss, J. New York, time-keeper, August 4.
 Bontsen & Zimmerman, Petersburg, Va., washing-machine, August 26.
 Bolton, Aaron Pittsfield, Vt., bee-hives, Dec. 31.
 Cooley, Anthony Kalamazoo, Mich., winnowing-machine, September 3.
 Clay, Wm. N. England, reducing ores, &c., July 5.
 *Clark, Wm. N. Chester, Ct., screws, January 1.
 Crane, Alanson Lowell, Mass., boring-machine, Oct. 1.
 *Cheatham, David Rockdale, England, cotton-rolling, March 14.
 *Carver, Eleazer Bridgewater, Mass., gin cotton saw, January 4.
 Chapman, Isaac L. New York, hat bodies, May 1.
 Cunningham, R. F. Abington, Ct., looms, operating shuttle, December 16.
 Chase, W. H. Pensacola, Fla., mastic cements, April 16.
 *Coston, B. F. Washington, D. C., gaslight, Jan. 31.
 Cooper, Peter New York, gelatine, June 10.
 Cooper, Chas. New York, india-rubber, June 10.
 Clark, Edw. Brooklyn, N. Y., printers' ink, July 5.
 Clough, Wm. T. Jersey City, N. J., oil from rosin, August 12.
 Campbell, Ethan New York, sugar-making, Oct. 25.
 Chilson, Gardner Boston, Mass., hot-air furnaces, Aug. 4.
 Clute, Peter J. Schenectady, N. Y., stoves, Sept. 19.
 Cox, D. B. Troy, N. Y., cooking-stoves, July 22.
 *Chellar, J. R. Troy, N. Y., cooking-stoves, Nov. 3.
 Cochran, J. W. Attica, N. Y., cooking-stoves, November 12.
 *Cochrane, John Baltimore, Md., steam-engine, April 16.
 Cornell, Ezra Ithaca, N. Y., telegraph, December 20.
 Cornell, Silas Rochester, N. Y., globes, mounting, July 5.
 Creighton, F. New York, doors and windows, Sept. 11.
 Cummings, Robt. Lima, Indiana, excavator, July 14.
 *Curtis, W. Boston, Mass., window-sash, March 31.
 Coleman, E. A. Philadelphia, Pa., lined-plates, Dec. 31.
 Cushman, W. M. C. Albany, N. Y., rails for tracks, January 16.
 Craddock, J. T. Baltimore, Md., filters and refrigerators, December 31.
 Chapman, Abm. Fort Miller Bridge, N. Y., water-wheel, July 23.
 *Cochran, J. W. New York, cotton and other press, April 22.
 *Collins, G. S. Ravenna, O., c. o. o. press, March 29.
 Clark, Wm. N. Chester, Ct., augers, gimblets, Jan. 31.
 Coffin, Jas. B. Middletown, Conn., boring-machine, January 20.
 Cheney, Saml. Cleveland, O., lath-machine, Sept. 27.
 Curtis, F. C. Columbus, S. C., harness-collar, Aug. 4.
 Caldwell, Robert Mobile, Ala., saddle-springs, May 29.
 *Clegg, Geo. C. Port Chester, N. Y., tanning and coloring, April 22.
 *Coffman, Geo. A. Middle Br ok Va., sausage cutter, February 23.
 *Coffey, G. W. Alexandria, D. C., piano-forte, Jan. 16.
 Colvin, Ephraim North Granville, N. Y., uterine support, August 14.
 *Cherry, George W. Alexandria, D. C., ventilating hats, July 26.
 *Cornelius, John D. Westery, N. Y., seines, knitting, May 10.
 *Cobb, Walter Damascusville, Ohio, carriage-brakes, February 12.
 *Caldwell, Erans Pittsburg, Pa., preventing steam explosions, February 24.
 *Decker, Abraham Walcott Township, Ohio, bee-hive, July 30.
 Davis, Jane A. Clark County, Ala., cotton-whippers and cleaners, May 16.
 Davis, Henry G. Clark County, Ala., cotton-whippers and cleaners, May 16.
 Deering, Richd. Senr. Louisville, Ky., hemp-machine, Jan. 10.
 Darfee, Chas. Palmyra, N. Y., rope-making, Feb. 23.
 *Dixon, Joseph Taunton, Mass., composition for bearings of machinery, January 31.
 Deering, Richd. Senr. Louisville, Ky., hemp-machine, June 25.
 Day, Horace H. Jersey City, N. J., hose combination, August 15.
 Day, H. M. Jersey City, N. J., india-rubber, Jan. 6.
 Day, Horace H. New York, plaster adhesion, Mar. 27.
 Davidson, J. New York, preparing provisions, Aug. 9.
 *De Bretton, J. New Orleans, sugar-making, Mar. 24.
 Deane, Louis C. France, sugar-making, July 10.
 Dumas, J. Francis Plaquemine, La., sugar boilers, December 16.
 Davy, John T. of Troy, N. Y., bakers, February 12.
 Davy, John T. Troy, N. Y., cooking-stove, March 12.
 Duff, William Baltimore, Md., spark-arrester, Sept. 20.
 Davy, James Gloucester, Mass., brooms and sads, Dec. 26.
 Dunning, William Dunningville, Pa., carriage-brake, November 1.
 Driggs, Wm. Coatesville, Pa., water-wheel, Nov. 25.
 Downs, Amos St. Clair, Mich., sash-machine, Nov. 5.
 Dane, James West Derby, Vt., saw-mill carriage, April 22.
 *Dexter, J. C. Ionia Mich., stone-dressing, March 12.
 *Dwyer, Abm. E. Boston, Mass., brushes, March 1.
 Draper, W. S. Boston, Mass., piano-forte, June 20.
 Eldred, Allen Openheim, N. Y., cultivator, Dec. 20.
 Ely, Thos. New York, gin cotton rollers, Dec. 11.
 Ems, Coleman C. Maury County, Tenn., hemp-brake, July 14.
 Ely, Theodore New York, wool-burring and cleaning, May 16.
 Edwards, Chas. S. Rushville, Ind., preserving potatoes, December 31.
 Ericsson, John New York, screw propeller, Sept. 9.
 Ericsson, John New York, steam-engine, Dec. 2.
 *Eckson, G. Pittsburg, Pa., propelling boats, Mar. 26.
 Eshola, Josephus Columbus, Ga., propelling canal-boats, November 9.
 *Eaton, John Brookfield, Md., railroads, March 12.
 Eddy, G. W. Waterford, N. Y., c. r. wheels, Dec. 26.
 *Evered, Joshua Sodus, N. Y., water-wheel, July 30.
 *Eckstein, J. Philadelphia, Pa., marble polishing, March 2.
 Ellsworth, Erastus W. East Windsor, Ct., drawing instruments, January 7.
 Edwards, Lewis Norwich, Ct., ruling-machine, Oct. 9.
 Elliott, James Newark, N. J., exercising-machine, September 2.
 Ellsworth, Erastus W. East Windsor, Ct., water-ram, Dec. 6.
 Farrand, Jehl T. Fort Byron, N. Y., stoves, Aug. 4.
 Faber, George Canton, Ohio, water-gate, Nov. 26.
 *Fitzgerald, Jesse New York, coffee-mill, Jan. 25.
 Freleigh, Ferris Stone, Ohio, mill-stone, March 29.
 Finch, Solomon F. Rootstown, Ohio, lath-machine, August 16.
 Farman, Joel Stillwater, N. Y., pottery-ware, Oct. 26.
 Fairchild, Starr Tr mbull, Ct., boot crimps, May 10.
 Frasure, Kasson Maulina, N. Y., buckles for harness, January 16.
 *Frasure, Kasson Maulina, N. Y., buckles for harness, March 25.
 Flemming, L. D. Newark, N. J., abdominal supporter, December 31.
 Field, Edward Port Chester, N. Y., coloring matter, April 22.
 *French, Newell Detroit, Mich., boring-machine, Jan. 23.
 Fessenden, Asa Templeton, Mass., match-splints, April 26.
 Fairchild, Reub. Trumble, Ct., boot crimps, May 10.
 Foster, E. B. Philadelphia, Pa., stencilling, May 13.
 *Francis, Jos. New York, sheet-iron boats, March 26.
 Genin, J. N. New York, manufacture of hats, July 22.
 Gallagher, Patrick Chambersburg, Pa., plow-clevis, November 26.

Grant, Isaac T. Schaghticoat, N. Y., winnowing machine, July 10.
 Gilman, Samuel H. Boston, Mass., manufacture of forks, October 16.
 *Gardner, P. G. New York, hemp-breaker, Feb. 23.
 Guess, Sol. Boston, Mass., removing grease, Aug. 26.
 Goodyear, Nelson Newtown, Ct., india-rubber, April 23.
 *Goodyear, Nelson Newtown, Ct., india-rubber, May 12.
 *Goldman, John East Cambridge, Mass., lamps, Jan. 23.
 Gross, H. N. Palatin Bridge, cooking-loves, May 13.
 Grimes, W. C. Baltimore, Md., spark-arrester, Nov. 13.
 Grimes, Wm. C. Baltimore, Md., spark-arrester, June 7.
 Grimes, William C. Baltimore, Md., spark-arrester, September 23.
 Griffiths, T. F. New Market, Md., attaching keels, April 26.
 Green, Wm. Jr. Woodbridge, N. J., iron ores reduced, July 5.
 *Gardner, Jas. South Lee, Mass., water-ram, Jan. 16.
 Grant, R. C. Pomroy, Ohio, water-wheel, July 26.
 *Gardner, G. P. New York, cotton-press, Feb. 23.
 Gross, Daniel New York, cotton-press, April 22.
 Goodman, Allen Dana, Mass., turning-lathe, July 22.
 Gault, Adin Chagrin Falls, Ohio, bedstead-fastening, Oct. 26.
 Goulding, W. R. New York, truss double pads, July 5.
 *Gibson, D. T. Damascusville, Ohio, carriage-brakes, February 12.
 *Hart, Silas New Haven, N. Y., bee-hives, March 26.
 Hizer, Henry Wooster, Ohio, clover-mill, June 14.
 Harrison, Alford Bilesfield, Mich., cultivator, Sept. 2.
 Hall, H. Mansfield, Ohio, plow-wheel, October 7.
 Hall, Wm. C. Boston, Mass., locks, October 16.
 *Huntington, John Zanesville, Ohio, metallic cones, February 24.
 Hovey, Wm. Worcester, Mass., grinding tools, Sept. 23.
 Howe, J. J. Derby, Ct., wire-machine, Dec. 26.
 *Harrison, John Glasgow, Mo., hemp-breaking, Jan. 7.
 *Harrison, John Glasgow, Mo., hemp-breaking, May 1.
 Hare, Robert Philadelphia, Pa., blow-pipes, July 5.
 *Hill, J. S. Boston, Mass., composition for machinery, January 31.
 Harrison, John Glasgow, Mo., hemp-rotting, May 10.
 Helm, J. New Brunswick, N. J., india-rubber threads, June 7.
 *Higman, Aug. Washington, D. C., chimney smoking, July 22.
 Heddemburg, F. L. New York, stoves, May 7.
 Huntley, Hosea Rochester, N. Y., stoves, August 3.
 Hubbell, Horatio Moyamensing, Pa., propeller, July 14.
 *Howel, Samuel Arcadia, N. Y., propeller submerged, Jan. 14.
 Hood, Andrew New York, gates and gateways, Dec. 16.
 *Hosmer, Arnold East, Ohio, carriage-brakes, June 2.
 Humming, Richd. Boston, Mass., links for cars, Oct. 11.
 Hinckley, Holmes Boston, connecting driving wheels, April 15.
 *Haw, John Hanover County, Va., horse-power, Mar. 15.
 Harris, E. W. Lancaster, Mass., sawing irregular forms, Sept. 27.
 Harrington, David German Flats, N. Y., boot lasting, Aug. 26.
 Haworth, Wade Dayton, Ohio, harness collars, May 7.
 Hagan, Harrison Brandonville, Va., washing machine, July 5.
 *Hoskins, Horatio Scipio, N. Y., washing machine, Aug. 26.
 Hunt, Walter New York, inkstand, May 29.
 Harrington, Dan. Phila., Pa., pen-holders, Sept. 2.
 *Hort, Chas. New Orleans, La., piano-forte, Sept. 27.
 *Hoe, Richd. M. New York, printing-press, May 1.
 *Hosmer, Richd. Boston, Mass., type-setting, Dec. 16.
 *Horr, Malion New York, O., machine app's, Nov. 8.
 *Harrington, Dan. Phila., Pa., galvanic inst., Sept. 2.
 *Hard, D. B. W. Bethlehem, Ct., truss, May 16.
 *Hatch, John Atleborough, Mass., buttons, Feb. 20.
 *Haywood, Benj. Pottsville, Pa., c. a. breaker, May 21.
 Hyatt, Thaddeus New York, vault covers, Nov. 12.
 *Hale, W. R. Boston, Mass., planing machine, Oct. 9.
 *Hale, W. R. Boston, Mass., lathe, July 22.
 *Haisle, Luke Hollis, N. H., horse-power, Jan. 16.
 *Hainval, Chas. Baton Rouge, La., skimming liquors, April 26.
 Harrington, Danl., Phila., Pa., inkstand, Nov. 8.
 Hawkins, Jos. West Windsor, N. Y., gridirons, Mar. 26.
 *Hamm, Henry Quantique, Vt., locks for safes, Nov. 12.
 *Hyes, Joseph Brooklyn, N. Y., machine app's, Nov. 8.
 *Jones, Elias Amsterdam, N. Y., bee-hives, Feb. 12.
 *Johnson, J. Wilmington, Del., smut machines, Nov. 8.
 Jones, Hy. C. Newark, N. J., lock for valves, Aug. 26.
 Jones, Adrian New York, hot-air furnace, Aug. 9.
 Jones, P. New York, ship-anchors, July 5.
 Jones, Jas. Galway, N. Y., wheel-lub., April 11.
 *Jacks, H. E. Huntsville, Ala., saw-cutter, May 6.
 Jewett, N. T. Worcester, Mass., musical reeds, Dec. 31.
 Jackson, G. W. Lynn, Mass., piano-forte, May 1.
 Kingsley, R. Springfield, Mass., lock and latch, Apr. 16.
 Keyser, Andw. Fulton, Mo., lard oil lamps, Aug. 20.
 Kimball, J. T. Kennebunk, Me., carriages, July 23.
 *Knowlton, E. A. Columbia, S. C., corn and cob mill, Feb. 12.
 King, T. H. New York, refrigerators, June 20.
 Kingsley, J. L. New York, printing-press, Jan. 4.
 *Kneeland, J. C. Troy, N. Y., printing-press, Feb. 23.
 Knight, L. L. Barre, Mass., match-splints, April 26.
 Keith, Edwin Bridgewater, Mass., cotton gin brushes, Sept. 9.
 *Keller, Jaques Phila., Pa., marble polishing, Mar. 12.
 *Katuschki, Ky. New York, fire-places stoves, Dec. 11.
 Lamborn, Israel, Marshallton, Pa., bee-hives, Aug. 26.
 Lapice, Jos. L. France, sugar-making, July 10.
 Lewis, H. L. B. New York, portable furnace, Sept. 19.
 Loper, R. F., Phila., Pa., steam-engine, Sept. 20.
 Loper, R. F., Phila., Pa., propellers, Nov. 26.
 *Lefell, James Springfield, O., horse-power, May 16.
 *Levy, E. F. Huntsville, Ala., saw-cutter, July 5.
 *Laighton, Wm. Portsmouth, N. H., backing machine for books, Jan. 10.
 Lewis, H. L. B. New York, calorific dining table, Sept. 27.
 *Lowber, R. W. New York, lead-pipes, March 12.
 Low & Leake, Albany, N. Y., cooking-stoves, Aug. 20.
 *Low, T. Troy, N. Y., cooking-stoves, Nov. 8.
 *Lambert, B. New York, preparing provisions, Aug. 9.
 *Lillie, Wm. Edwards, N. Y., bellows, June 2.
 *McCarthy, F. Demopolis, Ala., cotton-cleaver, Feb. 12.
 *McCormick, C. H. Rockbridge, Va., mowing machine, Jan. 31.
 *McKennon, Angus New York, locks and keys, Aug. 16.
 *Merrick, Geo. New Orleans, bagasse-drying, April 10.
 *Maclean, Jas. Phila., Pa., lamp wick-trimmer, Dec. 26.
 *Montgomery, J. L. New York, stoves, Nov. 1.
 *Montgomery, Jas. Memphis, Tenn., steam boiler, Dec. 26.
 *Montgomery, J. Memphis, Tenn., safety app's, Sept. 2.
 *Mitchell, Alex. Belfast, Ireland, ships' moorings, Apr. 1.
 *Mather, Sarah P. Brooklyn, N. Y., submarine telescope, April 16.
 *McCarty, Hy. Pittsburg, Pa., excavator, April 1.
 *Mussey, Thos. New London, Ct., cart bodies, Nov. 1.
 *Mecay, John, Millsborough, Pa., water-wheel, Dec. 26.
 *Morse, Earnest New York, fire-engines, Dec. 20.
 *Morris, Eph. New York, rising and lowering weights, July 5.
 *Mauck, Robert Honeyville, Pa., flour bolt, Dec. 26.
 *McCarthy, Formes Demopolis, Ala., printing-mill, Feb. 24.
 *Merrick, Silas Fallstown, Pa., stove machine, Nov. 12.
 *Montgomery, Richd. Waterville, N. Y., horse-power, April 10.
 *Miner, John Fallstown, Pa., stove machine, Nov. 12.
 *Magoun, Joseph East Cambridge, Mass., glass pressing, Dec. 31.
 *Mott, Jordan L. New York, chairs, Aug. 20.
 *Moyard, Edw. Washington, D. C., gun locks, Sept. 22.
 *Mills, Wm. New Athens, O., pract. machi e, Nov. 8.
 *Morehead, D. C. New York, galvanic rings, Aug. 26.
 *Morrison, John Newark, N. J., stoves, March 12.
 *Myers, Samuel Schenectady, N. Y., cooking stoves, July 23.
 *Mull, Jas. Phila., Pa., sails for ships, Dec. 11.
 *Moore, H. D. Phila., Pa., marble polishing, Mch. 12.
 *Mott, Jas. Westery, N. Y., knitting skeins, May 10.
 *Newton, Daniel Louisville, Ky., tinware, Dec. 20.
 *Norton, A. P. Waterville, N. Y., vice, May 16.
 *Nield, Jas. Taunton, Mass., loom power, March 15.
 *Nield, Jas. Taunton, Mass., loom power, March 15.

Norton, A. P. Sangerfield, N. Y., bark-mill, June 25.
 Northrup, J. G. Cortlandville, N. Y., printing-press, Apr. 24.
 *Newbury, James W. Kensington, Pa., shoemakers' shoulder irons, Feb. 20.
 *Oates, Geo. Charleston, S. C., door lock, Sept. 24.
 *Oxand, John Portland, Me., locks, April 10.
 *Osborne, Marmaduke New York, hat-bodies, Nov. 11.
 *Owen, B. Parson Cincinnati, O., brick-making, July 26.
 *Owen, Morris Sangerfield, N. Y., bark-mill, June 25.
 *Oliver, Chas. F. Lynn, Mass., piano-forte, May 1.
 *Orton, H. S. Porter county, Ind., bakers, Aug. 9.
 *Pa. As. Elias Whitfield, N. Y., bee-hives, July 26.
 *Powell, Saml. W. Turbot, Pa., clover mill, Aug. 16.
 *Pitts, A. H. Winthrop, Me., fodder cutter, May 1.
 *Palmer, J. E. Haddam, Conn., door-fastenings, Oct. 7.
 *Parkhurst, S. R. New York, cotton gin, May 1.
 *Phoenix Manuf. Co. Paterson, N. J., loom weaving, April 1.
 *Pfeister, Fred Providence, R. I., dye stuffs, Sept. 13.
 *Parker, S. B. New York, propeller, Sept. 26.
 *Pfleger, Leonard Wilmington, Del., propeller, Sept. 13.
 *Pillrow, Jas. England, railway, July 26.
 *Platt, Josiah Bridgeport, Conn., grinding-mills, Dec. 26.
 *Parker, Geo. Carver, Me., wind-mill, Sept. 11.
 *Pfeister, Danl. Switzerland, stone-dressing, April 10.
 *Parnall, P. D. Akron, Ohio, tanning, Nov. 1.
 *Pratt, Elijah New York, nipples 2 1/2, August 4.
 *Pratt, Elijah New York, nursing bottles, August 9.
 *Potter, J. G. Troy, N. Y., cooking stoves, Nov. 18.
 *Peck, R. Attica, N. Y., cooking stoves, Nov. 12.
 *Paterson, Alvan New York, safety valve, March 21.
 *Pelton, A. S. Clinton, Conn., shingle machine, Oct. 16.
 *Plant, John Washington, D. C., chimney, Nov. 20.
 *Quigly, T. B. Massfield, Ohio, plow wheel, Oct. 7.
 *Quinn, G. W. New York, portable forgo, Nov. 18.
 *Quinn, Alex. New Alexandria, N. J., saw mills, July 25.
 *Robb, Jas. Lewistown, Pa., bee hives, Dec. 31.
 *Ralston, Andw. West Middleton, Pa., cultivator, Sept. 2.
 *Rogers, D. B. Stafford, N. Y., cultivator tooth, Nov. 1.
 *Rogers, D. B. Stafford, N. Y., cutting and grinding, March 12.
 *Roberts, J. J. Jeffersonville, Pa., plow, Feb. 12.
 *Rogers, D. B. Stafford, N. Y., dies for cultivator's teeth, Nov. 8.
 *Russell, G. O. Middletown, Conn., knobs for doors, Oct. 7.
 *Reynolds, S. G. Bristol, R. I., pin machine, Dec. 31.
 *Reid, H. G. Scituate, Mass., rivet machine, March 12.
 *Roe, H. A. Erie, Pa., bending sheet iron, Sept. 11.
 *Rust, Samuel New York, lampwicks, May 10.
 *Roney, B. T. Attleborough, Pa., cooking stoves, Sept. 11.
 *Robinson, E. C. Troy, N. Y., cooking stoves, Nov. 26.
 *Rogers, L. A. Redford, removing incrustations from steam boilers, Sept. 11.
 *Rogers, Thos. Paterson, N. J., cut-off valve, May 1.
 *Raisbeck, Jas. New York ships anchors, May 5.
 *Rider, Nathan Worcester, Mass., bridges, Nov. 26.
 *Rowan, Wm. Belfast, Ireland, anti-friction boxes for car axles, Oct. 9.
 *Ray, F. M. New York, trucks for railroads, March 21.
 *Rogers, P. Lewistown, Pa., corn and cob mill, Nov. 1.
 *Royce, R. D. Detroit, Mich., boring and mortising, Jan. 23.
 *Robertson, Thos. A. Georgetown, D. C., shoe peg machine, Aug. 16.
 *Rider, Jas. Wooster, Ohio, boot patterns, June 2.
 *Ross, J. H. New York, vapor bath, April 15.
 *Rogers, H. M. New York, exercise swing, Feb. 26.
 *Riley, W. W. Columbus, Ohio, tooth extractor, Nov. 8.
 *Richardson, W. Philadelphia, Pa., coal breaker, Sept. 2.
 *Rogers, R. C. Saybrook, Ct., machine for dressing bones, Dec. 20.
 *Roberts, S. J. Jeffersonville, Pa., plough, Feb. 12.
 *Sandbar, Abram Carlsberg, Ohio, bee hives, March 26.
 *Snyder, Chas. Lamberburg, N. J., bee hives, Nov. 15.
 *Springstead, R. H. Wooster, Ohio, cultivator and seed planter, Feb. 12.
 *Shearer, Saml. Big Prairie, Ohio, plow, July 14.
 *Seehler, D. M. Wooster, Ohio, straw cutter, Feb. 20.
 *Sabbaton, F. A. Reading, Pa., hot blast forge, Feb. 24.
 *Sellers, G. C. Cincinnati, Ohio, force hammer, Jan. 10.
 *Smith, B. M. Massillon, Ohio, hemp and flax breaking and dressing, Oct. 7.
 *Singleton, W. W. Springfield, Ill., hemp and flax dressing, May 7.
 *Slingerland, Benj. Paterson, N. J., loom weaving, April 1.
 *Schump, G. A. New York, curing meats, May 7.
 *Stanton, N. P. Syracuse, N. Y., impurities from salt water, separating, Aug. 20.
 *Slane, P. F. East Cambridge, Mass., lamps, Jan. 23.
 *Scriptura, S. E. Syracuse, N. Y., oil-lamps, Mar. 15.
 *Staley, Henry West Poutney, Vt., coal stove, Jan. 4.
 *Smith, Theophilus Galway, N. Y., cooking stove, June 10.
 *Stanly Henry West Poutney, Vt., rotary top stoves, Oct. 23.
 *Sims, Thos. D. Norwich, Conn., removing locomotive wheels, Sept. 30.
 *Sweet, Saml. Jr. New York, spark arrester, May 13.
 *Stafford, D. S. Rochester, Ill., excavator, June 10.
 *Scoville, H. H. Chicago, Ill., rock driller, Sept. 9.
 *Speakman, S. T. Philadelphia, Pa., rock and earth borer, Sept. 17.
 *Stratton, K. A. Philadelphia, Pa., rock and earth borer, Sept. 17.
 *Stiner, C. J. Boston, Mass., window sash, March 21.
 *Semples, Jas. Alton, Ill., steam coaches, May 1.
 *Scriptura, S. E. Syracuse, N. Y., carriage wheels, April 1.
 *Springsteen, J. J. Oswego, N. Y., water-wheels, May 16.
 *Soley, O. W. Sodus, N. Y., water-wheel, July 30.
 *Shoemaker, Jos. Syracuse, N. Y., cotton press, April 23.
 *Snyder, Ira W. Flatville, N. Y., bark mill, Oct. 25.
 *Swift, Beriah Washington, N. Y., coffee mill, Aug. 16.
 *Smith, Jazel Petersburg, Va., mill for hulling seed, March 15.
 *St. John, M. W. Plainfield, N. Y., turning lathe, May 13.
 *Stano, D. C. Warwaring, N. Y., sugar handles, Mar. 12.
 *St. John, M. W. Plainfield, N. Y., lathe, May 13.
 *Snow, Chas. Spencer, N. Y., boot crimp, May 21.
 *Saddler, T. N. Spencer, N. Y., boot crimp, May 21.
 *Sandford, Wm. Cambridge, Mass., brick press, Sept. 9.
 *Suits, Benj. Chatham, N. Y., saddles, Aug. 9.
 *Snider, Simon Dayton, Ohio, tanning app's, Aug. 10.
 *Smith, Iva Chagrin Falls, Ct., bedstead fastening, Oct. 26.
 *Sabbie, H. W. Rushville, N. Y., washing and churning machine, Aug. 16.
 *Shaw, W. G. Thompson, Ct., turtle shell bugles, Aug. 4.
 *Senior, W. F. New York, piano-forte bottoms, Nov. 21.
 *Siemens, F. W. Berlin, Prussia, anastatic printing, Oct. 25.
 *Saxton, J. Jos. Washington, D. C., printing-presses, March 21.
 *Starr, T. W. Philadelphia, Pa., type-casting, Aug. 4.
 *Sweet, Benj. M't Morris, N. Y., medicated baths, Dec. 31.
 *Smith, J. C. Chelsea, Mass., portable shower baths, June 2.
 *Stitwell, S. B. Brooklyn, N. Y., garment-cutting, June 20.
 *Sheut, W. H. New York, adhesive plaster, March 26.
 *Seymour, Pierpont East Bloomfield, N. Y., smut machine, Nov. 8.
 *Trump, Jos. Connellsville, Pa., plow, Sept. 9.
 *Tatham, John Rockdale, Eng., cotton roving, laying in cans, March 14.
 *Tenny, Oliver Dorchester, Mass., machine for cotton wadding, Jan. 10.
 *Townsend, Wm. Rochester, N. H. hand loom, Apr. 10.
 *Townsend, E. S. Palmyra, N. Y., making rope, Feb. 28.
 *Tye, H. G. New Brunswick, N. J., cutting india-rubber shreds, June 7.
 *Tyson, Isaac Jr., Baltimore, Md., chromate of potash, Oct. 9.
 *Thyng, L. B. Lowell, Mass., hanging car bodies, Nov. 18.
 *Tyler, P. B. Phila., Pa., cotton press, Jan. 16.
 *Trapp, W. P. Dryden, N. Y., barrel machine, Oct. 1.
 *Tabbot, Saml. Richmond, Va., steam valve, Feb. 23.

Throckmorter R. B. Brooklyn, N. Y., planing machine, May 1.
 Tally, G. R. Westbrook, N. C., irregular sawing apparatus, April 16.
 Taylor, Saml. Cambridge, Mass., bristle blocks, May 1.
 *Treadwell, Danl. Cambridge, Mass., wrought iron column, Feb. 12.
 Thurbee, Chas. Norwich, Conn., writing machine, Nov. 18.
 *Towne, J. H. Phila., Pa., steam-engine, Jan. 10.
 Terry, Eli Plymouth, Conn., clocks, Aug. 9.
 Tainter, Wm. Porterco, Indiana, bakers, Aug. 9.
 *Thorp, Gould New York, cooking stoves, March 26.
 Upham, Geo. Hebron, Ohio, bee hives, May 1.
 Utter, Samuel New York, stoves, May 1.
 Urner, Jessu Wilmington, Del., corn and cob mill, Oct. 26.
 *Varden R.J.B. Baltimore, Md., hinges, Feb. 12.
 Varnahan, Arthur London, England, bee hives, June 20.
 Wheeler, Clark Little Valley, N. Y., bee hives, June 20.
 West, E. C. Bradford, Vt., harvester, June 25.
 Woodward, F. Upper Freehold, N. J., mower and reaper, Sept. 30.
 Woods, Enoch Belvit, Wis., planting machine, Jan. 10.
 *Woodcock, Ban't Wheeling, Va., plow, Jan. 31.
 Warren, J. F. E. New York, threshing machine, July 14.
 *Whipple, Selamon Albany, N. Y., tile cutter, Feb. 12.
 *Whitlow, J. E. Troy, N. Y., spike machine, May 10.
 Washburn, T. F. Lowell, Mass., burring machine, Oct. 11.
 *Whiteman, Hugh Pittsburg, Pa., carding machine, Feb. 12.
 *Warren, T. E. Troy, N. Y., water-proof paint, Mar. 15.
 *Wilson, Jas. New York, parlor grate, Sept. 13.
 *Whidman, Russell Hartford, Conn., spiders, Nov. 8.
 *Whelan, E. Phila., Pa., regulating lamps, March 26.
 *Wolf, Chas. Cincinnati, Ohio, cooking stoves, Jan. 10.
 *Wilson, Robert Williamsport, Pa., cooking stoves, Feb. 20.
 *Woolson, C. J. Cleveland, O., cooking stoves, Sept. 9.
 *Wielbicki, F. P. New York, stone for fire place, Dec. 11.
 *Well, C. L. H. Lockport, N. Y., stone portable, Dec. 6.
 *Wright, W. M. Pittsburg, Pa., preventing steam boiler explosions, Feb. 24.
 *Wright, Wm. Rochester, N. Y., steam engine, Sept. 9.
 *Wilson, J. W. Phila., Pa., trusses for vessels' yards, Dec. 20.
 *Walley, S. S. Charleston, Pa., canal and railroad, Dec. 11.
 *Webster, J. H. St. Louis, Mo., pumps, Feb. 23.
 *Walker, Frank Winchester, Va., pump, May 1.
 *Whitton, M. J. Broadalbin, N. Y., bark mill, Oct. 25.
 *Weikart, Andrew Green Village, O., boring machine, Nov. 1.
 *Wright, Wm. New York, boring machine for grooves, June 10.
 *Wilder, A. A. Detroit, Mich., boring and screw cutting, Jan. 31.
 *Willowby, J. D. Gettysburg, Pa., turning lathe, Mar. 15.
 *Wheeler, Jas. Rootstown, O., lathe, Aug. 16.
 *Webb, Benj. Warren, N. Y., saw mill, April 1.
 *White, Cosman Galway, N. Y., boot crimps, Feb. 12.
 *Wiles, Thos. Somerset, O., harness collars, March 21.
 *Wilder, J. M. Peterborough, N. H., meat cutter, May 10.
 *White, John Marshall, Mich., desk and table combined, Nov. 1.
 *Warren, S. R. Montreal, Canada, piano-forte, July 10.
 *Walker, E. S. Carlisle, Pa., piano-forte, Jan. 16.
 *Ward, Allen Camden, N. Y., tailor's mea's, Dec. 16.
 *Waite John Lancaster, Mass., brick machine, Mar. 12.
 *Young, John West Galway, N. Y., boot crimping, Aug. 26.

[Those marked * have already expired.
 Patentes, or, if deceased, their heirs, may apply for the extension of patents, but should give sixty days notice of their intention. Read our preceding remarks carefully.]

Interesting Items of Useful Information About Patents and Patent Law Cases.

There are questions constantly being put to us by our correspondents touching the legal rights of inventors and patentees. These questions are of a multifarious character, and oft-times involve matters of great importance to those interested. We present herewith a great variety of topics which we have no doubt will interest and instruct all who are in any way concerned in inventions and patent property. The information is mostly based upon the patent laws and decisions made in accordance therewith.

SALE OF INVENTIONS PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF PATENTS.

The question is often asked: "Can an invention be publicly used previous to the application for a patent without invalidating the claim after the Letters Patent are issued?" We answer yes. By the provision of the act of 1839, it is decreed that "no patent shall be invalid by reason of such purchase, sale, or use prior to the application for a patent as aforesaid, except on proof of abandonment of such invention to the public, or that such purchase, sale, or prior use has been for more than two years prior to such application for a patent." This is a humane provision, as it may often happen that, at the time the invention is made, the inventor may not be in circumstances sufficiently affluent to enable him to apply immediately for the patent, or he may desire to make some experiments for the purpose of testing the probable value of his invention.

Inventors, however, should carefully avoid reposing too much confidence in this provision, as the same section of the law thus cited provides that "every person or corporation who has or shall have purchased or constructed any newly invented machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, prior to the application by the inventor or discoverer for a

patent, shall be held to possess the right to use, and vend to others to be used, the specific machine, manufacture, or composition of matter so made or purchased, without liability therefor to the inventor or any other person interested in such invention."

NATURE OF A CAVEAT.

A caveat is a confidential communication made to the Patent Office, and is therefore filed within its secret archives. The privilege secured under a caveat is, that it entitles the caveator to receive notice, for a period of one year, of any application for a patent subsequently filed, and which is adjudged to be novel, and is likely to interfere with the invention described in the caveat; and the caveator is then required to complete his application for a patent within three months from the date of said notice. Caveat papers should be prepared with great care. The government fee is \$20, and this sum applies when the application is made for a patent.

Caveat papers cannot be withdrawn from the Patent Office after they are filed, but additions may be made thereto, by sending them to the Office; and the privilege enjoyed under a caveat may be renewed at the end of the year by the payment of a fee of \$20; and no money is ever returned on caveats, applications for designs, or re-issues.

THE INVENTOR MUST APPLY FOR THE PATENT.

It is necessary, in all cases, that an application for a patent should be made in the name of the inventor. Canadians, and other foreign inventors, have erroneously supposed that by transferring their full rights to an American citizen, preliminary to an application, they could thereby obtain the patent for the same small fee as is required of a citizen. There is not a lawyer either in England or America, from the Lord Chief Justice downwards, competent to prepare a transfer that can convey to another the right to legally execute papers on an application for a patent. In all cases the applicant must swear to his invention, and also as to whether he is a citizen or a foreigner. This is a perpetual bar to the conveyance of any such right.

RIGHTS OF MINORS.

A minor can take a patent in his own name, but it is subject to the control of one of his parents or his legal guardian, the same as any other property that may come into his possession; and when an assignment of an invention or patent is made by a minor, the consent of the parent or guardian should be duly inscribed upon the deed of transfer.

Women can also apply for and obtain patents upon the same terms as the sterner sex. We frequently take out patents for ladies; but they do not exercise their ingenuity as much as they ought.

CURIOUS QUESTION ABOUT OWNERSHIP IN PATENTS.

Many employers think themselves entitled to all inventions made by persons in their service. This is not so, unless there is a stipulation to that effect; and it is high time that employers should abandon such unjust pretensions. No inventor need fear of thus losing his right, unless it can be proved that he was employed expressly to bring out such invention for the benefit of his employer. This fact may or may not apply to an invention made by a slave; his status is, we understand, about to be legally determined.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS.

The United States Patent Office at Washington contains nearly 30,000 models pertaining to patented inventions, all of which are open to public inspection and examination, together with the drawings and specifications relating thereto. But the distance of the capitol and the time and expense involved in a journey thither deters, in effect, the majority of inventors from reaping the advantages which a personal examination of previously patented inventions might often-times give them. To obviate this difficulty we are in the habit of making these examinations at the Patent

Office, for inventors. When it is desired to ascertain definitely whether an invention, believed to be new, has been previously made, or to what extent, if any, it has been anticipated, the applicant sends to us a rough sketch and description of the device. We then make a thorough examination in the Patent Office at Washington, and report the result to the applicant. The charge for this service is only \$5; and it is frequently the means of saving the applicant the entire expense of preparing a model, paying government fees, &c., by revealing the fact that the whole or a material portion of his improvement was previously known. This preliminary examination is sometimes also of importance in assisting to properly prepare the papers, so as to avoid conflicting with other inventions in the same class. The reader should carefully note the distinction made between this preliminary examination at the Patent Office and the examination and opinion given at our own office, either orally or by letter, for which no fee is expected. It is only when a special search is made at the Patent Office that the fee of \$5 is required. We are able, in a vast number of cases submitted to us, to decide the question of patentability without this special search.

PATENT FEES.

When a machine or invention is made by two parties, one being a citizen of the United States and the other a subject of some foreign country, that amount of government fee will be demanded which would be required in case both were foreigners; for instance, if one is a citizen of the United States, and the other a subject of the British Crown, the whole fee would be \$500. To all other foreigners the fee is \$300; while to a citizen of the United States, or to an alien who has resided in this country for one year next preceeding the date of his application, and has within that time made oath of his intention to become a citizen, the fee is only \$30. In case of rejection, followed by withdrawal, two-thirds of the above fees are always returned.

ASSIGNMENTS.

An inventor may sell and assign all his right, title and interest in an invention prior to the application for a patent, or subsequently, as desired. But no assignment can convey to the purchaser the right to apply for the patent in his own name. The petition, drawings and specifications must be signed by the inventor, and no attorney or other substitute will answer, except in case of death, when the heir or administrator may sign.

When it appears to the Commissioner that a full assignment of the invention has been made prior to the application, he will issue the patent to the purchaser as assignee of the inventor.

There are three classes of assignments that must be recorded at the Patent Office within three months from their date, in order to ensure their validity against subsequent purchasers without notice. These are, first, an assignment of the entire patent; second, an undivided portion of a patent; third, the sale of an exclusive right, under a patent, for a particular territory. Illustration:—If A, having already sold a patent to B, turns knave and makes a second sale of the same property to C, who records it, (B having omitted to place his assignment on record within three months, and C having no knowledge of the sale to B,) then the assignment to C will be held valid, and that to B becomes null; B's only remedy being a suit for fraud against A.

We are very frequently asked the following question: "A, B and C each own an undivided third-interest in a certain patent. Can A proceed to manufacture and sell the patented article whenever he chooses, without the consent or without accounting to B and C as to the proceeds?"

In answer we say that A can proceed, without consent, to manufacture and sell the patented article whenever he pleases. Whether B and C can procure an order from the Court compelling A to give bonds that he will account for profits and set apart a third share

thereof to each, under the direction of the Court, is a question as yet undecided.

If an assignment of the invention is made at the time of the application, and the case is rejected after examination, and the inventor or his attorney afterward succeeds in securing the issue of the patent, by appeal or otherwise, this issue does not, as some have supposed, render the transfer invalid. The same remark also applies to a case which may have been withdrawn and re-submitted and patented under a new application.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the Letters Patent cannot issue to the assignee for only a moiety or part of the invention. Neither can the Letters Patent issue to assignees in cases where an inequality of interest exists; for instance, where one party has one-fourth and the other has three-fourths. To secure the issue of the patent to an assignee or assignees, he must hold the full and undivided right to the same.

STAMPING PATENTED ARTICLES.

It is customary, but not compulsory by any existing law, that patentees should have their names stamped or engraved on the patented articles offered for sale; but the patentee is required by law to conspicuously stamp or engrave the precise date on which the patent was issued, upon each article. The penalty of a non-compliance with this rule is one hundred dollars for each violation of the law, and a violation occurs as often as a machine is manufactured or sold. The same penalty is enforced against any person who marks the word "patented" upon a machine or other article for which no patent has ever been granted. This is one of the few forms of falsehood for which our truth-loving legislators have provided a pecuniary punishment. But pending the issue of a patent to an applicant, the latter may mark the words "patent applied for" upon his machine or other article, and affix his name thereto, if he chooses.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE USE OF PATENTED INVENTIONS.

It seems to be a disputed question with many persons, whether a patent for an invention prevents a man from imitating it, merely for his own private use, so long as he does not sell it. We answer, it certainly does. A patent is an exclusive privilege, granting to the patentee, for the term of fourteen years, the right to make, vend, and use, and to sell to others the same rights and privileges; therefore no one has any right to use a machine on his individual account. If this were not so, many patents would be entirely worthless, such as those for bridges and other structures or machines, which could be used by corporations, manufactories, &c., and the whole catalogue of manufacturing processes would thus become of no value.

The question is often asked: "Suppose John Brown owns the right of a patented invention for the State of New York, and John Smith, for the State of Pennsylvania. Then suppose a resident of New York goes into Pennsylvania and there purchases one of the machines thus patented. Now, can the latter individual carry it into the State of New York and use it without liability to John Brown?" We answer no. John Smith can sell as many machines as he pleases, to all who come upon his territory to purchase them; but the purchaser would be liable to damages if he used that machine in any State for which the right was owned by another party. The same remark applies also to the rights for towns and counties. The owner of such a right may take an order to make a machine from another town or county, but he must not sell it there; and the person whom he supplies cannot use the machine without the consent of the licensee of his own county.

CAN A PATENT BE ATTACHED?

This is an important question. It is contended by some that, as a patent is granted to a person specified in the instrument for his exclusive use and benefit, no court nor power of government can deprive him of it unless he

assigns it, and without his assignment the mere possession of the document is as so much waste paper. Lawyers engaged in ordinary civil suits have confused this subject very much for want of proper knowledge on this subject. Some years since we took the advice of an eminent counsel on patents, resident in this city, who gave it as his opinion that, by a proper process of law, a patent can be attached and sold like other property. Curtis, in his able work on patents, referring to the same subject, says:—"The interest in a patent may also be assigned by operation of law, in case of the bankruptcy of the patentee, as well as by his voluntary assignment. There is no question that a patent already obtained passes to assignees in bankruptcy."

REJECTED APPLICATIONS.

When papers are unskillfully prepared, or when an invention is found to have been wholly or in part anticipated, the Commissioner of Patents is compelled to reject the application. The applicant is notified of the rejection by an official letter, which cites briefly the reasons—in one case, requiring a better specification and drawing, or, in the other, referring him to other similar inventions, either patented, rejected, or otherwise known. Applicants, or their attorneys, who live at a distance, are of course unable to examine into the references and reasons given for the rejection; so that, in most cases, they are in the dark as to whether they have been wholly or only partially anticipated; or if an error has been made in the papers, they are equally uncertain as to the proper mode of correction.

We furnish the following letter as an example of cases, badly prepared, that are constantly being placed in our hands, for the purpose of being straightened up and conducted to a successful issue:—

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE,
June 30, 1858.

SIR:—The specification and one drawing of your * * * * are herewith returned, to enable you to furnish a specification which shall more definitely and fully state the construction and operation of your alleged improvements. The claim should be more definite, and should contain the words "substantially as herein above described," or words to that effect. Your oath is not in proper form.

Respectfully yours, &c.,
J. HOLT, Commissioner.

We purposely omit the name of the invention, as well as that of the applicant. It pertains to an application for a patent which was prepared by a lawyer who, though probably well versed in legal lore, possessed no knowledge or facilities for doing patent business. His client's specification was consequently botched-up, and the application was rejected until proper papers should be filed.

THE BOARD OF APPEALS.

An applicant for a patent, if his case is rejected, is entitled to a re-examination and a hearing before the examining-officer; and, if again rejected, he may appeal to the Commissioner of Patents. The latter then calls to his assistance the Board of Appeals—a body composed of three examining-officers—who give a hearing, review the case, receive arguments, and then report to the Commissioner their views as to the propriety of granting the applicant's petition. The Commissioner awards a patent or finally rejects the case, in accordance, generally, with the report of the Board, and here the jurisdiction of the Patent Office terminates.

APPEALS TO THE UNITED STATES COURT.

When the applicant is dissatisfied with the final decision of the Commissioner of Patents, he may petition for an appeal to any judge of the United States Court in the District of Columbia. A government fee of \$25 is required to be paid. The applicant files his reasons of appeal; the Commissioner answers them and produces all the papers before the judge; the latter hears argument, *pro* and *con*, and renders a decision, setting aside or confirming the ruling of the Commissioner.

PRIORITY OF INVENTION.

The fact that a patent has been granted is not full evidence that the patentee was the first inventor. If another individual comes forward, applies for a patent, and proves that he invented the thing prior to the invention thereof by the existing patentee, then the Commissioner of Patents will issue a grant to the second applicant. Two patents will thus exist for the same invention, the first of which, if not voluntarily abandoned by the holder, will, by due process of law, be adjudged invalid.

INTERFERENCE.

Where two different persons simultaneously apply for a patent for the same invention, or when a second inventor asks a patent for a thing already patented by another, the Commissioner of Patents will, either on his own volition or on request of the applicant, declare that *interference* exists; whereupon the Commissioner issues a notice to all the parties concerned, calling upon them to produce testimony, within a specified time, as to their respective dates of invention. This is done by witnesses, examined on behalf of the parties before any judge, justice or other officer qualified to administer oaths. The opposing party has the right to appear and cross-examine the witnesses in person or by counsel. The Commissioner awards the patent to whoever proves priority of invention.

In determining priority of invention, a variety of points are often to be taken into consideration. If the invention was experimentally shown at a prior date, but abandoned, such fact will not be conclusive proof of priority against a subsequent applicant who has gone steadily forward, and brought the invention into useful operation. Nor will the mere suggestion of the thing at a prior date, nor the mere drawing of the same upon paper, always be received as conclusive evidence of priority.

The circumstances which may affect the decision of the Commissioner are various, so that skill and experience, on the part of the attorney who examines or cross-examines the witnesses, is very desirable. After the testimony is submitted, the parties have the right to put in written arguments in support of their cases, reviewing the evidence, citing law points, &c.

The proper preparation of these arguments requires a knowledge of previous decisions in similar cases, and a thorough acquaintance with the law, rules and practice of the Patent Office. Attorneys who are inexperienced in patent business should never undertake to manage interferences.

ABANDONMENT.

After the expiration of two years from the date of a patent, it is then too late for a subsequent applicant to come forward and, by proving priority, receive a patent. In such cases the Commissioner of Patents holds that the prior inventor, by permitting the public exposure for two years, at the Patent Office, of a model and drawings of the invention, without setting up any claim to the invention, has virtually abandoned the improvement, and is not entitled to the protection of the law.

ANNULLING OF PATENTS.

The Commissioner of Patents has no power to annul an existing patent. He can order an interference to be declared between an existing patent and a pending application for a patent for the same invention, and then require testimony from each party in order to substantiate the question of priority of invention. If this is proved by the applicant for the pending case, the Commissioner exercises the right to grant the second patent. The evidence produced in the examination would confer a *prima facie* right upon the successful party.

RE-ISSUES.

The Patent Office is sometimes more averse to the first granting of a patent with a broad claim than it is to allow the inventor to increase his claim by a *re-issue*. It also sometimes happens, after the first issue of a patent, that the claim is not as broad as the inventor was entitled to; or it happens that an infringer, by some peculiar quibble, renders it

doubtful whether, from the wording of the original claim, the patent would be fully established on a trial at law. To meet such cases, as well as to correct any mistakes that may appear in a patent, the law provides for a *re-issue* of the document, with a new specification, new drawings, new claims, &c. It has become quite common for the holders of valuable patents when infringed, to obtain a *re-issue*, before a suit is brought, with claims so worded as squarely to meet the infringer. In other cases where parties are using an invention without infringing, because not then covered by the claim of the patent, it is a practice to have the grant *re-issued*, with a claim that will render any further use an infringement. In such cases the users are generally willing to pay the patentee liberally rather than stand a suit at law.

Again: where the manufacture of a particular device is *intended* to be commenced, a *re-issue* is sometimes obtained as a measure of intimidation.

The owner or assignee of a patent has the same right to apply for and obtain a *re-issue* as the original patentee. The government fee, payable on applying for a *re-issue*, is \$15. The fees of attorneys for preparing and conducting such cases are exceedingly variable. Our limited space forbids further discussion of the subject. Those who are desirous of obtaining *re-issues* are invited to correspond with us. We have had much success in cases of this character.

USING PATENTED DEVICES AFTER EXTENSION.

The benefit of an extended patent inures solely to the original inventor and patentee, or to his legal representatives. An assignee for the first term of the patent only, cannot exercise any right or interest under the extended patent. This question has been determined by a decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. Assignees, however, who were using patented machines at the time of the extension, still possess the right to use the same specific machines under the extended term of the patent, but this right does not cover the manufacture of new machines or their sale to other persons.

The language of the law on this point is as follows: "And the benefit of such renewal shall extend to assignees and grantees of the right to use the thing patented to the extent of their respective interests therein." This clause obviously permits only the using of the invention according to the interest in it, which is the *machine* and nothing more.

LICENSE LAWS OF STATES.

With a view to protect their own manufactures, certain of our States have passed laws regulating the conditions upon which goods may be sold by itinerant merchants or peddlers within their limits. Persons interested in the sale of patented articles have often supposed that these laws could not prevent them from selling such articles, as, otherwise, the laws would conflict with our United States patent code, which gives to patentees and their assignees the exclusive right to make, use, and sell their inventions in all States and Territories within the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court. In this opinion they are evidently mistaken, as each State exercises the right to decide *what* shall be sold, and *how* it shall be sold, within its borders. Therefore peddlers of patented articles cannot sell them in any State where such laws exist, without obtaining a license from the proper authorities.

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS WHO HAVE REMOVED FROM THE UNITED STATES.

It not unfrequently happens that natives of the United States remove to the adjoining provinces, and remain there without taking any legal measures to sever their former political connection. Sometimes inventors have applied to us to know what rights they possess under such circumstances. The following opinion from the United States Attorney-General will enable all to decide for themselves how far removal has affected their citizenship. He says:—

"There is no statute or other law of the

United States which prevents either a native or a naturalized citizen from severing his political connection with the government, if he see proper to do so, in time of peace, and for a purpose not directly injurious to the interests of the country. There is no mode of renunciation prescribed. In my opinion, if he emigrates, carries his family and effects with him, manifests a plain intention not to return, takes up his permanent residence abroad, and assumes the obligation of a subject to a foreign government, this would imply a dissolution of his previous relations with the United States, and I do not think we could or would afterward claim from him any of the duties of a citizen."

COPIES.

Messrs. MUNN & Co. will furnish, on short notice, copies of the full drawings and specifications of *any patent ever granted by the United States government*, except those destroyed by the burning of the Patent Office in 1836, and never restored. The expense of such copies is not much: the cost depends upon the amount of labor involved.

Copies of the *claims* of any patentee we are always ready to furnish for \$1 each patent.

To Patent Agents and Lawyers.

We have at our command the combined facilities of the two largest patent agencies in the country, one being located at New York, and the other at Washington. These facilities include the constant daily access to all the official records, assignments, extensions, books, models, and papers pertaining to nearly all the American patents ever granted, and to thousands of rejected cases and foreign patents. In addition to this, we have the advantage of many years' experience in the business, during which we have, and do now maintain, a palpable pre-eminence over all other establishments of the kind in the world.

We mention these facts for the benefit of our brother agents, wherever they may happen to be located, and would say that the combined advantages of our agencies are *always at their service*. Our position in regard to this, as respects facilities for conducting patent business, is somewhat the same as that occupied by the leading mercantile importers in the seaboard cities in relation to the procuring of goods for country merchants. All the original sources for information and action are at our fingers' ends.

To other patent agents and lawyers we shall be happy to render every assistance in our power in any matters relating to patent business (as we are frequently having occasion to do), whether it be in the prosecution of rejected cases, the preparation of specifications, drawings, assignments, searches of the records, extensions, *re-issues*, appeals, &c.

In new applications it will generally be advisable to have their papers pass through our hands for revision before being sent to the Patent Office, for it is usually more difficult to straighten a case after it has been improperly submitted, than before the documents are filed. Some agents may find it convenient to have us prepare the patent papers from beginning to end. When this is desired, the model should be forwarded to us. Copies of any desired claims, or the patents, with drawings in full, we can promptly furnish.

Our brother agents are, no doubt, frequently applied to for their opinions relative to the novelty and patentability of new inventions. But such has been the wonderful augmentation of improvements within the past ten years, that few persons can give an opinion worth a straw, unless it is based upon or backed up by a *thorough special examination of the models and patents at Washington*. We therefore advise all agents to recommend their clients to have a *preliminary examination* made at Washington, to ascertain whether their invention is actually new. This service will be promptly rendered by us and, including a written report, will cost but a small fee. The client's name need not appear; a sketch and description of the

improvement is all that we need. We shall be pleased to correspond with patent agents, at all times, and to furnish any further information, by way of making arrangements, that they desire. Address MUNN & Co., New York.

In respect to taking out foreign patents we would also say that our facilities are of the most extensive and complete character. We employ the most experienced attorneys abroad, so that those who commit business to our care will nowhere have it exposed to the risks of irresponsible and incompetent sub-agents.

The Patent Agency Business.

Such is the simplicity of the American patent law that the drawings and specifications of applications for patents can just as readily be prepared, if the party is competent, at a distance from the capital, as within its immediate precincts. The result is that applicants unwisely attempt to prepare their own papers; hundreds more employ country lawyers or notaries public, or justices of the peace, or other inexperienced agents, while the remainder entrust their business to the Scientific American Patent Agency and the few other skillful houses who make the preparation of patent papers their speciality. If inventors were more careful at the start to avoid the employment of ignorant persons, they would often save themselves from trouble, delay and exorbitant expense. Many a poor countryman is induced to make a weary and expensive pilgrimage to Washington, under the supposition that no other method exists whereby to correct the stupid errors contained in his papers and by reason of which his patent is refused. And he innocently supposes that on his arrival he will be received with open arms by all the government officials, from the President down to the doorkeepers of the Patent Office. He imagines that he has only to confront the Commissioner or the Examining-officer, when all difficulties will vanish as by magic, and the patent be issued to him on the spot!

But the reality is otherwise. The applicant is informed by the attending official that until his papers are properly corrected and presented, his case will not be considered; he will be told that his explanations, if intended as amendments, must be put in writing; that he had better employ some competent party to put his ideas into shape; and that under no circumstances can a patent be issued to him on the spot, because, first, the case must be officially examined in secret, and second, about two weeks' time is required to prepare and record the document before it can be issued.

If the applicant is a prudent person, his next step of course, will be to find some competent attorney to straighten and present his case aright. As he issues from the spacious portico of the Patent Office, the sign of "MUNN & CO., SOLICITORS OF PATENTS, SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN OFFICE," upon the opposite corner, strikes his eye; somebody must be employed; the name is familiar to his ear; it is a well known, experienced firm; it is the most successful agency in the country, for obtaining patents. He crosses the street, enters their office, makes known his business, and his troubles are rapidly brought to a close.

The personal attendance of an inventor at Washington is generally unnecessary, as all the business can be readily and thoroughly arranged by correspondence. Those, however, who prefer to visit Washington upon patent business, or who desire any aid or assistance, are invited to call at our office in that city. We shall at all times be happy to serve them. Hundred of rejected and defectively prepared cases are annually argued and corrected by us, and our success in this especial branch of business has been *very great*. Inventors who propose to visit Washington would do well to preserve this page of our paper, in order the better to keep the locality of MUNN & Co.'s office in mind.