Chicago. July 22, 1876.

My dear Sir,

As you are perhaps aware, Mr. Bailey sailed for Europe early in March to push telephone matters there. Among the first questions that arise will be the legal status of our case, and everything will depend upon our being able to show that our patents already obtained in England subordinate all those, taken out recently, with reference to speaking telephone. There is no question but that Bell has anticipated us in matter of time in his specific application for speaking telephone, because, but if we are able to show a connected history of the progress of the invention beginning where Reid left off and carry it to the point where speaking telephone proper began, and to show that the work that we did was necessary to make the
speaking telephone a possibility and that in fact we anticipate all others in conception and description of this particular invention, thus establishing our equitable rights even to the latter, it will go far towards placing us upon a solid foundation over the water.

I send you an extract from letters by Mr. Beeth who is travelling for Bliss now in Europe. He says "Call on Mr. Breeze when in London and we had a little chat in regard to telephone matters. I mentioned what you had written in regard to groups and frank Pope's conclusion."

"After an enthusiastic examination, Mr. Pope said "We know when Frank Pope gives his opinion that there is no occasion for further examination and I am prepared in this case to believe he is right." I think he does not endorse Bill to any great extent. This letter was written from Paris just last to Mr. Barton. Do you not think it will be a good idea to have in addition to your resume which Mr. Bailey takes with him an opinion from Mr. Gifford?"

Now we come to another matter to which I wish
you would give your serious attention. If it
should occur that in two or three weeks
after Mr. Bailey arrived in England and he
should cable you to go over there, could you
do so? and at what price?
at an interview in Chicago with Mr. White and
Bailey it seemed to be the unanimous conclusion
that we should have to be represented for a
while at least by an expert not only in the
scientific but legal features of our case.

I saw another letter from London written recently
indicating that there was already a strong party
advocating the introduction of one telephone and
claiming that Bell's patent had been invalidated
here by the publication made by Sir Ivan
Thompson made previous to Bell's application
for patent. The letter went on to state that if this
proved to be the case the only solid patents left
would be those of Gray. I feel sure that of
these things can be affected if matters are pushed
that we can occupy the field independently or from
a consolidation with the other party.

Please answer soon and oblige.

Yours truly,

Elisha Gray