

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—I have no objection to adopt the suggestion if hon. members think it is necessary, but as a rule whenever there is a disputed claim it is submitted to the Minister of Justice before the Department can deal with it. On technical questions, as to whether it is a real invention or not, the Department decides. If the amendment is accepted by the House, I have no objection to it: we might say the first part of the 21st section.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—I am very glad that the Minister has taken this course, because otherwise, if this subsection was repealed with the other part of the section, there would be no protection at all, even where a dispute might arise on a legal point.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause as amended was adopted.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I notice in subsection 2, relating to the payment of fees, the words "or before" are struck out. It should be "at or before."

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—Those words were in the Bill as introduced in the House of Commons and were there struck out. Of course, that would not debar any one from sending the fee beforehand, and I thought it would not be worth while to insert the words in the Bill after they had been struck out by the House of Commons. It would cause delay and trouble for a trifling matter. Everybody will understand that common prudence will require the fees to be mailed a little in advance in order to have them reach Ottawa in time.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The action taken by the House of Commons seems extraordinary. It may happen, for instance, that the representative of the patentee is in Ottawa a month before the expiration of the patent, and has taken that opportunity to pay the fee. What the motive of the House of Commons was in striking out those words it is difficult to understand.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—I did not understand it either: but suppose the patentee happened to be in Ottawa a month before the expiration of the patent and offered the fees, the hon. gentleman will understand we never refuse them.

Hon. Mr. DRUMMOND—I understand that the shortest term of a patent is six

years and that it can be extended for twelve years longer. Suppose after the end of the first year the inventor wishes to extend the patent for the full term can he do so?

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—Certainly; that is the way I understand it.

Hon. Mr. DEVER, from the Committee, reported the Bill with an amendment which was concurred in.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

THE DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY COMPANY'S BILL.

A QUESTION OF ORDER.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—I should like to call the attention of the House to the position in which we stand with reference to the Drummond County Railway Bill. I am asked, as Chairman of the Committee on Railways, to call a meeting of the Committee for to-morrow morning. I am quite prepared to act, as I am sure every member of the Committee is, but I am placed in a position of difficulty in which I should like to take the counsel of the House. The rules of our House require that a Bill shall not be considered in Committee until after twenty-four hours' notice. It has been suggested to me that that was evidently intended to mean a sitting of the House, and, if that be a correct interpretation of the rule, as the second sitting of the House to-day has been counted a separate day, the Committee might meet to-morrow morning and consider the Bill. The difficulty in my mind arises entirely from the fact that this might not be considered twenty-four hours' notice. Substantially it is, because the Bill has had two distinct stages to-day. If there is any doubt upon that point, it is but fair and right, after the manner in which we have suspended the rules of the House in other cases, that the parties should have an opportunity of presenting their claims for incorporation. I have been pressed to call a meeting of the Committee, but have refrained from doing so until I know what the feeling of the House is on the subject.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I think the remarks made by the hon. member from Amherst are correct, so far as they apply to the rule itself. It was understood, I should judge, when that rule was adopted, that it