

four Bills on our Statute-book already carrying out the principle which my hon. friend seeks to act upon in his Bill, some of which passed without any objection whatever, and I only find one instance of a Bill being rejected in another place, and none in which a Bill of a similar character was rejected in this House. So, in reality, if we come to precedent the statements quoted in the Commons *Debates* were erroneous, for there are actually laws on the Statute-book similar to this one in all respects. Even that would not decide me to pass a Bill like this as a matter of course, or anything approaching a matter of course. I should only do it in an exceptional case, and I could conceive a case where it would be a manifest hardship to a patentee to refuse him a renewal of his patent, and I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House would reject an application of that description. I could speak of a case which occurred where the mail happened to be late—where the money for the renewal of the patent was in a registered letter that had arrived in Ottawa a few minutes after the period at which registered letters were delivered in Ottawa. The letter and money made their appearance in the Department after the time for renewing the patent had lapsed and the Commissioner refused to renew it. Should a gentleman come to the House under such circumstances and apply for a renewal of his patent on the ground that he did everything he could to get a renewal within the proper time, we should feel disposed to sanction it. I am confident that the great majority of this House would vote for it. It is possible to conceive a case where we would be disposed to relax the rule prescribed for us in the patent law. My hon. friend from Burlington tells me that he can make out a very strong equitable case in favor of this Bill, and I do not think we shall compromise ourselves in our final vote on this Bill by passing the second reading now and referring it to committee to ascertain what my hon. friend can prove of the efforts made by the petitioner to get a renewal for his patent.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am opposed to this Bill. I think it is a dangerous measure, calculated to establish a precedent of a vicious character. We have not only to look at the rights of the indi-

vidual himself, who neglected to renew his patent at the proper time, but we have to look to the interests of the public. This industry belongs to the public, and we are actually by this Bill depriving them of the benefit of it. We may by our action be depriving gentlemen who have invested capital in the manufacture of this article, whatever it is, of a right to which they are fairly entitled under the law. The petitioner has had for five years absolute control of this patent, and I do not see why he should have a continuous monopoly. If it is his misfortune to have forfeited his patent it is also his fault. He has had five years of a monopoly, and with the practical experience gained in that time, and with his plant and facilities for manufacturing, he still has the advantage over competitors, and if, through his neglect, his patent was not renewed at the proper time, and it has now become the property of the public, I do not think it is in the interests of the community that the public should be deprived of the rights which they have acquired.

HON. MR. McDONALD—You rob the patentee of his rights.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If he has neglected his duty and allowed his patent to lapse, I do not see why we should interfere between him and the public. Supposing others have been investing their money in this industry, knowing that the patent had lapsed, are such men to be prejudiced in this way? I think the public have rights to be protected as well as the individual. We are told that there is another Bill of this character before Parliament, and if we pass this one it is hard to say how many more we shall have if such a precedent is established.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I think my hon. friend from Lunenburg is making a great mistake in opposing the second reading of this Bill. His statement shows the necessity of letting this Bill go to the committee, where evidence can be received. How can any of us form a judgment on the case without knowing the particulars of it? We have had it shown already, by the leader of the House, that circumstances may occur where not a single member of the Senate would refuse relief to an applicant. How do we know but this is a case of the kind? If we remit this Bill to the