from working under them any longer. I, therefore, think the Bill should not be passed, but if through carelessness the time has been allowed to expire, if the patents are worth anything they are worth the trouble of coming to this House and asking special legislation for the extension of the time.

Mr. McCUAIG. The objection my hon. friend refers to is overcome by clause *a*, which reads:

"In all cases in which not more than a year has elapsed since the expiration of a patent, and application to renew the same has been made to the Commissioner of Patents within ten days of such expiration, the Commissioner may, in his discretion, and after such hearing of conflicting interest (if any) as he may deem expedient, revive the expired patent and continue the same for the period for which, if application has been made in time it might have been extended under 'The Patent Act of 1872,' but no such patent shall be revived after the thirty-first of October in the present year."

Now it so happens that I am familiar with a case where an application was sent with the money to a member of this House three or four days previous to the expiration of the patent, and by the neglect of the member it was not taken over to the office until a few days after expiry, and the Minister refused to renew it. I certainly think this was a case where the owner of the patent was entitled to some further consideration. I think this Bill is very important and ought to be accepted. It is all very well for the member for Leeds (Mr. Jones) who is a manufacturer and benefits by these patents, to take the course he does, but it is a very hard case for a poor man who makes a discovery in mechanism to lose a small patent of this kind by oversight, or by ignorance, and who has to pay $200 or $400 to get it renewed. I may say that in the case I referred to the money was sent to myself, together with the application, but not being familiar with the rules of the department, I, unfortunately, allowed it to lay in my desk two days too late, and when I went to the Patent Office the Minister told me the law would not permit him to receive it.

Bill read a second time.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878.

Mr. BOULTBEE, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 52) to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, said: In proposing this measure to the House I shall endeavor to deal with it in a reasonable and argumentative spirit. As far as I can discover there seems to be a great deal of feeling about the Bill, at least I should so judge from the numerous anonymous letters I have received on the subject, threatening me with various pains and penalties if I proceeded with the Bill. But the letters being anonymous I have not paid any attention to them, and I shall venture to brave the pains and penalties which may be imposed upon me. In proposing this amendment, the position I take is not in any way against the temperance cause, but in its favor. The object of this Bill is merely to make it necessary, before the Scott Act shall go into effect, that its principles shall have been affirmed by a full majority of all those who have a right to vote in the district in which it is submitted, and I conceive that the principle of the Bill is one which, when reflected upon fully, will be seen to be in no way against the cause of temperance, but strongly in its favor; because I do not know anything—at least, in the Province of Ontario, from which I come—which is doing so much harm to the cause of temperance as the attempts which are being made to force this prohibitory legislation on the people. These attempts distract the attention of the people from the legitimate means of dealing with this evil, and are intended to substitute for them a process of legislation which fails in every instance to effect the object desired. In no case that I am aware of—and I have paid a good deal of attention to this matter—has this prohibitory legislation been successful, either in Canada or in any other country; in fact, it seems to bring the cause of temperance into disrepute; because, whenever you attempt to enforce a law which does not commend itself to public opinion, but which is felt to be tyrannical and unjust, it not only excites people to break the law, but tempts them to break it, merely for the sake of asserting their independence. I have read the opinions of some of our leading thinkers and jurists who have given much consideration to this question, and the weight of all authority seems to be against all attempts to coerce people by prohibitory legislation. Among those who are in favor of this prohibitory legislation, we do not so much find the most earnest and valuable advocates of temperance, but rather busybodies who wish to gain some sort of notoriety and to bring themselves before the people, and politicians who have not been very successful in a legitimate way, and who have become as they say, "played out." In the city of Hamilton, and throughout several Ontario counties, this prohibitory law is being at the present moment agitated, chiefly by one of these played-out politicians, who is endeavoring by this means to escape from that obscurity into which he has been relegated by the common sense of the people. But from such a description, I wish specially to except the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley), one of the strongest and most ardent supporters of a prohibitary law in the House; but he has got his brain so soaked with it that all the cavities are filled up, to the exclusion of every sense of justice in regard to this question, and he has become very tyrannical in his way of dealing with his fellowmen. He does not seem to consider that in this case he is seeking to enforce a law which is ruinous to many men, destroying their property, their income and their means of living, without any compensation. He and gentlemen like him come and say to me in private conversation: "Why do you treat temperance men exceptionally? Why will you subject them to a law which you do not apply to other people?" I say that argument does not stand on fact, because in a Statute of the Province of Ontario, with regard to a matter not nearly so important as this, the very principle contained in this Bill has been affirmed, namely, with regard to bonuses in aid of railways or other undertakings. If it is necessary that there should be a clear majority of all the ratepayers entitled to vote, in order to carry a bonus by-law, surely it is necessary that there should be a clear majority to carry a measure like this, which restricts the liberties of the people, and is a sumptuary law of an exceedingly harsh character. Sumptuary laws have been tried in other countries in a way which we should think absurd. For instance, in Russia, under a pure despotism, a ukase was issued some years ago, ordering that men should wear their beards and hair in a particular fashion. Even in Russia it was found very difficult to enforce that trivial law, because it was regarded as interfering with the personal liberties of the people.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Mr. BOULTBEE. When the House rose, I was trying to establish the position, not only that by this Act I did not seek to apply any exceptional law to people in favor of the Scott Act, but also the principle that a majority of those entitled to vote should pass upon such a law before it should come into operation, and in support of this I showed that the Act, as passed in the Province of Ontario with regard to bonuses, established that principle. I was going on to show that even if this principle were not admitted, the Scott Act is in itself of such an exceptional character that it should have exceptional provisions attached to it for guarding the people and the country, its revenues, and its general status, against the effects of that Act which are so