amendment, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed under a suspension of the rules.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (110) "An Act further to amend the Patent Act."

The Bill was read the first time.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS moved that the rule of the House be suspended and that the Bill be read the second time presently. He said :—The object of this Bill is to compel applicants for patents to furnish the Department with the claim or claims in triplicate. It also provides that the Deputy-Commissioner of Patents may be authorized to sign the same as well as the Commissioner. It provides that where more than one application for a patent is made in one notice, the fee of $2 be collected for each patent mentioned in the notice, and that if a partial fee only is paid, the proportion of the fee paid shall be stated in the patent, and the patent shall, nowithstanding anything therein or in this Act contained, cease at the end of the term for which the partial fee has been paid, unless at the expiration of the said term the holder of the patent pays the fee required for the future term of six months. That is the main object of the Bill. The object of allowing the Deputy-Commissioner of Patents to sign, is to avoid a delay when the Commissioner of Agriculture is away or engaged in other business : and there is no reason why the Deputy-Minister should not have that power. There are several thousands of those patents issued every year.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The principal object of the Bill—if that is the one just mentioned by the hon. gentleman—is a perfectly right and proper one. The Deputy-Commissioner is the only person who has to do with the patents, and it is a mere piece of red tape and unnecessary formality to require the signature of the Commissioner, who is the Minister, I understand. There is one provision to which the Minister referred which needs some explanation. He said that it was proposed that the plans and specifications should be sent in to the Department in triplicate.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—Not the plans, merely the claims The plans are sent in duplicate, but it is required that the claims should be sent in triplicate. One copy remains in the office, one copy is annexed to the patent as it is issued, and the third copy is for the Printing Bureau, so as to save the Department the trouble of making a copy of a long and technical document.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The explanation is thoroughly satisfactory.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Mr. POWER—Does this Bill say that section 21 is repealed? I wish to call attention to the fact that the subsection of section 21 was apparently dropped altogether, and that was one of some importance. If instead of repealing section 21, you repeal the first section of 21, it would probably answer just as well.

Hon. Mr. ANGERS—There is no discussion about the application. There seems to be very little reason why it should be referred to the Minister of Justice, because only questions of law should be referred to him. The technical questions that may arise must be decided by the officers of the Department, who are specialists in this matter, and of course the Department would not think of granting a patent when there was a disputed claim upon it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I am able to speak rather feelingly from a little experience I have had in connection with applications for patents at Washington. The people who are applying for patents, and the public generally, need all the protection they can get. The second subsection of this section 21 is a very valuable one. It tends to prevent litigation ; everybody knows there is hardly any subject which is a more fertile source of litigation than the acquiring of patents. It is very important that where questions do arise the opinion of the Deputy-Minister—not necessarily the Minister of Justice—should be had in the first instance, so as to be sure that the man who thinks he is getting a patent is really getting a valuable right, and is not simply getting hold of a lawsuit. I do not think we should part with that second subsection.