

go ahead and develop them; they made a big investment. Then the war intervened, and the government made regulations that prevented the people who were to develop and make these machines from getting the necessary materials and the labour. Consequently they were held up, although I presume they had gone to a great deal of expense.

An hon. gentleman to my left said that this should be treated as a contract. I have not the cases here, but it seems to me that you will find plenty of authorities to the effect that, when it is impossible to carry out a contract owing to the intervention of war, that puts an entirely different aspect on the agreement. In this case these people had invested their money in these patents, prepared the machines and were all ready to do the work. Then the government passed certain regulations which prohibited them from getting the materials and prevented them from employing labour, because the government said it wanted to put materials to other use and men to work somewhere else. Consequently the patent holders stand to face a big loss. Is it fair or right that, because the war intervened, they should be deprived of their right of going ahead? Is it right that the privileges secured under the act should be taken away from them?

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): What about the 180,000 other patents?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know anything about the other 180,000 patents. I do not know if there are 180,000 or not. But I think this particular measure should be considered on its own merits and should be considered upon principle rather than upon the assumption that consent to it might lead to flooding the patent office with other applications. Is that not the right way to deal with this matter, to consider it on its own merits rather than say: Oh, well, if we pass this bill there will be a lot of other bills come into this house.

That, I know, is only one side of the question. You can look at it in another way. You may say it is the wrong principle that we should do it in this way. Then it seems to me that if it cannot be done in this way, there should be an amendment to our Patent Act somewhat similar to the amendment to the English patents and designs act to enable a man who has secured a patent to go to the courts. He should be able to go there and not come to this house, when he finds himself in such a situation. Under circumstances like this, where a man has been prevented from developing a patent by reason of war intervening he can in England tell his story to the court and, if the court is satisfied, it can grant

him an extension of the time in which he can control that patent. It seems to me that there should be an amendment to our Patent Act to cover a situation of this kind, and that is the reason I submit that it might be to the advantage of this house and of the country to have this matter sent to a committee of the house for consideration and not just brush it aside in this peremptory way without proper consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour for private and public bills having expired, the house will revert to its former business.

THE BUDGET

DEBATE ON ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Hon. Douglas Abbott (Minister of Finance) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of ways and means, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. T. J. BENTLEY (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) is not in his seat at the moment, because all those who have preceded me in this debate, including some notable and redoubtable members, have offered their congratulations to the minister upon the excellence of his budget presentation. I should like to add mine too, humble as they may be. I think he earned congratulations upon his presentation. However, after reading the budget I find that, while I can congratulate the minister upon his presentation, I cannot congratulate him upon the subject matter of the budget. Like the other speakers from this group, I am keenly disappointed over the things I see in the budget and disappointed over some of its important omissions, and those omissions will be the main part of my discussion tonight.

The budget itself is a rich man's budget, in a year when rich people are getting richer and poor people getting poorer. It is a direct negation of the government's promise to bring in a new order of society in the interests of the great mass of the producing and working citizens of Canada. A little over a year ago the Minister of Justice (Mr. Isley), then minister of finance, informed the house that the wartime prices and trade board had permitted Canadian manufacturers of farm machinery to increase their prices by 12½ per cent. He gave it as his positive opinion and that of the officials of the department, or of