

thy men in the County of Cape Breton. He put this notice on the paper in 1874; but at the request of the Postmaster-General, who assured him that this gentleman would not be dismissed, he dropped it. Afterwards the dismissal took place; and in 1875, he gave a similar notice of motion, but was unable to carry out this intention. He had no opportunity for doing so, save on one evening, and the Postmaster-General being then absent, he had deferred the matter. He believed that the removal was due solely to political reasons. In 1874, at the general election, the Ministerial candidate in the County had threatened Mr. McDougall with dismissal, unless he voted for him. This might be denied, but it was susceptible of proof. The Postmaster-General had informed him (Mr. McDonald), that the discharge was due to such causes that he did not wish to have it brought before the House. The late Postmaster-General having made the same statement, he had communicated this to Mr. McDougall, who requested him to bring the question before the House. He was informed that Mr. McDougall knew of no charges having been preferred against him, and was not aware for what reason he was removed. Mr. McDougall did not care for the position, save to suit his own convenience, as he did fully one-half the correspondence in that quarter.

The hour being six, the House took recess.

---

AFTER RECESS.

LETTERS PATENT.

Mr. IRVING moved the second reading of the Bill to enable William Smith Amies to obtain Letters Patent for a new and useful Artificial Manure.

Hon. Mr. LANGEVIN—Will the hon. gentleman explain the nature of this Bill?

Mr. IRVING said it was to obtain, in favour of the present assignees of the patent, an extension of time, which by law they were entitled to had they filed their petition in time, and which, by an oversight, they permitted to pass over the five years. The Premier,

when the Bill was introduced, had cautioned him it was so at variance with the principle of the general law that the Government could hardly permit it to pass; but on explaining that it was a patent which had already been granted, he (Mr. Irving) was allowed to have the Bill printed, read the second time, and referred to the Private Bills Committee to be dealt with by them as they thought proper.

Mr. BOWELL asked if the Premier gave his consent to the principle of extending patents by special legislation after the patentee had failed to comply with the law in case he required an extension of time. In the past, when the law was not as liberal as it is now, the Government and the Private Bills Committee, of which he was then a member, on every occasion refused to extend these patents on the principle that the patentee, having allowed whatever right he might have had for extension to lapse, it was in the interest of the public that no special privilege should be given him, particularly if he had received the profits arising from the article patented.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said he had warned the hon. gentleman at the time the Bill was introduced that the House would not likely consent, and the Government certainly could not consent to give patent rights by legislation where the law was not complied with. The claim in this case was that the parties meant to apply for an extension of a second five years, but were late by a few days. One consideration that arose was how the House might be disposed if it turned out to be the result of neglect on the part of a clerk to recommend that the Bill should be allowed to become law. It was a serious question whether even that should be done, and he had only consented to the introduction of the Bill on the strict understanding the Government did not commit themselves to allow it to become law unless it was clearly established the delay was the result of accident. He remembered a Bill similar to this, which Mr. Wood of Durham had in charge, was allowed to pass, it being proved that the delay was due to the neglect of an attorney.