

him some of the winnings, shall I say, that come from the discovery which he has made. And so, through all the years and I think in all countries, the idea of granting a patent is to preserve to the individual the benefits that go with the discovery that has been made. As time has passed and as industrial development has become more complex and on a much wider scale than was perhaps true of years ago, the value of patents has become less according to the ability of the individual to press forward the merits of his discovery or to bring it into general use. I think it has become increasingly difficult for individuals to get the full merit of patents. Very often large corporations will purchase for a comparatively small figure the rights of a patent, put it away and never use it because the new device is such that it might conflict with some article already on the market and well established in their industry. In dealing with matters of patents I think the major duty of parliament is to preserve the interests of the individual primarily responsible.

The article here dealt with is a certain type of glass, a new type of glass. This is something which is very generally used and which is needed or required by a large number of industries. It is alleged that a patent attorney in France made an error or committed an oversight when dealing with a patent attorney in New York and instructing him to take out patents in America. Because the patent attorney in New York did not safeguard the interests of his clients in Canada, it is argued that this group of individuals have a right to come to parliament and ask for the special legislation now before us. It is very difficult for me to believe that a patent attorney in France would be so ignorant of what is necessary to establish his rights in various parts of the world that he would overlook a place like Canada. I am quite certain that a patent attorney in Canada would not advise an attorney in Paris to look after his interests in other European countries, and then pay no more attention to the matter. I am quite certain that when the patent attorney in Paris got his returns from the patent attorney in New York he at once recognized that he had received protection in but one country, namely, the United States. In addition to the United States, there is Mexico on the one side and Canada on the other. It is difficult to conceive that such an error could be made, and it certainly does not appeal to me as the reason why parliament should pass a special act to vest this patent in the applicants.

The suggestion is made that the granting of this patent will possibly result in the estab-

lishment of a new industry in Canada. I certainly would like to see a new industry established in Canada but I cannot conceive why the failure to obtain these patent rights would deter a bona fide industry from entering upon the manufacture of this class of glass. I am not at the moment familiar with the rate of duty upon this article, but that rate would be the same whether or not there was a patent granted. So far as the particular industry is concerned, the protection would be precisely what the tariff provides. In my opinion there is no argument in that contention. The only additional advantage to the applicants would be to obtain the exclusive right of manufacture in Canada, and that exclusive right of manufacture would mean the charging of royalties to those who desired either to make or use this glass. The advantage to anyone who wished to manufacture this glass in Canada of securing this special bill authorizing the issue of this patent would be that he could charge higher prices for the glass because he had a patent. I cannot follow my hon. friend in his argument in that respect. My hon. friend said that it would likely result in the cutting of the price of glass, but here again I find it difficult to follow him because the only difference in the price of glass would be the amount of the royalty, and that could be cut only if the individual securing the patent rights were to make the price of glass so much higher than otherwise would be necessary.

For a great many years I have raised my voice in this house in opposition to this class of bill. I feel it is unwise and very often improvident for this house to give these special rights. Very often we are asked to revive a patent which has completely expired. If I remember rightly, a patent right expires in Canada after eighteen years, which is two years longer than in Great Britain. We are frequently asked to extend this right because an article has not been manufactured or for some other reason. I think parliament should be exceedingly careful in these matters. I reiterate what I said a moment ago. In the first place, the object of a patent right is to protect the interests of the individual who makes the discovery. The assumption is that if the individual does not take advantage of his patent right within a reasonable time—I have forgotten the exact time, but I think it is two or three years—the right then expires and it becomes, as the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) has so well defined, part of the public domain. I am sorry that I must differ with the hon. member who is sponsoring this bill but I take very strong exception to its passage. I do this, first, because of the general principles