one from an official of the hon. gentleman's own department, throwing considerable discredit upon the statements alleged to have been made by Feldberg to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I found that an injunction had been obtained against Feldberg for infringement in the exchequer court on April 18, 1934. Subsequent evidence submitted showed that Feldberg, despite this injunction and in contempt of court, was proceeding still with the infringement of this patent by the sale in considerable quantities of articles which were an infringement of the patent. Feldberg was brought before Mr. Justice Maclean of the exchequer court on July 17, 1934, for contempt. Mr. Justice Maclean entered very carefully into the matter and gave a full explanation to Feldberg with regard to his wrongdoing and with respect to the order of the court issued against him; and then, taking a personal promise from Feldberg that he would no longer attempt these illicit sales, he postponed the commitment of Feldberg, on his solemn promise that he would cease from these infringements; and it appeared to me that in these cases, which had been closed in the court by judgments of the court, no good purpose would be served by my entering into this private dispute.

With regard to the matters which are under discussion at the present time, I would seek the earnest attention of the house to one or two considerations which I feel it my duty to submit. The real issue is whether we are to adopt an amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Kootenay which, in its terms, if carried into effect, is a complete violation of an international convention to which we are a party. The government, in giving consideration to this issue, decided that, although the previous government ratified that convention, it was the bounden duty of a succeeding government, so long as that convention remained in force, to maintain legislation consistent with its terms, because the violation of that convention by a succeeding government would cast grave reflection upon this house and the government.

In order that the matter may be more completely understood, allow me to say that the first international convention for the protection of industrial property, which includes patents and patent rights, was signed in Paris on March 23, 1883. Canada did not become a party to that convention. The second one was signed at Brussels on December 14, 1900. Canada did not become a party to that convention because the laws relating to patents in force in this country at that time were not consistent nor in conformity with the obligations which a nation ratifying the convention would be in honour bound to undertake. The third convention was signed at Washington on June 2, 1911. That convention was not ratified by Canada until September 1, 1923. I find that there was considerable correspondence between the late government and especially the government of the United Kingdom with regard to the ratification of that convention The officers of the government of the United Kingdom pointed out to the Canadian government that while our patent law remained as it then was, it would be improper for Canada to become a party to that convention. But in 1923 the government of the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) ratified the convention on September 1, and in that year brought into effect certain amendments to the patent law which were in conformity with the terms of the convention as they then existed.

The fourth convention was signed at the Hague on November 1, 1925. That convention was signed by a representative of Canada, but the ratification of it was not deposited by this country until May 1, 1928. That Hague convention of 1925 introduced into the existing convention certain new provisions which were to the effect that before a patent could be revoked in accordance with the terms of the convention, there must first be an order for the granting of licences to others to manufacture the patented articles within Canada and a reasonable time must be given to ascertain whether the granting of licences, and thus bringing about within this country competition in the manufacture, sale and use of the patented article, would serve to remedy the abuses then complained of, but if those abuses then complained of were not remedied by the grant of licences to competitors, then the commissioner of patents or any other executive authority would have, within the terms of the convention, the right and power of abrogating the patent and wiping it out of existence, so that thereafter there would be no continuing monopoly in being in this country and every person desiring to manufacture, sell and use, would be quite free from any restrictions imposed by the grant of the patent.

The amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for East Kootenay is, in terms, section 40 of the existing act, and he proposes to amend section 65 of the bill by the addition of that clause in the present act which was first enacted in Canada on June 13, 1923, before the date of the Hague convention in 1925 and before the ratification of that convention in 1928 by the government then led by the present leader of the opposition In