

inconvenient system the hon. gentleman himself finds it difficult to know at first sight what the amendment is.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend knows he is raising a question which has been greatly discussed amongst draftsmen as to whether the amendment shall be printed by itself, or whether the clause as amended shall be re-printed as a whole. I am rather inclined to think that the second way is the more convenient.

HON. MR. POWER—In England, where they have no consolidation, such as our Revised Statutes, the hon. gentleman's views would be correct, but here in Canada and in the various Provinces of Canada there is in each instance a consolidation of the statutes. We, in 1886, consolidated our statutes, and the statutes that govern Canada are to be found in two large volumes. Now that is a sort of Code, and I feel that the balance of convenience is very much in favor of making the amendments in the shortest possible form, so that every one who has a copy of the Revised Statutes can note the changes in the law on the margin of his statutes.

Clause agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The 2nd clause is like the first, providing for two or three slight amendments, one of which is important. By the General Act it is provided that any dispute which arises shall be decided by the Minister or Deputy of the Minister of Agriculture, whose decision in the matter shall be final. This clause transfers the decision of the dispute to the Exchequer Court.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I rise to call attention to the fact that they have adopted in clauses 34 and 47 two different principles. The hon. gentleman from Halifax considers that it would be infinitely simpler and better if the proposed amendment were introduced by itself, instead of a re-print of the clause as amended, and we could then see what the changes were. No doubt, to those who are passing upon the proposed legislation it would be the better way, but I think if the profession were consulted, who, with the assistance of the courts, have to interpret the law, it will be found that it is infinitely better to repeal the whole section and re-print it as

amended. Otherwise, you have to refer to two different volumes to find out what the change is. I notice with regret that the principle which the leader of the House has laid down is not followed in this case, for I see that the amendments in the 3rd and 4th clauses are made in the way referred to by the hon. member for Halifax as being the proper method.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will see the reason is that the amendments in the 3rd and 4th clauses are very trifling.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It does not follow an invariable practice, that is all. I have been asked to propose an amendment, giving a degree of latitude that the law does not now permit to British subjects who have taken out patents in Great Britain, allowing them a longer period than one year within which to perfect their right in Canada, restricting that privilege to British subjects only, and to those who had taken out patents in Great Britain. I submitted the proposed amendment in the form it should come to my hon. friend, and I would like to know whether he has considered it, and whether the Government will accede to it or not?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I have considered the suggestion made by my hon. friend, and have submitted it to my colleagues, and I must say that their unanimous opinion is against it. The law at present makes provision that any inventor shall be intitled to a patent for his invention if a patent has not been in existence in the country from which he comes for more than twelve months prior to the application for his patent in Canada. That is the period which has been selected in the United States, I am told, and it is considered to be sufficiently long to enable any person taking out a patent in any foreign country or in England to take it out here. Communication between foreign countries and Canada is very easy. Probably if this law were now made for the first time twelve months would not be allowed, but it was different when it took a month or more to cross from England to Canada.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington), from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.