Mr. ROBB: I have no objection to delaying it, but I would point out that, admitting for the moment all my hon. friend has said, is there not all the more reason why some responsible person elected by the people should have the last word in case of dispute?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would not think so at all. I would think that what the people are interested in, in the first instance, is a proper patent law, and, next, an impartial non-political administration of that law. I would not think they would be at all interested in knowing that the person who administered it was concerned in votes in this or that constituency.

Mr. ROBB: They are not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is for the purpose of getting away from just what my hon. friend says the practice has always been, to take to the Exchequer Court the question as to whether a patent ought or ought not to be granted. I fear that under this section the minister can take the place of the Exchequer Court to some extent.

Mr. ROBB: All the powers to-day under the existing act are in the hands of the minister. We are widening them a little, transferring some of the powers to a commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And under the existing act the minister has absolutely full responsibility, there is no chance of his saying that it is the commissioner who is doing this thing; there is no chance of the hidden hand. If it is done in this way the minister, so far as the public is concerned, has no responsibility at all, for he can say that he has the active commissioner administering the act and cannot interfere.

Mr. ROBB: I am afraid my hon. friend does not understand the section. We will let it stand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I confess I have not had a chance to go into it.

Section stands.

On section 7—Applications for patents—who may obtain patents:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Any change?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: This is partly a new clause. In line 29 there is a period of two years fixed. In the following clause it will be noted that a period of one year is prescribed. Why should two years be fixed?

Mr. ROBB: Under the old section public use or sale for more than one year in any part of the world prior to application for a patent is a bar. Under the new clause public use or sale is extended to two years. One year has been found in practice to be a very short time in which to allow an inventor to try out his invention on the public in order to ascertain whether or not it is worth patenting. This gives a little more time.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not particularly disputing that, but still I am not at all agreeing that it is a wise change, unless the officials of the department are very sure of their ground based upon extended practice. But the words in line 30, "in this country", I understand are not in the old act, and objection is taken to them on the ground that it is going to hamper inventors. There seems to be no particular reason why they should be inserted there. It is sufficient to control the situation to leave out the words I have referred to.

Mr. ROBB: Those words were put in with a view to protecting Canadian patentees against unscrupulous persons from other countries who might come in and interfere with the patentees' rights.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think, Mr. Chairman, we will get along better if before we do anything with these sections the minister will tell us just what changes are proposed. We now learn from the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that there are two changes here. Are there any others?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should have all the changes of each section stated so we can understand what we are discussing.

Mr. ROBB: In the old section the word "process" does not appear in the list of inventions for which patents may be granted. Patents for processes are very numerous. They were supposed to be included in the term "art" in the old section, but it has been questioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So we have those three changes?

Mr. ROBB: Those three minor changes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not see any objection to the extension of the word "process" at all. As to the point raised in connection with the words "in this country," I suppose really what is behind it is this: that you might have a perfectly proper Canadian patent attacked on the ground that it has