

regulates rights as between manufacturers and traders, and the words "Attorney-General" really ought not to have been in the Bill at all. We are following the precedent England sets us in giving the individual the right of proceeding.

HON. MR. POWER—It occurs to me that the objection taken by the hon. gentleman from Calgary is not altogether well founded. I would submit to the leader of the House that the words "Attorney-General" here mean the Minister of Justice—the Attorney-General of Canada. Chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes is, "An Act respecting the Department of Justice." The first section of that Act says "that the Minister of Justice shall *ex officio* be Her Majesty's Attorney-General of Canada," and it occurs to me that the natural interpretation of the expression "Attorney-General," occurring in a statute of Canada without any reference to a province, would be "Minister of Justice." If it is intended to include the provincial officers as well, then the Bill should say so.

THE CHAIRMAN—Shall the committee report the Bill without amendment?

HON. MR. POWER—Does not the Minister think it would be well to remove any doubt that may exist about that?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The Attorney-General must mean the Minister of Justice, because the Attorneys-General in the various provinces have no rights in the matters at all. It is a matter of Dominion right—trade marks and designs.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will see if anybody thinks that somebody is robbing him of his trade mark, and desires a remedy, he has only to take it himself. My own opinion would be that if it were desirable to amend the clause at all I would strike out the words "on the information of the Attorney-General or," for there is really no reason for the intervention of a public officer in a matter of purely private concern. However, it is there, and I see no objection to it, and I would be disposed to let it go as it is.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not wish to make any captious objection, but I think there is reason to believe that the expres-

sion "Attorney-General" occurring here, means the Minister of Justice; if it does not—if it is intended to mean the provincial officers, the Bill ought to say so. I have just read from the Revised Statutes of Canada to show that the "Attorney-General of Canada" means the Minister of Justice, and I think that is the officer with whom to deal in this Bill.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The Attorney-General in a province has no right to appear, as such, in any matter not coming within the jurisdiction of the province.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It is quite possible my hon. friend may be right, but I do not think it is worth holding back the Bill for it. If I were going to amend the Bill at all I would strike out the words "Attorney-General" altogether. However, it is possible that some occasion might arise in which it may be proper for such an officer to take the initiative. There is nothing in the Interpretation Act, as I understand it, which provides that the words "Attorney-General" shall mean the Minister of Justice, but I think the construction of this clause is a matter of not much importance.

HON. MR. POWER—I should much prefer that the Senate would send its legislation to the other branch of Parliament in such condition that it cannot be amended, than to send it down to them in such a shape that they can make amendments to it, which may be only trivial, but which they are always pleased to make, and I think the better way is not to give them a chance.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I think the words "Attorney-General" are used in the Act itself.

HON. MR. POWER—You substitute the Attorney-General here for the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. MR. ROSS—I do not think the argument of my hon. friend from Halifax is a very good one. If the Commons must necessarily amend our Bills it is better to leave them room for it; because it is better to make the Bills perfect than to make them imperfect if they must change them.

The clause was agreed to.