

Mr. RICHARD: You say everything will be published?

Mr. OSBORNE: That is right, sir. There is no real obstacle that I know of to prevent publication in a separate journal. If it is felt desirable to publish a separate trade mark journal, that could be done. Whether there would be any great advantage to it, I am not prepared to say. But I think we would bear in mind that notices respecting trade marks have for many years past been printed in the Patent Office Record. However, they were notices of registrations and not of pending applications.

Mr. RICHARD: I suggest there should be a separate trade mark journal, because the two things, patents and trade marks, are altogether different. We should get away from the confusion which exists in looking at the end of the Patent Office Record.

Mr. OSBORNE: I would like to refer to your question with respect to the extent of distribution of the Patent Office Record. Viewing the matter from the standpoint of trade marks, it has been literally valueless for any person to consult the Patent Office Record because by the time he sees the notices of the trade marks, they are already registered trade marks. Thus, anybody who would be interested in opposing them will have no opportunity to do so. There is a further reason why the distribution of the Patent Office Record will not necessarily reflect the number of persons who are actually interested. In a good many cases, as you know, it is the task of representatives of companies, of lawyers, patent attorneys and of others to check the records and to advise their clients. Those clients may be very extensive in number. That is a practice which has been followed, so far as I know, in all the great countries.

Mr. RICHARD: I still think we should have a separate trade mark journal if we want to have better distribution.

Mr. OSBORNE: The Act simply provides for advertisement. Within one month of the advertisement any person who wishes to oppose the application may do so.

Mr. CANNON: Does the Act provide for any particular form of advertisement?

Mr. OSBORNE: As to form, no, Mr. Cannon. It will be left to the rules. This and several other points which will be much more extensive.

Mr. CANNON: That would not come in the Act in any way. Suppose we wanted to provide that notices should be given two or three weeks in succession and that they should be in the *Canada Gazette*, because we think that the *Canada Gazette* has a wider circulation and that better notice would thereby be given. That would not be a matter for the bill but for the rules?

Mr. OSBORNE: That is right; and the committee on rules, if one is appointed, will certainly take that under consideration.

Mr. CANNON: I am of the same opinion as Mr. Jeffery. I wonder about the notice, due to the fact that we are widening the scope, or widening the field of words that can be registered. I wonder if we could not give more adequate notice so as to provide for an appeal. You say that certain lawyers make it a custom to look up these things on behalf of their clients and advise their clients. That is all right if it is the case of a big corporation. But how about the little fellow? He has not got a lawyer working for him to look up the records?

Mr. CRESTHOL: Well, he should have.

Mr. JEFFERY: This Act is extended to services to a wide extent.