

*Patents of Invention*

studied the bill somewhat and I believe that if it were submitted to a special committee, where there could be free interchange of opinion with the experts of the department, the underlying reasons for certain sections would be more apparent than they are now. I do not know whether it is possible at this stage to have the bill go before a committee. Reverting to this very section, 30, if it means anything it means that assignments must be registered; otherwise they shall not be valid. I do not think there should be any such intention; the assignment should be valid as between the parties. It should be perfectly good whether registered or not, but as against third parties it should be registered. I wish the minister would give some consideration to that view.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is no doubt right in so far as the assignment relates to third parties. As regards the observations of my hon. friend for Vancouver, it is a little late in the session to suggest referring the bill to a special committee, when so many committees are already at work. May I observe again what I pointed out on Friday in introducing the bill, that it is precisely the same as that introduced in 1920 and again in 1921 and which reached a second reading. It therefore seems to me that no good purpose can be served by delaying the measure. Generally speaking it has met with the approval of all interests, with very few exceptions. As a matter of fact there is no opposition before the department. While some requests have been made to me that the bill be referred to a special committee, I rather gather that these requests have come from sources that want to tie up legislation altogether. It is not the policy of the government to introduce such a measure and let it drop again by the wayside. This is the third time the bill has been introduced, the first time before this parliament, and twice before a previous parliament. I think we had better make some progress with it here, because it will have fair consideration in this Chamber and it can be considered fully in the Senate again. We can serve no good purpose by delaying it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the closing sentence of my hon. friend's remarks really gives the key to the whole situation. This bill is to have proper consideration in the Senate, and because it will have proper consideration there, there is no reason why we should not get rid of it, knowing little if anything about it.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. ROBB: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would point out to my hon. friend that it is a very good thing when introducing legislation to know why it is being introduced. It is a pretty sound principle that the House should know why changes are being made. I asked my hon. friend the other day, for example, just exactly what the benefits of the Berne convention were to which he was referring, but he left us without any information in regard to it. I think my hon. friend ought to tell us why each change is being made so that the House may assist him in seeing that the purpose desired is being properly carried out.

At present we are discussing section 30 dealing with joint assignments. We have already dealt with the ordinary class of assignments. Hon. gentlemen from this side asked the minister as to whether or not rights inter partes are discharged unless there is registration. The minister is going to look into the question. Hon. gentlemen on this side have pointed out that rights inter partes should not be interfered with, and that the only effect of a non-registration penalty should be as against a third party. Section 30 itself looks after it. It provides that assignments shall be registered, and that they shall be null and void in the case of third parties unless so registered and all that section 30 does is to put the joint assignment in the same position as the single assignment. If we could have these sections read out at the time, Mr. Chairman, we would learn what they are. For instance, if section 29 had been read out we would have known where we were at in regard to section 30. I think the least the minister can do is to read out every change that is being made and give the reason for it so we will know something about it.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is quite right, but the clauses under consideration are old clauses and have been in the act since its first enactment. I can quite understand some hon. members opposite who have not had an opportunity of reviewing this bill, finding fault with it, but I can scarcely understand my hon. friend's criticism. He sat around the council table when this bill was considered first in 1920 and again in 1921. He was a member of the government that advanced the bill to second reading and then let it drop by the wayside. Surely he is not in a very good position to reprimand me now for introducing this measure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not blaming my hon. friend for introducing this bill