

*Patent Act*

amounts to around \$30,000. There is, therefore, a deficit from the operation of printing patents and the *Patent Record* of close to \$370,000 a year. Were it not for this printing, the patent office would have a surplus of some \$235,000 or \$240,000 a year.

It might be of some benefit to hon. members if I traced the story of the printing of patents. I am hoping the Secretary of State will find some way whereby we can either cut the cost of printing these patents or else he will have to increase the price charged for them. As I recall it, the original report which was submitted by the commissioner of patents and his advisers in 1947 stated that printing would cost about \$45,000 if done by the rotaprint method. Some further estimates were made later, and it was stated that printing would not cost more than \$90,000. Since there was a surplus of \$130,000 a year, it was thought the patent office would not lose any money. However, the cost has proved to be nothing like that, and has gone up from \$230,000 in 1949 until today it is about \$400,000. Some time ago I spoke to the Secretary of State and suggested to him that the price of these printed copies should be substantially increased. The printed copies now cost only 25 cents each. As I calculate the cost of printing, and I can only go by my figures, the cost of printing a patent is about \$30. They are sold for 25 cents each.

As I have often said to the commissioner of patents, those who want printed copies will pay \$1. Before printed copies were obtainable it usually cost in the neighbourhood of \$4 for a typewritten copy of the patent, but those who needed them bought them. It is true that more printed copies are sold, but at a price of 25 cents, which I feel cannot be justified. I feel that the minimum charge should be 50 cents, and I would go as high as \$1 for a printed copy such as is furnished by the Canadian patent office. I am a patent solicitor as well as a barrister, but my practice is mostly in patents and trade marks. I know that when I want a copy of a patent I tell my secretary to get four because they are only 25 cents each. I only need one, but I put the others on the file and give them to people asking for them. If the printed patent cost \$1, I would get one or two. I would even pay \$2, because that is a very small amount to pay for a copy of a patent and the drawings exactly as they are supplied in the patent office. In the past, to avoid delays, attorneys had to make a search for the patent, and then make copies themselves.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the purpose of this bill. Last year there

[Mr. Richard (Ottawa East).]

were about 16,000 applications for patents, and about 10,000 allowances, so if the fee were increased by \$5 the extra revenue would amount to about \$130,000. This would cover the deficit, along with other increases in salary. Hon. members of this house need not cry over the increase, because, of the 16,000 applications filed in Canada, about 12,000 were filed from the United States, 1,867 from England, and only in the neighbourhood of 1,173 from Canadian sources. Even some applications in the latter group were from subsidiaries of United States corporations. In effect, we are therefore taxing foreign corporations and foreign inventors. It will not be the Canadians who will suffer. I believe, however, for the present we have reached the limit in fees for filing applications and for allowances, when we consider the services rendered. I hope that, moved by his zest and zeal, ambition and courage, our new Secretary of State will, as a result of all the good things he has in mind, and the inquiry he wishes to conduct, bring about a better Patent Act.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** If the Secretary of State speaks now he will close the debate.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak long. I could not help rising to echo what was said by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard). I, too, hope I will remain Secretary of State for some time.

But my main purpose in rising was, being a cautious man, to enter a caveat. I said I had hoped there were no postcards in this bill. I did not say there were none. I tried my best to think of everything even remotely related to the bill that the house might wish to know. But it is possible I may not have thought of everything. If so, I hope that my having said so in advance will reduce the enormity of the oversight.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 1—*Tariff of fees.*

**Mr. Fulton:** I wonder if the Secretary of State would answer one or two questions. I believe he said that last year there was a deficit of \$130,000. Is it intended that the increase in fees resulting from the increases provided in the schedule, together with other increases the minister contemplates, and which I understand he has power to make by regulation—or that the governor in council has power to make—will make good the whole of that deficit? Or is it expected that there will still be some to make good?