This law must not be passed.
As an illustrator, animator, designer, photographer, cinematographer, composer, writer, inventor, etc… descendent from a long line of artists, I speak from first hand experience.
If anything, artists require greater protection under the law.
The imagination of every artist is an exceptional and rare gift.
Innovative ideas are the foundation of the endurance of the human race, inspiring, motivating, igniting progress.
The ability to conceive and manifest a unique creation is an extraordinary contribution to society.
The value of a creation to its creator is immeasurable, as it often represents significant time, dedication and sacrifice, producing a product entwined with an intrinsic emotional value.
For many of us, our hearts are deeply invested into all that we imagine and create. Our creations are like a piece of our soul, our children, our life's blood, our legacy… an invaluable asset.
By legally protecting an artist's inalienable rights of ownership to the original works they conceive and produce, artists are encouraged to be productive and share their creations with the world.
Few artists are privileged enough to offer the fruits of their labour without hope of compensation.
Those with the greatest talents frequently rely upon creative expression for their livelihood, often enduring many years of hardship before becoming recognized. For many, the creative well is not boundless. Some great artists produce only one defining work in their career. Imagine if that one work was never recognized as being the rightful property of the creator, but instead exploited for use by advertising companies and the like, without honouring or compensating the originator of the work.
If an artist's natural rights were dissolved by this law, artists would be highly discouraged from sharing their creations with the world, knowing that revealing their works without the costly and time consuming process of registration, would result in the loss of rights to their works.
Significant historical works could be lost forever, all because an artist could not afford to register the vast collection representing a lifetime of works.
Artists would be hindered from publicly promoting or sharing their unregistered works with galleries and museums, knowing anyone with a cell phone camera would be within their rights to reproduce the work for profit or create derivative works, without compensating the artist.

Originality would be squelched, and the world would become homogenous with cheap knockoffs created by “technicians”, while inventive minds faced an even greater struggle to be recognised in a sea of copycats vying for dominance in the latest trend.
We need only to look at the “apps” market, “youtube”, or China’s art world, to see how over-saturation disadvantages the creatives who originated a concept.
People should be encouraged to form radically new ideas and significant advancements on existing ideas, rather than merely repackaging a profitable concept.
There was a time when unique individuals had a powerful voice, with an opportunity to bring positive change for the benefit of all.
Burying the valuable contributions of original thinkers and creators, by enabling mass production and indistinct adaptations of their works, only insures a bleak and stagnant future.

A more positive solution would be to offer free copyright registration services. This way, works are archived, preserved for enjoyment by future generations, and artists are protected for their lifetimes, as are their heirs.
In my opinion, the exception to copyright and patent should be as it pertains to inactive use, particularly in the case of invention.
Given a scenario where all patent and copyright processes are free to the originator, if an intellectual property owner is not actively making use of a concept or creation for 10 years or more, a third party should have the right to challenge the IP owner. Once challenged, the IP owner has the option to utilize the concept or creation within one year, or it falls into a category, where the public can purchase a limited license to use the IP, with all proceeds going to the originator, with licensing revokable and refundable, should the originator or their heirs resume active use of the IP. This would hopefully prevent hoarding and stimulate the timely evolution of valuable concepts. Allowances should be made for inactive use due to insufficient financial means or health limitations. However, a forum should be provided to connect creatives with interested parties possessing the means to further their success.