

60. Canadian reprints would only take the place of American, and therefore the result to British authors would be the same.

61. Inconvenient to Canada to carry out her own undertakings! Why should a government thus bespatter a people? Canada can give up collecting this royalty when she likes, but by refusing the *quid pro quo* under which foreign editions are admitted, and compelling us to withdraw the Order in Council under which they come in. Then every copy could be seized as a piracy. The Act of 1847 makes the royalty essential to the efficacy of the Order in Council.

62. Australia is ahead of Canada in literature and authors because she fairly protects their property. It is not a case for parliaments, but for the exercise of common honesty.

63. This might be the outcome of the isolated position Canada takes up. Canada attacks the literary property of all nations, and thus places herself outside the arrangements of civilised society even more than Liberia or Haiti, and in the same paragraph is shocked at the idea that her interests should not be considered more than those of the rest of the world.

64. Either Canada has overlooked the interests of authors or cannot understand them.

65. Competition creates opportunities for all. Canada cannot sit still and say she has no opportunities. Her failure to grasp opportunities is due to want of enterprise fostered by the fascination of "building the house with bricks belonging to someone else and taken without his sanction." The royalty to be received by an author under the Act of 1889 is not guaranteed by Canada herself even.

66. The Despatch complains again that England made concessions to the United States, having said previously (par. 36) that she did not do anything of the kind.

How is Canada's condition worse, except that, like all parties to the Convention, she must pay now for property which she could previously use without payment?

67. Copyright laws are to protect property, not trade.

68. Cheapness of production is still more in favour of the Canadian producer. If Canada, as here acknowledged, can compete in one case, why not in all? Is not this self-stultification? Nothing hinders competition but want of enterprise. Is it dignified to cry out for protection without helping yourself according to your opportunities? More than 50 books have already been published in Canada with the authors' sanction, and 20 times as many might be, without let or hindrance. A Canadian can print his book in the United States more easily than an Englishman can. His true remedy is to compete for British copyrights like the rest of the world.

69. As remarked before, we cannot control United States legislation. England is affected as well as Canada, but we think it more dignified not to complain of what we cannot prevent.

70. Canada seeks the encouragement of her reprinters, and to promote this all other interests may "go to the wall." Does Canada think she can, in common honesty, ask the Imperial Government to help her pillage British and Canadian authors to benefit Canadian printers, even if this could be the result of the action? The granting of "any number of licences" to reprint British books would soon kill the royalties by "competition," which Canada does not like.

71. No law prevents Canada "selling in its own market," but it must keep within legal limits and not take the author's profit to put it into its own pocket.

72. So it would be.

73. Canada's proposed action would hinder the production of new copyright books by filling her market with very cheap reprints of books already published. This result was experienced by America.

74. If it benefited Canada why should she hold back because it would also benefit the United States? Would it not be possible to maintain the duty except against England and her Colonies if Canada wishes to do so?

75. The present low royalty is undoubtedly a hardship on British authors, and was only conceded to benefit Canadian readers, whose market was too small to justify the preparation of special editions for it. It is only necessary to stamp all imported copies, and render all unstamped copies offered for sale liable to seizure, to make the present laws effective.

76. This should apply to the Act of 1847 royalty, but the similarity of the rate with the tax on books seems to be accidental.

77. That inference is not justifiable and does not appear to be put forth seriously. Any fixed royalty is unjust to the author.