

Q. From the point of view of your association would you consider that a law of this kind would be objectionable?—A. Being immoral, I should call it objectionable.

Q. Of course, it is all a matter of opinion whether these things are immoral or not?—A. Yes; my opinion may be wrong, or the association may be wrong. I have tried to look at it from the printers' point of view. As I say, I have had the most pleasant relations with printers as well as publishers.

Q. Supposing the licensing clauses, as far as books are concerned, were repealed, to give the author—as would seem to be reasonable—the sole control over his books, printing and everything, but so far as magazines, like MacLean's, for instance, and periodicals like that, the licensing clauses remain so that they may obtain writings which otherwise they could not obtain—so far as the country's interest is concerned, would you have any objection to a law of that kind?—A. I am glad that the country's interests have been mentioned at last.

Q. I might tell you that is the point of view I am taking myself.—A. I might say that if the country chooses to install a purely socialistic system, if it decides to become purely socialistic and take possession of all private property in the name of the country, I shrug my shoulders and say "All right"; that will not prevent me from writing; I will keep on writing because I want to write, when I think I have something worth writing, but you cannot run with the hare and the hounds at the same time; you have to be socialistic or not socialistic.

Q. Are there not many laws of a socialistic kind which are advantageous to the country at large?—A. They tend that way, certainly. I do not know if there is any law which empowers a private individual, like a printer, with the connivance of a public individual, a minister, to take possession of my property, the product of my brain, my literary property. You can take possession, and do take possession of private property for the country's use in the way of taxation.

Q. Mr. Kennedy, did you know that before statute law was passed the authors had no rights whatever over their publications?—A. I suppose it was a question—I have read the history—

Q. The authors came to Parliament and asked the special right of having complete jurisdiction over their property?—A. Yes, you know how the authors were suffering through the absence of any control of piracy and a Copyright Act was passed, and that Act, properly, I think, should have given the author just as much right over that form of his property as over any other form of his property. But it did not, and we bow to the inevitable. We cannot get unlimited copyright in our work. We know that. But we can fight tooth and nail against any further limitations like these.

Q. In the opinion of many of us who have heard the evidence—some of us are of the opinion that all these matters which engaged Parliament, at once affect the rest of society. You have to weigh the interests of the whole country. That is what it comes down to. Now we will turn to the point of my original question. Supposing a law was made so as to eliminate the licensing clauses as they apply to author's books and publications of that kind, but allowed the licensing clauses to remain so far as they affected periodicals—in other words, a concern like MacLean's could have a first class story and publish it in Canada, in an atmosphere of this country, for the benefit of this country.—A. Personally, I should be inclined to say that half a loaf is better than no bread. I am not instructed by my association so I do not like to express an opinion on that point, but as the question of magazine publications has been brought up, I want to say that I have felt as much as anybody the need of helping our serials, our national serials. I think it is one of the questions which might well concern Parliament, how to deal effectively with this flood of alien

[Mr. Howard Angus Kennedy.]