

49. The author is supposed to be compensated by a royalty, not a Customs duty. It is not denied that the use of the property would be made without the author's consent. Every effort has been made to show Canada the effect of such withdrawal on herself.

50. Canada has no *right* to withdraw unless England is willing. England has power, if she thought it desirable, to refuse her request.

51. The Committee's statement is true and most important. Lord Salisbury's statement should not be wantonly made untrue by subsequent changes, except after consultation with the party to whom he made it, viz., the United States. We cannot help Canada's conduct, but mere self-respect prevents our aiding and abetting the wronging of others for her benefit.

She has no wrong for which she can ask redress. Can she be serious in saying "Canada's commercial interest is placed at the disposal of a privileged class"? When Canada resorts to *veiled threats* it is only kind to her not to notice them. We are discussing an important question which is engaging the attention of statesmen. Canada is at no disadvantage. She enjoys all the rights that England enjoys under existing copyright laws, and one extra advantage conferred by the Act of 1847.

The confusion of the commercial interests of Canada and Canada's market with the title to copyright is again apparent here.

52. Quite true. This is also the international view.

53. But America has shown a disposition to adopt it. The manufacturing clauses are confined to books, photos, chromos, and lithographs. It has just been decided in *Novello and Co. v. The Oliver Ditson Co.* that they do not apply to music. We repeat we cannot control United States laws or actions, but we aim at reprinting not being required, because it is obviously against the author's interest. Does Canada, in the last sentence, ask us to diminish her field of copyright because her printers will be satisfied with what they can take from what fields are left.

54. Undoubtedly. It would be depriving the author of the control of his property.

55. The statement referred to is true. A book has other qualities besides its money value. It gives forth views the author wishes to disseminate. It enhances his reputation; it gives him notoriety, &c. But all this would be destroyed if he were *unable to modify in future editions what he desires to say*, or to bring up his information to the newest standard of knowledge. If the United States publisher does not pay more because he has the Canadian market, surely it is easier for the Canadian publisher to outbid him in negotiating with the author.

56. If so, the Canadian could acquire both rights advantageously to himself by the despatch's own showing; but the statement is very confused. If the American bought the right, how could the author sell it afterwards to the Canadian? Probably the American bought one book, which so far increased the author's reputation, that his subsequent work became much more valuable. This instance goes far to show that the Canadian publisher can now buy both markets with advantage, *if he will exert himself to do so*, and publish in both markets.

57. This despatch does not show any "grievance" except the disappointment of the reprinter, and is asking the Imperial Government to legislate at the expense of the British copyright owner for the Canadian reprinter's benefit. We cannot find when or where the Imperial Government promised to redress "*this grievance*." The grievance is constantly shifting. At one time it was the public, now it is the reprinter, that is the great sufferer, and at all times the Canadian author is ignored.

58. We think the opinion quoted is true. For "tax" read "author's royalty." For "was collected" read "should have been collected," if only to show that Canada could honourably carry out her own undertaking. Canada cannot be ignorant of America's action, but wilfully ascribes it to Great Britain. Are such statements trustworthy? All know that copyright slightly enhances the price of a book, just as having to pay for the bricks or stones of a house increases its cost. Would Canada say, therefore, steal them? It rests with Canada to show that the Canadian cannot acquire the copyright. The Canadian readers seem to desire to honestly pay for copyright, for they make no complaint of a slightly enhanced, not doubled, price.

59. The "Canadian press" is not locked, but Canadians seem too indolent or ignorant of business to utilise it. In a State Paper, the Premier of Canada actually talks of banishing British literature because he is unable to discriminate between honest royalty-paid literature and that which, as we can prove, is smuggled in with the Government's connivance. Canada's conduct does not prove that the author's position would be bettered by the Act of 1889.