

the proposed legislation upon Canadian authors. Only a special or a standing committee of this House could go into the matter thoroughly. This would involve considerable time, and we are too near the close of the session to attempt such an inquiry.

There is, however, this comforting reflection, that before the end of the year an international conference at Brussels will make a general review of the convention. In preparing for that conference our representatives will have to review our copyright legislation to ascertain whether we have not given too large a measure of consideration to those interested in this legislation, to the detriment of our own authors. The principle is that an author is free to deal with his work as he pleases. His freedom is subject to many restrictions, in that we allow this class and that to use his work without fee. It appears to me that it is for the author to say when he will authorize the use by others of his own intellectual production. I hope that if the Brussels conference concludes its work before the next session of our Parliament we shall be able next year to grapple seriously with the question.

Hon. C. E. TANNER: Honourable members, at an earlier stage of the session I dealt with the practice of the other House in deluging the Senate with important legislation in the last days of the session, and I ventured to make a suggestion by which that condition of affairs could be remedied. This Bill, to my mind, is an outstanding illustration of what should not happen. I observe that on February 27 a private member of the House of Commons introduced a Bill on virtually the same lines as this one. The Minister on that occasion, or the next day, intimated that he intended to bring down a Government measure on the subject. That is nearly four months ago. This Bill is founded entirely on the report of a royal commissioner, Judge Parker. As I understand it, there was no necessity for any further research, because Judge Parker had made a complete investigation. In common with the honourable leader of the House, I want simply to enter another protest against this practice by the other House of delaying legislation until the very last days of the session.

Right Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: Honourable senators, as chairman of the committee which dealt with this Bill, I may be allowed to say a word. I agree entirely with the view that not only is this haste towards the end of a session unseemly, but it becomes impracticable to give due consideration to belated legislation from the other House. I

have spoken along similar lines ever since I became a member of this House, but my remarks do not seem to have had much effect.

This Bill, like the Patent Bill which we dealt with last year, is complicated. The granting of patents throughout the world is based on international conventions, and it takes months to settle the draft of a bill to deal with the subject. Honourable members will recall that two years ago the Hon. Mr. Cahan spent many days and nights working out a new Patent Bill. The question of conventions and treaties appears all through that legislation, as it does throughout this Copyright Bill. A proper study of the Copyright Act, which is many-sided, cannot be made in an hour or in a day. The committee did the best it could. Some may say its best was not very good, but that is because there was so little time to devote to it. I am in agreement with the suggestion that a new bill, if one is to be brought before Parliament another year, ought to be initiated in the Senate. It would give us something to work on, and we should have time to deal with it properly.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

## UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF AND ASSISTANCE BILL

### FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 100, an Act to amend the Unemployment Relief and Assistance Act, 1936.

The Bill was read the first time.

### SECOND READING

Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND moved the second reading of the Bill.

He said: Honourable senators, this Bill amends the Unemployment Relief and Assistance Act of 1936, which was passed by this House and sanctioned during this session. It contains but one clause, which I think is self-explanatory. It proposes to replace section 4 of the Act by the following:

The Governor in Council may enter into agreements with any of the provinces respecting relief measures therein and providing for any payments on account of such relief measures to be made out of moneys appropriated for relief purposes by Parliament for the fiscal year 1936-37, and where necessary the Governor in Council may grant financial assistance to any province by way of loan, advance or guarantee to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate the maximum amount which may be payable by the province for its share of the cost of unemployment relief and undertakings during