

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVII.

MARCH 2, 1891.

No. 4.

IN these days of literary piracy it is refreshing to find in the United States a paper taking to task the decision of a New York Judge for legitimizing the plundering of the work of foreign authors. *The (N.Y.) Nation* quotes a decision of a Judge (Wallace) of the Circuit Court, who held "that any American may take and sell for his own profit all that goes under the name of the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, provided he does not use articles therein written by Americans," and then remarks, "we trust there is not one honest man or woman in this community who will read it without a blush of shame and indignation. It means that American jurisprudence sanctions and even protects the wholesale, deliberate, advertised theft of the fruits of another man's labor and capital, provided that other man be born under a foreign flag. It is, therefore, a decision which, without meaning any disrespect to the learned Judge who delivered it, ought never to have been heard from any tribunal but that of an Algerine Cadi in the old days of the Corsairs. It actually makes mockery of our religion and of our morality, and brings disgrace on our courts and legislature. Of course there are plenty of Gallios among us who think it injudicious to say these things lest the thieves should get angry and steal more than ever. But theft and brigandage were never yet suppressed by soft-sawder. They have been always put down by the anger of honest men and the shame and sorrow of religious men."

WE find from an English paper that in a case before the Recorder of Plymouth, on a complaint by a Mr. Treleaven, where four gangs of porters were employed to unload his colliers (one of these gangs consisting of non-union men), and the union decided that he should be requested to discharge the non-union men, and that if he should refuse, the union men should strike, three of the secretaries of the unions were deputed to make this decision known to Mr. Treleaven, who refused to comply with it, and the men struck accordingly, but quietly. The Recorder decided against the union men, as guilty of an offence against the law forbidding intimidation, and fined each of the secretaries £20. The Recorder's judgment is described as "an elaborate and careful piece of reasoning, which betrays no trace of prejudice, and is pervaded throughout by a judicial spirit," and contains the following passage:

"I am of opinion that a strike by the members of a trade union for the purpose of increasing their wages or altering the condition of their employment is lawful, unless accompanied by violence or intimidation . . . but that a strike for the purpose of compelling employers not to employ other persons, or to alter