

Copyright Act, 1844, and one question was whether registration was necessary. It had not been registered as required by the Act of 1842, and Neville, J., held that the registration required by the Act of 1844 is in substitution for and not in addition to the registration required by the Act of 1842, and as the proprietor had been relieved by virtue of the International Copyright Act of 1886 (49-50 Vict. c. 33) ss. 4, 6, and the Berne Convention, 1887, and the Orders in Council adopting the same, from registration under the Act of 1844, no registration under the Act of 1842 was necessary. But he also held that the proprietor of such a copyright desiring to retain it in force in England must on the title page of every copy published in England print in English the notice reserving such right required by the Musical Compositions Act of 1882 (45-46 Vict. c. 40) s. 1. He also held that when a proprietor, tenant or occupier of a place of entertainment, at which an unauthorized performance of a copyright musical composition takes place, does not "wilfully cause or permit such unauthorized performance knowing it to be unauthorized," he is, by virtue of the Musical Compositor's Act, 1888 (51 and 52 Vict. c. 17) s. 3, relieved from liability to any penalty or damages in respect thereof, and in such cases an injunction will not be granted unless he threatens and intends to continue the performance. In this case the defendant, a hotel keeper, had hired musicians to play at his hotel, leaving it to their discretion what to play, and without his knowledge they performed a piece which was subject to copyright, and on his attention being called to the fact, he forbade the further performance of it. The plaintiff, moreover, failed to support his copyright because the publications of his composition in England bore only a notice in French reserving his rights.

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION—COUNCIL MEETINGS—RIGHT OF PUBLIC
—NEWSPAPER REPORTER—EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC FROM MEETING OF COUNCIL.**

Tenby v. Mason (1908) 1 Ch. 457. This was an action brought by the municipal corporation of the Town of Tenby against the defendant, a newspaper proprietor and ratepayer and burgess of the town, to restrain him from being present at council meetings without the permission of the council. The plaintiffs had passed a resolution excluding reporters, but the defendant had attended a meeting in that capacity and refused to leave when required so to do. The defendant claimed the