

but of which, it is equally certain, he rarely receives the benefit. On the other hand, we must distinguish between the competitive generosity, if such a phrase is justly applicable to the case of the great British or American houses, and the practices of a multitude of less honest traders, who not only reprint without scruple, but issue imperfect, and at times spurious, travesties of the originals. Nor is the system, adopted we will assume generally by the larger firms towards authors of high repute and popularity, by any means universal in its application. Messrs. Appleton declare that not on novels merely, but on grave works of science, philosophy, and history, they have paid many thousands of pounds, and that for a dozen years they have been endeavouring to extend this arrangement amongst British authors willing to accept remuneration upon terms similar to those the publisher in the States could afford to pay to native writers. But whilst Messrs. Appletons' statement is frankly accepted as true with respect to their own good intentions, and probably may be taken as fairly representing the policy of many other firms, there will always, in the absence of legal protection, be a great many exceptions to the rule, if, indeed, the general rule be not the converse of theirs, and such honourable regard for unprotected private rights the exception. Even in Messrs. Appletons' own defence there occurs a statement which, by implication, admits this view of the case to be correct. Mr. Mortimer Collins complained that one of his novels had been reprinted by the Appletons. He was coolly told in reply, that "the book was probably one of those picked up at a slack time to keep the men at work," and Messrs. Appleton "trusted the author did not flatter himself that international copyright could ever help in the case of such books." In other words, if Mr. Collins had announced to Messrs. Appleton that he was about producing a new and popular novel, they would have entered the lists as competitors for advance sheets

and paid him handsomely. Trade rivalry would have kept them true to their avowed policy, but failing that moral corrective, the author's book was "picked up to keep the men at work," without one thought as to whether its appropriation was in accordance with a due regard for his interests. We are at a loss to conceive how it can be argued that an international copyright law would fail to reach such cases as this. Had such a law existed, a professional book-maker like Mortimer Collins would most assuredly have availed himself of its protection; and Messrs. Appleton, with the fear of the law before their eyes, would have found some more righteous method of employing their spare hands. Was it the mere temporary exigencies of the composing room that presented Mr. Erichsen's standard work, already mentioned, to the Government and surgical profession of the United States? It is, however, asserted that, under existing arrangements, the author obtains a larger remuneration from the foreign publisher than he would receive by the sale of his copyright. We may, no doubt, easily find illustrations in proof of this statement from the dealings of publishers with authors of high standing and world-wide fame. But even voluntary liberality must find its level. Wealthy firms may, from motives of policy, endeavour to attract the crowd of book-wrights to their mart by an occasional show of free-handed dealing. But it will hardly be alleged, we imagine, that the aggregate sum paid to British authors by American houses, or *vice versa*, is larger than it would be if all were equally protected by copyright laws. It might be worth while to enquire to what extent, in certain cases, a few popular authors benefit by the fact that the ability of the foreign publisher to pay them handsomely for their advance sheets is enhanced by the supply—for which he pays nothing—of books picked up to keep the men going during slack seasons. It is quite possible that, under the present system, the British publisher, reckoning on a heavy pay-