

reported the appeal and complied with the lecturer's wish. The other suppressed the appeal and published the lecture.

The suppression of the appeal serves to show that the manager of the journal knew what the verdict of society between him and the lecturer would be. His representatives, it was understood, pleaded on his behalf their legal right, having paid for their tickets, to carry away anything they could and make any use of it they choose. Legal right is not moral right; there is a law which is made by Parliament and there is a law which men of honor make for themselves. So far as we know there is nothing in the Statute Book to prevent the editor of a newspaper from publishing private conversation provided he keep clear of the law of libel. The purchase of a ticket for a lecture no more gives the purchaser a moral right to deprive the lecturer of his literary property, than the purchase of a copy of a book gives a right to pirate the contents. In the case of a book, morality is protected by law: in the case of a lecture, it has hitherto been generally guarded by the rules of society and by the respect of the Press for the rights and property of literary men. The Press of the United States enjoys what, in the eyes of men of honor is a somewhat unenviable reputation for "enterprise;" but we believe it habitually respects the property of lecturers; so undoubtedly does the Press of England; and so, we may add, does the Press of Montreal.

The lecturer immediately concerned happens to be one who lectures but seldom, and only for charitable purposes, or in compliance with friendly invitations. His remedy, therefore, if he wishes to escape annoyance, is simple and obvious. But he is not the only or the principal complainant; and in his person a right important both to literary men and the community is imperilled. Public lecturing is a regular calling, and one which, to be carried to perfection, requires a remarkable combination of literary and personal perfection. It exacts much preparation and careful training. At the same time it is one to which the people of this continent owe much and are bound to see justice done. Among a population with little access to books, or too busy to read them, the public lecturer has kept alive intellectual tastes and interests, carrying the lamp of culture into regions where it

might otherwise have been entirely extinguished. The history of the lecturing system in the United States would be that of one of the most beneficent agencies on this continent. Nor is this special utility of the system yet exhausted, even were it likely that the day would ever come when people would prefer the lifeless page to the living presentment of thought and emotion. But it is evident that public lecturing will cease, and that this fountain of popular entertainment and culture will cease to flow, if a lecture which has cost long and laborious preparation, as every good lecture must, is, upon its first delivery, to be reported in the newspapers and rendered unavailable for the future. In the cases of great notabilities, people sometimes go rather to see the man than to hear the lecture; but in general cases, few people will purchase a ticket to hear repeated in the evening what they have read in their morning paper.

A question also arises as to our liberty of addressing a particular audience or congregation without addressing the public in general, as speakers and preachers may often have occasion to do. Is no meeting or society to be allowed to keep its sentiments and affairs to itself without taking legal precautions against publication? Is every pew-owner to be entitled to publish in the newspapers anything which a minister may address to his own congregation? The vulgar lust of publicity which is so rampant in the United States, and which is rapidly spreading in this country, will in the end subvert freedom of speech and reduce all utterances of which a reporter can get hold to a wash of unobjectionable milk and water. Already a fatal effect is being produced on manliness of character and boldness of moral bearing. For one man in the United States who is looking straight to the mark of action there are three looking at their own shadow in the Press.

In general cases social opinion is the only restraint. But in the case of public lecturers there is a definite injury to property against which the law might probably guard. It might perhaps be enacted that a notice in the advertisement and on the tickets that the right of publication is reserved should be equivalent to registration of copyright in the case of a book. Such a provision would be an effectual safeguard, and we see no difficulty in carrying it into effect.