

any other form. The only thing to be said on the other side is, that the steamers take more time in the passage between the two cities than the railways, and this loss of time may be a serious thing to men to whom rapidity of movement is of special consequence. But on the whole, the change in following the course of nature is one which must sooner or later have been made, and the surprise should be perhaps that it was not made before.

Chief Justice Taylor, of Winnipeg, has refused to continue the interim injunction to restrain the N. P. & M. road from crossing the C.P.R. He finds that the railway commissioner is proceeding on behalf of the province, under proper authority, to build the road. The validity of the local act is questioned by the C.P.R. The evidence showed that little damage could be sustained by the C. P. R. from the crossing. At most, the Chief Justice remarked, the plaintiff might suffer some injury to its business from the existence of a competing line. But this is precisely what the C.P.R. has been paid by Canada to permit. Upon the injunction being dissolved, the Local Government advertised for tracklayers and special constables to protect them. But the C.P.R. resolving to continue the vexatious delay, obtained another injunction, which is made returnable to-day. The means of obstruction, which the C. P. R. shows a disposition to use to the last extremity, are not yet exhausted. The case can be argued at any length, at Winnipeg, and it is to go through the ordeal of the Supreme Court. It is difficult to see what the C.P.R. expects to gain by all this vexatious opposition. It has entirely lost the sympathy of the public; and if it expects to bleed the Canadian tax-payer once more, by another appeal to Parliament, it will find that that is a game which cannot be repeated to infinity.

COPYRIGHT IN CANADA.

The meeting of the Canadian Copyright Association, in Toronto, last week, was fairly representative of the publishing trade. Whether the Berne convention shall be ratified by the Canadian Parliament is a question which especially concerns our publishers. A bill to give effect to it was introduced last session, but was withdrawn or held over. If this bill had become law, British copyrights would extend to Canada, even though the works were not published here. To the passing of this bill the Canadian Copyright Association is opposed, and we think there are good grounds for the opposition. A Canadian author cannot secure copyright in this country unless his work is printed here; and it would not be reasonable to give a British subject not resident here greater rights than the inhabitants of the country.

Copyright is everywhere subject to limitations. As a rule it is subject to limitations both as to time and territory. The argument for making copyrights perpetual, which Lord Macaulay opposed with singular force, is stronger than that for making it extend over countries other than that of which the author is a citizen or resident.

The practice of limiting copyright in point of time justifies its limitation in space. If a self-governing country, as Canada is, may refuse to grant copyright to British subjects who reside in Great Britain, much more may it prescribe the terms on which it may be granted. And this is what the Copyright Association proposes to do. Instead of accepting the Berne convention, the Copyright Association proposes conditions on which British authors can secure copyright in Canada. One condition is that any work other than Canadian, copyrighted in Canada, shall be printed and published in this country within two years of its original publication. This is not unreasonable. But we scarcely see the necessity of the proposal that any work other than Canadian intended to be copyrighted here shall be registered with the Minister of Agriculture simultaneously with its publication elsewhere. The object is, of course, that Canadian publishers may have timely notice of the fact, and be in a position to reprint a work which the author or original publisher has no intention to print and publish here. Less than two years' notice should suffice. The Canadian Copyright Association does not propose to legalize literary piracy. It does not propose that, in any case, a Canadian publisher should be allowed to appropriate an English book, by republication, without accounting to the author. But it does propose that our Legislature should fix the rate of remuneration at ten per cent. on the retail price of each copy, which is as much as Canadian authors get. An objection to the author's remuneration being fixed without his concurrence may be anticipated by saying that this is the percentage agreed between the British and Canadian Governments, long ago, to be charged upon the importation of American reprints of British works, when the author makes application to have the amount collected. If the rule is just when applied to imported reprints, and the British Government has decided that it is, it cannot be objectionable when the reprint is undertaken in Canada, by a Canadian publisher, of a work the right to republish which has been abandoned by its author. The author would always have the right to republish; and he would, besides, be secured ten per cent. on the retail price of a republication which he declined to undertake. The fairness of this arrangement is not open to reasonable objection. Whether the Canadian publisher lost or gained on the venture, the British author would get a percentage on each copy. If only a small number of copies were sold the publisher would be a loser, but the author would get something.

On one of the restrictive clauses of the proposed Act we cannot look so favorably. The proposal to refuse copyright in Canada to American authors until an international copyright agreement is made between the United States, Great Britain, and Canada might be justified on the ground of reciprocity. But the demand that Canada should have a monopoly of reprinting British works whose authors decline the risk of republication here, by excluding American reprints, is not admissible. A great many British works are reprinted in the Repub-

lic, where a large population insures a remunerative sale, which could not be undertaken here, where only a few copies could be sold, and the proposed exclusion would be a great inconvenience to the Canadian public.

THE FRENCH REGISTRATION DECREE.

By a decree of the President of the French Republic, all foreigners who intend to reside permanently in France are to be registered. At first sight the object might be supposed to be political: to enable the Government to keep its eye upon persons who might be liable to become connected with conspiracies dangerous to the peace of the country. But the London *Economist* traces the decree to a different motive: jealousy of foreign immigrants on the part of French laborers. The number of immigrants in France is equal to three per cent. of the population. Belgian and Italian laborers are not welcomed in France by the French laborers with whom they compete. The Italians work longer hours than the French, and make it very difficult to organize strikes. But these laborers would not find employment if their labor was not needed, and their displacement would cause a reduction of national wealth. The attempt to drive them out is a part of the protective system of the country.

In one respect the French laborer has a good ground of complaint against these immigrants. Not being naturalized, and therefore not liable to the conscription, the foreigners have an advantage over the natives who owe military service to the country. A tax on foreigners in lieu of the conscription would not be unjust. These immigrants enjoy the protection of French laws, and they have no right to an immunity necessarily denied to natives. Just now the feeling between France and Italy is in some degree mutually repellent, and skilled French workmen who find employment in Italy are looked on with jealousy, and sometimes subjected to open demonstrations of hostility. The growing feeling against foreigners of one kind or another in several countries is thus particularized by the *Economist*: "The Germans of the North-East only two years since expelled vast numbers of Poles, ostensibly because they were Catholics and Slavs, but in truth because the more civilized German labourers and peasantry could not compete with them. The Swiss, by their communal laws, heavily handicap the foreigner, who shares in none of the communal distributions; and even the Austrians, with their easy-going wages and wealth of low-priced land, are beginning to look uneasily at the slow but ceaseless march of the Italians up the Brenner. The Americans are sending back all immigrants who can be described as paupers, though these immigrants have labor to sell, which in such a country is as good as property; the Australians are expelling the Chinese bodily; and even in England there is a loud demand for interference with the Polish Jews, who in some quarters of London undersell certain descriptions of artisan, and are becoming a perceptible feature in the population."