

an action in which the defendant justified a breach of his contract to let rooms to the plaintiff on the ground that they were to be used for the purpose of delivering lectures upon such subjects as "The Character and Teachings of Christ, the former defective, the latter misleading". Lord Coleridge admits that Lord Chief Baron Kelly's judgment "goes the full length of the doctrine" that to attack christianity is to expose yourself to an indictment for libel. From this he dissents and points out that Baron Bramwell rests his judgment upon the Statute of Wm. III.

Whether Lord Coleridge or Mr. Justice Stephen is right will have for the present to remain unsettled. In Manitoba there is the further point, whether the law of England as to blasphemous libels was ever in force here. It is said that to attack christianity is an offence at common law and that the common law was introduced into this Province. But is not this law one which is applicable only to a country where there is an established or state recognized religion? In answer to this we must refer our readers to *Pringle v. Town of Napanee* 43 U. C. Q. B., 285, where after an elaborate judgment it was held that although in Ontario no sect was entitled to particular protection the fundamentals of christianity are as safe from denial as in England. The same point has been decided in the same way in the United States. (See the cases referred to in *Pringle v. The Town of Napanee, ante.*)

A very large number in the community then, including all the booksellers, are, perhaps, out of jail only upon sufferance of any one who wishes to lay an information. We cannot doubt that it only requires that it should be attempted to apply the law to some persons of respectability in order to ensure its unanimous relegation to the nearly completed list of stupid attempts to stop people thinking, and expressing their thoughts in any language they choose to employ—whether inspid or vigorous.