The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1888.

The Week.

THE death of Chief-Justice Waite was so sudden and unexpected that most people were probably surprised to learn that he was a man well along in his seventy-second year, who had earned the right to retire on a pension a year ago last November. He had but recently completed his fourteenth year of service, having been appointed in January, 1874. Judge Waite was Grant's fourth choice for the Chief Justiceship, and his nomination was received by the country with a profound sigh of relief after the remarkable selections which the President had previously made. The place was first offered to Mr. Conkling, who had never shown any qualification for it, but happily declined, as "Senatorial courtesy" would doubtless have secured his confirmation. Grant next hit upon George H. Williams, then his Attorney-General, who was not only without proper legal qualifications, but was positively disqualified for other reasons. When it became evident that Williams could not be confirmed, Grant gave the country a fresh surprise by sending in the name of Caleb Cushing, who was already four years past seventy, and who, in his long career, had become better known for craft and shrewdness than respected for integrity. Cushing was quickly done for by the production of a letter which he had written in 1861 to "my dear friend" Jefferson Davis, recommending another friend of his, a renegade civil servant, to the President of the Confederacy. While everybody was wondering what surprise Grant would next perpetrate, came the nomination of Morrison R. Waite, a man only slightly known to the general public, but of excellent repute and record as a lawyer and as counsel for the United States before the Geneva tribunal. The appointment was hailed rather as a happy escape than as a conspicuously fit one, but the Chief Justice has grown steadily in public estimation, and he leaves an eminently respectable name.

The death of the Chief Justice, following within a few months that of Justice Woods, foreshadows an early reconstruction of the Supreme bench politically, so far as a majority of its members are concerned. Of Lincoln's five appointees to this bench only Miller and Field survive, and they were both born earlier in the same year with Waite. Of Grant's four appointees, Hunt and Waite are dead, Strong retired, and Bradley was seventy-five years old last week. Blatchford, Arthur's appointee, was sixty-eight a few days ago. Fortunately, these changes in the Supreme Court did not begin until the old issue which formerly divided parties had been settled. The "State rights" question was formally and finally disposed of by the Supreme Court while all its members were the appointees of Republican Presidents; "the necessity of the autonomy of the States and their power to regulate their domestic affairs," to use the language of Justice Miller, having been reestablished, after the unsettling period of war and reconstruction, before a Democratic President had a chance to make a single appointment. The great distinction of the late Chief Justice will be the fact that he threw the weight of his influence on the right side when the highest judicial tribunal was annulling unconstitutional laws passed by a Congress of his own party, and that he did not shrink from joining in a decision on the Virginia debt question a few weeks ago, which was "regarded by all classes in Richmond as a fixed and final triumph of State sovereignty." There was a time when the fear of a "State rights" bench appointed by a Democratic President would have caused widespread apprehension, but the course of events has been such that the wildest partisan organs will now find it difficult to arouse alarm over the prospect that Mr. Cleveland is to appoint a Chief Justice.

Mr. James Russell Lowell will deliver another address in this city April 13, on the invitation of the Reform Club. It will probably be full of politics, and will cause renewed agitation among the Blaineites. It is almost impossible to avoid making them howl in any political speech not delivered on behalf of Blaine, because they resent as insulting to their fetish all praise of any other public man, living or dead. If one who is known not to admire Blaine speaks well of Washington's integrity, for instance, they suspect him of alluding to Blaine's crookedness. If he eulogizes Macaulay as an historian, they think he means to depreciate 'Twenty Years of Congress.' If he speaks highly of Hamilton Fish's diplomacy, they conclude he means to deride Blaine's "Pan-American" conference. But the climax of annoyance is reached if he calls the President upright or disinterested, because this is always received in Blaine circles as a veiled allusion to the Little Rock and Fort Smith bonds and the Mulligan letters. As it would be hard for Mr. Lowell to make a speech without praising somebody, we may therefore look for "lively times" among the "aut Blaine aut nullus" people.

The London correspondent of the *Tribune* telegraphs that "nothing affords Mr. Blaine so much amusement as the Democratic and Mugwump comments on his refusal to allow his name to be presented to the National Convention, etc." But the same correspondent telegraphed December 6, 1887, that Mr. Blaine "laughed—he is always laughing." It would seem, therefore, that either Mr. Blaine is afflicted with cachinnatory hysteria, or he is so easily amused that there is nothing wonderful in the amusement he gets out of the Mugwumps and Democrats. The truth is, however, that the discussions over all his sayings—his refusals and assertions and denials—are very amusing, and amuse even the gloomiest men of all parties. The difficulty his followers have in interpreting his utterances, the general unwillingness to accept any of them as final, the "further explanations" that follow them, and the various modes in which exposures of his ignorance or untruthfulness are met, have been making people laugh now for ten years. The hardest blow his admirers have received is the announcement that he sees the fun of it all himself.

There could hardly be a better sign of the times than the debate on the tariff in Boston on Saturday between Mr. E. P. Wheeler of this city and Mr. Butterworth, the member of Congress from Ohio, the former representing the Massachusetts Tariff Reform League, and the latter the Home Market Club. The Tremont Temple was crowded with people eager to listen to the controversy, and their plaudits and interruptions showed their keen interest in the subject. Mr. Butterworth was naturally embarrassed by his advocacy of free trade with Canada, which, of course, is not to be justified by the standard tariff arguments, but he made as good a fight as can be made on the anti-British line of defence. If the association of bad, wicked England with a low tariff had been taken out of his argument, there would have been but little left. Mr. Wheeler, on the other hand, was undoubtedly much aided by the effect of the Trusts on the popular mind. Arrangements for keeping up prices are, in other words, discredited just now as they never have been before; and consequently any one who says a good word for the poor consumer receives a more attentive hearing than he has done for many a day. But no matter who gets the best of it, the fact that the subject is at last being debated before popular audiences is a great thing for the country, and full of promise for the future.

The Louisville *Courier-Journal*, by its Washington correspondent, foots up 142 Democratic votes for the Mills Tariff Bill, together with 5 Republicans and 4 Independents—total, 153. In a full house 163 votes will be required to pass it. These must be obtained from the Randall Democrats—19 in number. What is meant by passing the Mills bill is not stated by the writer. If he means that the Mills bill as it stands, with all its items unchanged, will receive 153 votes, we take leave to doubt the statement very seriously. But if he does not mean this, he means that some bill, after running the gauntlet first of the Committee of the Whole and then of the House, will pass, which is a very different thing. We do not believe that the bill as reported, or as it may be reported, will come anywhere near passing—not because it is not a good bill, or as good as all the circumstances, political and other, will allow, but

because every local interest touched by it will make a desperate effort to change the particular item which concerns itself, and will, in many cases, succeed in doing so. The necessity of reducing the revenue, however, makes a vast difference between present circumstances and those of 1883. This necessity is imperative and overwhelming. Consequently the Mills bill may, and probably will, pass, but it will be a very different thing from the present bill. Its value consists more in the shaping of future political issues than in the particular items contained in it. Even if the final shape of it should be the taking of the whole revenue reduction off sugar and tobacco, we should consider it a measure of great value and importance, since it would not only relieve the strained financial situation, but would present to the country a new set of ideas to work out and vote upon, swamping the Southern question and all the faded and fading issues of the past quarter of a century.

Among the numerous Trusts springing up in every direction, the Halibut Trust is entitled to some consideration. This is a fish trust, and is closely connected with the fishery dispute that has been the cause of so much international disquietude. The Boston *Herald* recognizes, in the names of the persons prominent in the Halibut Trust, several that have been prominent in protesting against the "surrender of our rights" in the pending treaty, and who are urgent in favor of immediate "retaliation." In case retaliation is put in force so that Canadian fish are wholly prohibited, the *Herald* expects that a Cod Trust and a Mackerel Trust will be formed immediately. Why not? Is there anything more absurd intrinsically in a Smoked Herring Trust or a Sardine Trust than in a Sugar Trust or a Lead Trust? Certainly not. Let us have all the Trusts we can—subordinate, of course, to the great Tariff Trust. They are all for the advantage of the laboring man, because the more money the Trust is enabled to levy on the community, the higher wages it is enabled to pay. But when we come to consider the pending Fishery Treaty, it is consoling to know that there is a Halibut Trust opposing it with might and main.

The Chicago *Tribune* gives a very instructive account of the headquarters of the managers of the engineers' strike in Chicago. They have rooms which would be the best in the hotel if they did not front on a courtyard. They are very large and luxuriously furnished, and Chief Arthur's bedroom adjoining is one of those expensive ones which have bath-rooms attached. They cost $20 a day, or $500 for twenty-five days. Men who are directing a strike have to be comfortable, and make a good show to the monopolists when they call on them. Besides these, the Brotherhood is paying for other rooms at the European National Hotel, where the C., B. and Q. Grievance Committees sit. The bills here are also very heavy, and the telegraph bill is said to be huge. The result of all this is that about 1,000 men are thrown out of work for an indefinite period, and must live for some time to come on the funds of the Brotherhood. In other words, the strike has proved a total failure, and, besides the loss to the men, has inflicted great loss on the railroad and on the community. In resisting it, the C., B. and Q. was simply asserting the right to manage its property in its own way, opposing the doctrine of compulsory hiring, which asserts the right of laborers to stay in other people's service against the employer's will, on their own terms. It is for the enforcement of this doctrine that Powderly concocted the maxim that "the injury of one is the concern of all," and initiated the practice of sympathetic strikes. The answer to it all is that mankind could not, in the existing condition of human nature, extract even a bare living from Mother Earth under any such arrangement. Mother Earth has fixed matters in such a way that the human race at present can only make itself comfortable through the plan of having every man mind his own business, and rigidly refrain from unloading on his neighbor, or meddling in his neighbor's affairs without the neighbor's consent.

Gov. Larrabee of Iowa was very neatly caught by President Perkins of the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad in the correspondence which was printed last week. By way of harassing the road in the interest of the strikers, the Governor wrote that "frequent complaints had of late been made to him concerning the interruption of freight and passenger transportation caused by the strike of the engineers, as well as the danger arising from the employment of incompetent substitutes for such employees." This Mr. Perkins took quite seriously, and said: "I will esteem it a favor if you will kindly have transmitted to me a statement of all complaints which have been or may hereafter be brought to your attention, in order that we may endeavor to render satisfaction in each case." He also offered "to make payment in full" by way of damages where liable. We need hardly say the brave Larrabee was not prepared for this. So he made answer:

> "In compliance with your request, I shall take pleasure in forwarding to you any claim for damages that may in the future be brought to my attention. While the inconvenience caused to the public by the present strike has been the subject of much complaint, my intercedence to recover damages has thus far not been requested."

In other words, either he had evolved the "frequent complaints" out of his gubernatorial imagination, or they came from the strikers themselves.

The sympathetic strike of the switchmen on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad of course must end as the strike of the engineers has done, in the employment of other men to fill their places, with more loss to the road, heavy loss and suffering to the men and their families, and considerable delay and interruption to business. The general result will be, that at the end of the year both labor and capital will be worse off in consequence of these strikes than they would have been, though their relations to each other will not be changed. People who expect some great revolution in the organization of modern society in consequence of these labor troubles, would do well to take note of these facts. Labor troubles, in the existing condition of intelligence and character, cannot possibly produce a social revolution of any kind. They can cause disturbance, delay, and diminution of profits, and increase the timidity of capital, but they cannot introduce any new order of things. All the great social changes have been the results either of increased mental and moral culture on the part of the masses, or the increased ascendency on the part of the cultivated few. Discontented ignorance has done nothing for the world thus far, and never can. The only solution of the labor question thus far offered by Labor in this country is that great enterprises should be controlled by their employees under the despotism of a small knot of outside professional agitators, and that the lazy and incompetent man should be paid as much as the diligent and capable. Of course these are not wonder-working suggestions. In fact, sensible men do not consider them at all, and civilized society in the long run is carried on by sensible men.

Another important decision bearing upon the question of prohibition has just been rendered by the Supreme Court. The State of Iowa, by a law passed in April, 1886, attempted to prevent any railroad company from bringing liquor into the State unless the company had been furnished with a certificate from the County Auditor of the county to which the liquor was to be transported, showing that the consignee was legally authorized to sell it. This was equivalent to denying any citizen of Iowa the right to order and have brought to him, even for his own sole use, any liquor by any railroad company from outside the State. The court declares this law invalid, holding that the power to regulate or forbid the sale of a commodity after it has been brought into a State does not carry with it the right and power to prevent its introduction by transportation from another State, and that such legislation would be an unauthorized interference with inter-State commerce. The *Iowa State Register* pronounces this "a pretty serious blow to the cause of prohibition in Iowa, as it will inevitably lead to a large traffic in liquor in the State from other States."

The stringent working of the new High-License Law in Pennsylvania is calling forth loud complaints from the brewers. They cannot take out licenses for as many saloons as they please, as they have done heretofore. In fact, they can take out none at all. As about half the saloons in the city have been closed already, there is a great falling off in the sale of beer, and it is said that nearly all the smaller breweries will be forced to shut down. The larger brewers say that they shall have to reduce

the number of their employees from a half to two-thirds, and declare that in all probability 9,000 of the 12,000 hands at present employed will be discharged. A manufacturer of brewers' wagons says, that, since the law went into effect, orders which he had for twenty new wagons have been countermanded. A dealer in horses for brewers says that his business has also been greatly injured. Just how much exaggeration there is in these complaints cannot be ascertained, but there is evidently a good deal. Still, there is no doubt that the law is restricting the liquor traffic seriously, and as a consequence all branches of it are affected more or less. This is a most encouraging development, for heretofore in Philadelphia, as in New York, the law has not operated as a check, but has been rather an aid to the great brewers in their eagerness to increase to the utmost the facilities for the sale of their product.

It is very natural that the Presbyterians North and South should be anxious to italicize this their centennial year by an organic reunion of the two great sectional divisions of their Church. Indeed, the sentimental considerations in favor of union now appear to be more powerful than the sentimental considerations which tend to keep up the separation. The hitch will come in matters of practical detail, if at all, and, among these, the hardest to handle is the status of the colored people under the new arrangement. From the published correspondence of the committees on reunion, it would seem that the Northern committee is disposed to accede to the Southern demand, and to set off the colored Presbyterians in separate presbyteries, even when conterminous with white presbyteries. This would be a recognition of the color line highly distasteful to many of the Presbyterians of the North, and in the teeth of the professions of the Northern Presbyterian Church. That it would be an abandonment of the practice of the Northern Church, however, as is asserted in some religious papers, is not so clear. Of course there are occasional colored members of Presbyterian churches in the North, who are tolerated and even made at home among their white brethren, though usually, we believe, in the guise of interesting objects of charity among the church's poor. But, so far as we know, there is no colored Presbyterian church in the North affiliating on equal terms with white churches of the same denomination, or even a church in which the colored membership rises above the most insignificant fraction.

If this were all the difficulty before the Southern Church, it would be no difficulty at all. The trouble arises in view of the larger masses of colored people at the South, and the question is how to deal with the two or three colored presbyteries of Florida, Georgia, and the Carolinas, composed wholly of colored members, and established as the result of missionary effort conducted by the Northern Church among the freedmen. They have been in as complete isolation from the Northern Church as from the Southern, with the exception of being entitled to representatives in the General Assembly, and that privilege is to be accorded them under the suggested arrangement. So that, practically, the proposal involves no change at all for the Northern Church, and the committee from that branch of the denomination seem to think it unfair to force a social difficulty upon their Southern brethren which, they doubtless feel, their own Church would shrink from meeting were the question one of practice and not sentiment. It certainly ought to be remembered, in connection with these pending negotiations, that in some cases—for example, in home missionary work in Texas—the Northern Church has already drawn the color line as sharply as the Southern; even a "Northern" Presbyterian church there having to be, as a minister of one such remarked, "either one thing or the other, white or colored, no mixing allowed."

The State Treasurer of Kentucky, one Tate, has defaulted and absconded. The assets he has left behind are very curious and a little "racy of the soil." One item is $75,000 in due bills from friends to whom he had lent the State money. Another, and the best, is 600 barrels of fine old whiskey, estimated at $50,000. That a man harassed, as he must have been, with pecuniary cares, should lay up so much whiskey, shows what a place this product holds in the Kentucky mind. It evidently stands where diamonds stand in other countries, as the thing to put money into for a rainy day. There used to be an old story of the Kentucky gentleman's travelling outfit consisting of two bottles of whiskey and a clean shirt to wrap them in to keep them from breaking; but that belonged to the day of small things, before the telegraph and telephone and electric light. Whiskey is now "carried" in broker's offices and public stores, instead of in gripsacks.

A mere glance at the work cut out for the Woman's International Council in Washington ought to be enough to send James Anthony Froude's heart down into his boots, and to convince him that no amount of talk from him will induce the talkers to stop talking, or even cut down their talk. "Papers" are to be read on fifty-one topics, if we have counted rightly, and discussion is to follow each paper. Besides this there is to be a sermon, a "Conference of Pioneers," and a symposium, and a farewell address, a song from "Lohengrin," and a solo on the violin. A full stenographic report of the proceedings is to be printed day by day. All this is to be the work of one short week. It will be a bad week for the Senators and Representatives who have not as yet made up their minds on the leading questions of female politics. The scarcer they make themselves, the better it will be for their peace. Most of the topics on which the talking is to be, are of a practical character, so that it is possible to communicate information as well as "views," and we, therefore, are satisfied, Mr. Froude to the contrary notwithstanding, that the talk, voluminous though it be, will do good, help to correct mistakes, and make some dark things clear.

We have, what is very rare, two *causes célèbres* pending in this city at present—both will cases, and both very odd in their way. One is nominally an attack by her blood relatives on the will of the late Mrs. Stewart, which gave ex-Judge Hilton half the residue of her estate, and, curiously enough, was drawn by himself, but it is really an inquiry into the way in which nearly the whole of A. T. Stewart's vast fortune was transferred to the same person, although only $1,000,000 was bequeathed to him in the will. The case will probably grow in interest as the trial proceeds. Ex-Judge Hilton's own examination or cross-examination by Mr. Choate will probably be one of the most interesting forensic spectacles of our time. The contest over Mr. Tilden's will concerns the claim of the city to about $4,500,000 for a public library, one of the most splendid gifts ever made for such a purpose. There could hardly be a better illustration of Mayor Hewitt's account of the composition of the city population than the small amount of interest taken by the public in this magnificent contribution to its higher welfare. Few seem to know, fewer still to care, much about the matter. If the will should be set aside and the money for the library lost, we doubt if there would be a word of lamentation, except something formal in the newspapers.

The Ministry have been making very distinct gains in England during the last two or three weeks in the sense of making the dissentient Liberals more contented with their lot, and readier to remain in the Tory camp! The Local Government Bill is as democratic in all its features as any that Mr. Gladstone would have introduced, and Mr. Goschen's budget is probably the best that any Chancellor of the Exchequer except Mr. Gladstone has produced in these later years. He is, after Gladstone, probably the most competent man in English public life to make a clear financial statement. In the present case, too, he has the immense advantage of coming to Parliament with a surplus, and being able through his conversion scheme to promise a reduction of taxation. His conversion of the public debt when fully carried out will reduce the annual charge by over $10,000,000, which to Englishmen, whose surplus rarely exceeds that amount even in good years, is a considerable gain. The applause with which his proposed imposition of a tax of $25 on race horses was greeted was due partly to the disgust excited by recent "turf scandals," partly to the belief that if anything be a luxury it is a race horse, and partly to the feeling even of sporting men that there are far too many "meetings" and too many horses in the field either for the good of the breed or the good of sport,

THE CHIEF JUSTICESHIP.

To a man of legal training and judicial temper, interested in the study of principles and the development of institutions, ambitious to participate in the government of his country and to leave an enduring mark upon its history, the Chief Justiceship of the United States Supreme Court is the most attractive position in the nation. The tenure of office is for life, unless the incumbent chooses to retire upon a pension equal to his salary after reaching the age of seventy, and he is thus freed from all anxiety as to his old age. He is never troubled, as Senators so often are, by the fear that a political revolution or the temporary loss of public favor may end his career with the current term, and he escapes that terrible but inevitable revulsion which overtakes the man who has been President when he retires from the White House into obscurity. If he is appointed in middle life, he has before him the precedents of men who held the office for periods of twenty-eight and thirty-four years, and may anticipate seeing several generations of Congressmen and several executive administrations come and go while he keeps on his way.

The first Chief Justice clearly perceived the preëminence of the position. When the Government was organized, Washington offered Jay the choice of all the offices at his command, and he selected the headship of the Supreme Court. As he resigned after six years, because he believed it his duty to the people of New York to accept the Governorship, Jay's incumbency was too brief for him to realize his ideal, but Marshall, who served from 1801 to 1835, demonstrated the great possibilities of the place. For a third of a century Marshall was, as the Chief Justice should be, the dominant personality in the Court, and Taney, who succeeded him and served nearly as long, came to wield in his turn the paramount influence in the tribunal. Ill health and the Presidential fever combined made Chase's comparatively brief service hardly worthy of his earlier fame, and Waite never quite measured up to the full requirements of the office, highly respectable though his record was. The varying experience of the nation with Chief Justices has only served to emphasize the great importance of the office which a man of Jay's power deemed the most desirable, and there will be no lack of candidates for the existing vacancy.

It is a remarkable fact that, although the Chief Justiceship is the highest judicial office in the land, its incumbents since the beginning of this century have been men who had previously held no judicial position. Waite had not even had a case before the tribunal when he entered it, and his only legal service outside the ordinary practice of his profession had been as counsel of the United States at Geneva. Chase had been Governor of Ohio, Senator, and Secretary of the Treasury, but never a judge. Taney had been a member of the Maryland Legislature, Attorney-General of his State, and Attorney-General of the United States, but never a judge. Marshall had been member of the Virginia Legislature, Representative in Congress, and Secretary of State, but never a judge. It will thus be seen that it is as true of those who made the greatest careers in this office as of their less conspicuous successor just deceased, that they became the chief judge of the country without having held a subordinate judgeship.

It is also true that there have been great associate justices who went upon the highest bench, like their chiefs, without previous service upon any bench. Take two cases, one in our earlier and the other in our later history. Story, who sat for nearly a quarter of a century with such distinction beside Marshall, had been a member of the Massachusetts Legislature and a member of Congress, but never a judge, and, indeed, had practised law only ten years when appointed. Miller, whom Lincoln appointed in 1862, was educated a physician and practised medicine for eight years. He did not even begin the study of law until he was thirty, and he had held no judicial office, nor indeed any office of any sort, when elevated to the highest bench sixteen years later. Miller's case is perhaps the more striking of the two. Both were worthy of the Chief Justiceship, but Story was somewhat overshadowed by the greater Marshall, whereas for years Miller has been the dominant figure of the court. Nobody can examine the series of decisions rendered since the war, which have brought the Government back to its ancient moorings, without perceiving that Miller's has been the controlling mind, or without feeling that he ought properly to have been also the titular head of the court.

It would, of course, be absurd to argue that vacancies on the Supreme bench should only be filled from among men who had served on no lower bench, but it is obvious, in the light of such history, that the field of choice should not be restricted to men who are or have been judges. Other things being equal, such service would be an advantage; but if the President finds a man whom he considers conspicuously fit for the tribunal devoid of such experience, he should not consider it a drawback. The country doctors of Kentucky who had known Miller when he was an M.D., doubtless thought it odd when they heard not many years later that he had been made a judge of the highest court; but experience showed that Lincoln knew his man. With Republican administrations at Washington from 1861 to 1885, and Republicans controlling most of the States during the same period, Democratic lawyers have stood but a poor chance of holding judgeships, but Mr. Cleveland need not feel restricted to the comparatively short roll of such judges. If he can find the man who will prove a second Story or Miller, it will be no objection that he has never been a judge before.

One qualification should be insisted upon in any case. The appointee should be a man of vigorous physical constitution and in the prime of life. It is every way desirable that changes in the Chief Justiceship should be as rare as possible. Two men filled the position from 1801 to 1864, whereas the latest two incumbents served only from 1864 to 1888, or considerably less than half as long. Taney's case was exceptional, as he was 59 years old when appointed, and yet sat for 28 years, but Marshall's record of 34 years was due to his appointment in his 46th year. Forty-six was the age of Miller, who has already served nearly 26 years, and appears good for a number of years yet, and Field, who joined Miller in 1863, was born in the same year with him. Wayne, who sat 32 years, was 45 when appointed; and McLean, who also sat 32 years, was 44 when he received his commission. Of late the tendency has been towards appointing older men, Lamar, Blatchford, Hunt, and Strong having been 62, Waite and Bradley 57, and Chase and Matthews almost 57; but it is not a tendency to be encouraged, in view of the fact that Chase and Hunt broke down before they had served ten years, and Strong retired on a pension after ten years' service. By the time he has reached forty-five or fifty a man has had a chance to prove his quality, and if he goes on the bench then, experience shows that he will stand an excellent chance of doing good service for twenty-five or thirty years. The Chief Justice named by Mr. Cleveland in 1888 ought to be a man who, barring accidents, may be expected to keep at work until 1915 or even 1920.

THE SENATE AND INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

EARLY in the present Congress (December 12, 1887) Senator Chace presented his proposed amendment of the Revised Statutes, which extends, under certain conditions, the protection of the domestic copyright law to the productions of foreign authors and artists. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Patents, and there became the personal charge of the Senator from Rhode Island, who has been untiring in his efforts to put the project upon such a footing as should secure for it an affirmative vote in the Senate. To this end the chief concern has been to adopt such a text for the International Copyright Bill as would secure the support of all persons whose interests should be in any way affected by it. The success which has attended the repeated conferences between the representatives of the typographical unions, the publishers, the authors, and Senator Chace, was demonstrated at the hearing held in the room of the Senate Committee on Patents on Friday, March 9, where representatives of all classes concerned in the production of books were unanimous in advocating the passage of a bill with a final compromise text (the result of the various consultations), approved by the Senator having charge of it.

But five members of the Senate Committee on Patents took any part in this hearing, and of these no more than four were present at any one time, while for the greater part of the session only three members were in their seats, and but two remained during the entire conference. With the exception of the intelligent interest exhibited by the Senator whose bill was under discussion, there was the same expression of apathy so noticeable two years ago, when this subject was under consideration before the same Committee. It was bluntly intimated that