

“ The aim hereof is to concisely present the doctrine that is settled by our final authority. It is substantially a summary of established points, from among the opinions severally set forth in my recent detailed treatise on this subject—plus subsequent cases.” This purpose is strictly adhered to and the same arrangement of subject-matter, seen in the earlier work, is followed. The subjects treated are: I. License Under Patent; II. Identity of Invention; III. Validity of Patent and IV. Recovery for Infringement, these being the subjects, in proper order, necessarily disposed of in the normal suit for patent infringement, as Mr. HALL treats the subject. At the end of the work is a complete collection of Supreme Court decisions arranged chronologically under the decisions of subject-matter, followed in the text and enabling one at a glance to trace the growth of doctrine in the decisions which have developed it.

The “ Outline ” should be valuable to the practitioner as a work of quick and general reference, especially in presenting immediately lines of authority supporting the text, and to the layman, as a clear, succinct statement of the law relating to the infringement of patents, neither burdened with detail nor of so highly technical a character as to be unpractical.

R. SAILER.

CURRENT EVENTS

OF GENERAL LEGAL INTEREST.

Although, perhaps, more properly the subject for political or ethical comment, the present state of affairs in the City of New York cannot fail to interest the legal world in its broad sense. Laws are not supposed to be enacted only to be ignored, or, what is far worse, to be enforced or overlooked as the political convenience of the executive branch of government may suggest. One of the first principles instilled into the mind of the embryo lawyer, (would that it could be into that of the embryo legislator!), is the danger of the growth of disrespect for law in general which arises from the observance of its

**The Struggle
for the
Observance
of the
Law in New
York**

neglect in particular instances. Of course, in these days the historically learned may know that laws are after all merely the crystallization of customs, but this class is still in a decided minority. The great body of the people for whom laws are made, or at least who live under them, must learn to obey the laws, or they will soon come to regard them with contempt, a far more dangerous feeling in the long run than out and out dislike.

In short, the only course open to New York seems to be to enforce the law as long as it is the law. If it is unpopular there is the remedy of repeal. If the lapse of time is necessary before this can be accomplished the lesson will be all the more likely to be appreciated. The responsible citizen realizes this and sacrifices his convenience and comfort to the principle whose importance he cannot fail to recognize.

Regret for the death of Mr. Justice Jackson is naturally coupled with interest as to who will succeed him. With the many places of appointment at the disposal of the President there are none he so rarely has the opportunity to exercise, none of more real importance to the country, or which call for a more careful exercise of impartial judgment than supreme court vacancies.

Unfortunately, the comparative *otium*, even with all its *dignitas*, of a career upon this Bench does not appeal to some successful leaders of the active Bar, whose appointment might otherwise be hoped for, and this sometimes necessitates the falling back upon jurists of less celebrity. This, however, need not prevent the selection of a man of irreproachable integrity, fair unprejudiced ideas, sound training, and last, but not least, undeviating patriotism.

The proverbial conservatism of the City of Philadelphia is now involved in a question in which its equally noted patriotic spirit plays a part. The subject in dispute is so famous and the principles of law growing out of it so interesting in these days of municipal reform agitation that the case will be watched with curiosity by the legal profession at large.

The case
of the
"Liberty Bell"

It appears that the officials of the forthcoming "Cotton States Exhibition," to be held at Atlanta, Georgia, having extended to the citizens of Philadelphia, through their Mayor and Councils, a general invitation to attend and to send exhibits, the City Councils accepted this general invitation, and, following the precedent established at the time of the World's Fair at Chicago, went to the further alleged uncalled for extent of resolving to send the famous old Liberty Bell from its resting place in Independence Hall.

Aroused by this to them seemingly improper, not to say perilous scheme of the city fathers, certain private citizens and taxpayers have filed a bill in equity praying for an injunction to restrain the removal of the historic heirloom, alleging, among other grounds, the following: that the proposed action would be "an improper diversion of corporate property possessing great intrinsic value;" that it would "strip the shrine [Independence Hall] of its most precious and venerated treasure;" that it will "deprive the complainants and all other citizens, residents and sojourners of Philadelphia of their rightful possession and enjoyment of the Bell;" that "it tends to establish a precedent for future separations of the Bell from its present hallowed associations." The concluding allegation denies the legality of the ordinance as being directed in furtherance of an object not municipal in character.

The sentimental side of the question makes the case an unique one; the result of the objection to the appropriation on the last of the above mentioned grounds will go a step toward defining the powers of municipal legislative bodies with regard to the objects for which they may spend the public money.

W. S. E.