

rolled in the public schools of some Southern States than in New Hampshire, while even South Carolina, which has the largest proportion of negroes, falls only a trifle behind New Hampshire in this respect.

The latest reports of the Superintendents of Education in the Southern States teem with proofs that outside help is not needed, a few of which must be cited. The average length of the school year in Virginia is already nearly six months, and the Superintendent recommends as perfectly practicable a further extension through the increase of local assessments. In West Virginia the average length is nearly five months, and the Superintendent urges an increase, remarking that "the additional tax for two months would scarcely be felt." In Tennessee the Superintendent reported that "our public-school system is growing in favor with the people," and the Legislature justified his statement by more than doubling the school tax within a month after the Blair bill lapsed by the expiration of the Forty-ninth Congress, while the counties in their turn are doubling the local fund raised for education. In Alabama the Superintendent recites the growth of the system within four years from 4,624 schools with 177,428 pupils and a school fund of \$392,904, to 5,595 schools with 252,967 pupils and a school fund of \$523,353; he says that "our educational facilities must be increased to keep abreast with the material prosperity of the State," and adds that "all know there has been a gratifying increase in the resources of the State during the past few years which requires an increase in the annual appropriation for schools." In Arkansas the Superintendent reports that "we are making rapid progress in our educational interests, and in a few more years Arkansas will stand side by side with the most favored of her sister States in the educational advantages she offers to her children"—a statement which is certainly warranted by the increase between 1883 and 1886 from 2,462 teachers, 112,233 pupils, and \$479,471 expenditure, to 3,691 teachers, 175,935 pupils, and \$866,892 expenditure. In Georgia the Superintendent reported an increase within four years of pupils from 244,197 to 309,594, and of expenditure from \$498,533 to \$723,161, while he showed once more that a small increase in the tax, which could be laid "without unduly burdening the people," would enable the State to keep the schools in operation for six months of the year. In Florida the Superintendent reports that the amount expended upon schools has risen within four years from \$133,260 to \$400,000, while the school year falls only a few days short of New Hampshire and Maine. In Texas the Superintendent reports a steady and rapid advance in the cause of popular education, and insists that "the school term throughout the State should not be less than seven months."

Space will not permit a full presentation for each State of the wonderful progress which has been made in developing the school system of the South within the past few years. The Blair bill was introduced in December, 1881, upon the ground that the South was so "impoverished by the war"

that it could not raise any more money for schools than it was then raising, and that Federal aid ought to be granted for eight years. Six of the eight years have passed; the amount raised for schools has been largely increased in every State, and doubled or trebled in some, while the man who should now talk about the South being "impoverished by the war" would provoke the derision of every self-respecting Southerner. The rigorous test of time has been applied to the plausible pleas which were originally made for the passage of this bill, and their fallacy has been clearly exposed. The South has shown herself able to overcome the difficulties of the situation, and her success is another tribute to American self-reliance. The most satisfactory feature of the matter is the fact that the opposition which has defeated the "Bill to Promote Mendicancy" was largely the opposition of self-respecting Southern men, like Senator Butler of South Carolina, who put the case against it most forcibly four years ago, when he said:

"We ought to pause and reflect, for fear that in throwing this large amount of money into the States you will check the effort in those States to develop their own common-school system in their own way. Why, Mr. President, there is no success in life comparable to the success which attends individual effort, none so enduring, none so satisfactory. I would, therefore, be very cautious before I would appropriate money and put it with the States, the effect of which, I am afraid, would be, among others, to induce a very great many men who are now earnestly struggling to build up their own local institutions, to put their hands in their pockets and say: 'The general Government is going to educate everybody—what is the use of any man paying taxes for education?'"

PICTURES AND PICTURE-BUYERS.

A CORRESPONDENT in the West writes, on behalf of some local economists who are just now occupied with the tariff discussion, to ask us whether we set paintings down among the things known as "luxuries," and therefore a fair subject for Custom-house taxation. The question will most probably come up this winter in connection with the 30 per cent. duty which we now levy on the works of foreign artists, and which we believe nobody any longer defends on the ground that it is legitimate protection for native industry against foreign competition. Thirty years ago there were American artists who dreamed of the possibility of making by the aid of the tariff a sort of art vacuum in this country which native talent would fill with a purely and distinctively American school, owing nothing whatever to European precept, spirit, or example. But this dream has for the most part passed away, and American artists have resigned themselves to taking part in the general struggle for distinction and a market without any adventitious aid.

If any are now disposed to rely on the tariff at all, it is rather for protection against the dealers in this country than against professional rivals abroad. They say, and with a good deal of force, that in no country is the dealer so powerful an influence in the picture market as in this, because in none are there so many buyers with long purses who do not

venture to rely on their own judgment in making their purchases. When the time comes in their career, therefore, at which they think it is incumbent on them to fill their houses with works of art, they put themselves unhesitatingly into the hands of an importer, and he generally covers their walls with the products of foreign studios, and, if he allows them to buy American pictures at all, recommends them only for bedrooms and the less frequented parts of the house.

Against this discrimination the human nature in American art naturally revolts, and if the tariff would do anything towards repressing it, we imagine a good many advocates for the duty on foreign pictures would be found among American painters. But as a matter of fact the duty on foreign pictures, although it may in some degree prevent importations being as large as they would be in its absence, has not perceptibly diminished them. The ebb and flow of the American demand for European pictures seems to be more affected by the condition of the stock market than by any other influence known to us. In truth, the ordinary American picture-buyer is rather stimulated than deterred by dearthness. The addition of 30 per cent. to the price is in nine cases out of ten more likely to increase than to cool his ardor. In his own ignorance of the conditions which fix the value of a picture in money, he is apt to defer to the judgment of those who profess to know something about them, and to conclude that their asking a very high price is a sort of confession of the importance of what they have to sell. He does not know, what is literally true, that the picture market now closely resembles the stock market—that it has its bulls and bears and corners, just as Wall Street has, and that dealers not infrequently "sell short" works which they know are held in considerable quantity by a rival, in order to break him down, or "make corners" in works which they know he is seeking, and unload freely on "lamb" from the West works in which their own expectations have been disappointed.

So that, on the whole, the effect of the tariff on the sale of foreign pictures, though doubtless considerable, can hardly be said to be perceptible. It keeps foreign pictures out to some extent, but we do not know to what extent. The only aid in approximating to an estimate of it is to be found in the large number of counterfeits of distinguished European artists which are to be found all over the country. A French connoisseur came here a few years ago to catalogue, if possible, the more valuable works of French art to be found in this country in private collections and public galleries. He had not gone very far, however, before he came on forgeries, enough to astonish him, of the more readily imitable works of such painters as Corot and Rousseau. In fact, we have ourselves been assured by a leading American painter that there is in one of the suburbs of New York a Corot factory, from which you can obtain works of this master of any size or in any quantity you please—either by the dozen or the single copy. That the

tariff fosters frauds of this sort is very certain. The smuggler and counterfeiter always follow close behind the custom-house inspector.

The objection to the picture duty which American artists, we imagine, feel most keenly, is the discredit it inflicts on us in the eyes of foreign nations, which contain a large proportion of the public whose opinions they value. We are the first civilized country which has ever sought to make difficult the importation of works of art. All the leading governments of Christendom spend money in buying pictures for public galleries, and encourage by every means in their power the introduction of them from abroad by private individuals, both for their own greater glory and for the cultivation of the popular taste in an important field of human expression. We enjoy the amazing distinction of being the only people to put pictures on a level with cotton goods, and pig iron, and raw wool. Every American who occupies himself either with literature or art or science, or with the cultivation of the ideal in any field of human observation, is, of course, compelled to hang his head for shame when he is asked to explain this to a foreigner. But the reason why he hangs his head for shame in talking to the foreigner is also the reason why he is puzzled and embarrassed when he is called on to explain to the ordinary Congressman why taxes on works of art are all wrong. He cannot make the Congressman understand the part which art plays in the higher development of the race any more than he can make the foreigner understand the Congressman's indifference to it. If a man sees no educational value in art, one can hardly reveal it to him by any sort of exposition. It is, like color-blindness or the absence of ear for music, a difficulty which can only be overcome by faith. That is to say, people who see nothing in pictures, whether old or new, must trust that immense body of the best men and women of all ages who have treated art as "the flower of humanity."

The accumulation of first-rate pictures in America, in spite of all difficulties, is very rapid. They are, it is true, luxuries, in the sense that only rich men can buy them. But they are luxuries which rich men cannot consume, which delight the eye and cultivate the taste and imagination of millions who could not afford to buy them, and in a vast number of cases they find their way in the long run into public galleries and become to all intents and purposes the property of the people. We can hardly check this tendency by any import duty, however heavy. The money the present duty brings in is a mere bagatelle, so that in levying it we accomplish little beyond making our legislation seem barbarous.

THE CHACE COPYRIGHT BILL.

SENATOR CHACE of Rhode Island has again presented to the Senate his International Copyright Bill, with no change in the text except that the date in the enacting clause is set forward one year to July 1, 1888. We

have before summarized the provisions of this bill, and now desire only to revert to the clause which prohibits the importation of any foreign edition of a book reprinted in the United States. Although the two measures proposed to secure copyright to British authors which, for the moment, are attracting the largest share of public attention, both originate in Philadelphia, they are diametrically opposed in one respect. While Mr. Smith's proposed bill is designed to give the utmost latitude to competing editions, upon the plea that in this way the lowest price will be secured to the reader, the effect of the prohibition-of-importation clause in Mr. Chace's bill is absolutely to remove competition. Should this latter bill, as it is now worded, become law, American readers may find themselves obliged to choose either to go without the book, or to pay for the American reprint of Tennyson's next poem double or treble the price of the original English edition. This is no fancy illustration. Whenever an English author of established popularity shall announce a new work, American publishers will hasten to compete for the privilege of issuing it in America, and the bidder offering the highest price to the author will, of course, secure the right to republish. Having thus obtained the entire American market for his edition, with the absolute prohibition of importation enacted in the bill barring out any and every competing foreign edition, the acute publisher will very naturally hasten to recoup himself for his outlay by demanding from American readers the highest obtainable price for the work thus secured.

This is so plainly the practical result of the legislation proposed that it is with considerable curiosity one turns to see what the projectors and defenders of this bill have to say in defence of this stipulation. The arguments made are threefold: (1) That it is "an invariable rule in all countries where copyright exists"; (2) that it is necessary to enforce the requirement of the American manufacture of each book copyrighted; and (3) that the "apparently harmless concession" of an importation of copies of the authorized English edition by the author or copyright proprietor "would overthrow the whole design and purport of the bill."

Concerning number one, we have before pointed out at some length that so far is it from being the "invariable rule in all countries" to prohibit the importing of the authorized original edition, that it is entirely without precedent in the copyright legislation of any and all countries; only surreptitious reprints are thus prohibited. As regards the second reason advanced, section two of the bill distinctly requires that, in order for the foreign author to secure any copyright at all in this country, he must, within three months after recording the title of his book, deposit with the Librarian of Congress "two copies of the best edition of the same printed in the United States"; and if he does not, he remains in exactly the same position as regards an American copyright, after the enactment of the proposed law, as that which he now occupies. It is, therefore, but a transparent

pretence to claim that the prohibition clause is necessary to secure American manufacture. At number three, however, we arrive at the true reason for the insertion of this clause. Instead of being, according to reason number one, simply an article usual in all similar legislation, we discover from Mr. Henry C. Lea's words, quoted above, that the enactment of this article is necessary to secure the real purpose of the entire bill.

Mr. Chace states in his report that the present tariff on books of 25 per cent., added to what is repeatedly referred to by Mr. Lea and himself as the high price of the original editions, would not afford sufficient "protection" to the American manufacturers engaged in the production of books. In other words, the importation of the "expensive original editions," even with the addition of a duty of one-quarter of the English price, would produce a competition detrimental to the interests of the American republishers. It is necessary, therefore, to enact a law which will allow the American reprinter unhindered opportunity to add as much per cent. to the English price as will enable him to meet the additional cost of manufacturing the book in this country (which, according to Mr. Chace, "just about balances the amount of duties imposed"), and, in addition, secure to himself a handsome profit. And this is very evidently "the whole design and purport of the bill," which would, as Mr. Lea says, be thwarted were the prohibition-of-import clause removed. As the interests of the English author and the American reprinter are identical, so far as obtaining the highest possible price for the reprinted book is concerned, it is easy to agree with Mr. Chace that they "will both be protected," but it is by no means so easy to "perceive that the interests of the American reader will suffer no detriment" by giving the first two parties an absolute protection from competition.

During the copyright agitation of 1871-72 the publishers and others of Philadelphia held a meeting in January of the latter year, at which Mr. Henry Carey Baird presided and Mr. Henry C. Lea was present. Fearing that the Copyright Bill requiring American manufacture which was then urged upon Congress might become a law, a resolution opposing it was passed upon the ground that its enactment would "enable the foreign author and his assignee in this country, by an absolute monopoly in the production, to fix the price of his book without fear of competition." At that time, it should be borne in mind, there was no question of giving the reprinter such absolute monopoly as would result from cutting off the competition of the imported edition, and the remonstrance Mr. Lea then sanctioned would, therefore, apply with much greater force to the bill he now urgently advocates. A further resolution, however, setting out that this obnoxious monopoly would fall into the hands of the "great capitalists of the Atlantic seaboard," *i. e.*, the publishers of New York and Boston, gives rise to the conjecture that it was this possible danger to Philadelphia reprinters which was the real grievance.