

to the husband. Then there are the children to be considered. Personally the wife, even when innocent, suffers more in reputation from the censoriousness of society, unjustly, no doubt; but society is so constituted, and it is vain to protest. Moreover, the wife (such, again, are the ethics of society embodied in the law) has to prove unfaithfulness *plus* desertion or legal cruelty—to get over two stiles, in fact, where the husband has but one to surmount. A curious revelation of the statistics is that unfaithfulness breaks out mostly after between ten and twenty years of matrimony. The spouses presumably are tired of one another. Human life, as insurance companies know, has its critical periods, its dangerous ages, and the second decade seems to be the critical one of married life.—*Ib.*

A JOURNALIST'S SOURCES OF INFORMATION—ARE THEY PRIVILEGED?

The recent decision, says a writer in the *University Law Review*, of Judge Bradley in the action against Schriver, the newspaper correspondent of the "Mail and Express," who refused to answer a question propounded by the Senate investigating committee concerning the name of a Congressman who had informed him that he had been told by a certain wire manufacturer that there was, during the pendency of the Wilson Tariff bill in the Senate, a conference in a room in the Arlington Hotel between certain United States Senators and the sugar magnates, regarding which conference the witness had written a letter which appeared in the paper represented by him, opens up a somewhat new field for discussion. The witness's refusal was put upon the ground that a disclosure would be a breach of faith to his informant and a violation of his duty as a journalist. In this refusal he was sustained by the Court, which based its decision, however, upon the fact that the question asked of the witness was not pertinent to the subject under inquiry, and observed that:

"The reason given by the committee for its insistence upon an answer, and the reason urged on the argument of this motion in support of the right to put the question, was that, given the name of the member of Congress, he could be summoned and compelled to give the name of the wire manufacturer, and he, in turn, could be summoned and compelled to disclose what he had heard behind closed doors.