

strong desire for facts for their own sake, or much skill in discovering facts, or more than a superficial training in inductive reasoning. The substitution of natural science for the classics was expected to be a great improvement in this direction, but perhaps it is too soon to get results; up to the present time it has not produced any satisfactory change.

The value of a good education can hardly be overestimated, and the greatest service the colleges can render to the country is to develop in the minds of young men an appetite for facts and a good degree of candor and intelligence in drawing inferences from the facts. The professors on whom the greatest amount of responsibility is thrown, if we consider the civic value of an education, are the professors of political economy, using the term in a broad enough sense to cover studies that appear under different names in college courses. At the present time there is too strong a temptation among these gentlemen to be original and to be mathematical. The desire to be original creates a disposition to throw away what has been said, and say it over in some new way, which is generally far from being an improvement. There is a disposition to acquire a reputation for acuteness by making subtle distinctions and to carry the process of analysis back to the primordial atom, but which is too apt to prove the starting point. Geometry and algebra are imported into a study where they are quite inapplicable, and while a beautiful blackboard demonstration is being made the interpretation of history and the application of its teachings to contemporaneous events is to a great degree missed. If the young professors will waive some of their ambition to discover new laws and to make distinctions that had never occurred to any previous professor, and to refute Mill, who is quite out of

date, and Cairnes, who is old-fashioned, perhaps because intelligible, and would devote more of their energies to tracing the current of economic history, they would achieve less reputation in each other's estimation, but they would render a more valuable service to the community.—*New York Journal of Commerce.*

Life imprisonment for a boy sounds shocking. It suggests a barbarous state of society, in which punishment is vengeance and human life means nothing. It calls upon a picture worse than of death, of youth condemned to hopeless existence, of a person on the threshold of manhood and all its opportunities cut off from every one of them. Yet, awful as is the fate of Hildreth, the young train-wrecker, no one can say that the punishment is unjust or that any pleasanter solution of his case could have been found. As specimens of youthful depravity, he and his companions, who are each to spend 40 years in prison, would be hard to match. It is pitiful to think of the whole life of a youth for whom an honorable career might have been hoped being ruined, but the State for its own protection had no alternative but to inflict this penalty upon him. Ruined as his life is, it is he himself who has ruined it. Yet not entirely himself—no, not even principally himself—but the training or lack of training of his boyhood has ruined him.

The boy's father has a load of sorrow almost too great to be borne. Were he and his son unique in their relations to the community they might be ignored in their misery. But theirs is only one case, made noticeable by the enormity of its consequence of an extremely prevalent evil in American life. Nobody who studies young men at all can fail to be impressed with the alarming tendency to rowdiness among