

that certain physical ailments, especially short-sightedness, which was increasing to an alarming extent, were directly due to too long hours and bad ventilation in school rooms. He asked his hearers to reflect on the meaning of these figures in relation to the question of national defence. What they wanted was soldiers. The country also stood in need of intellectual leaders and efficient servants. But how was the stock of these to be replenished when the number of short-sighted youth in the upper forms of the schools rose in some cases to as much as seventy-four per cent.

When he studied at Cassel, no fewer than eighteen of his fellow pupils out of a class of twenty-one wore spectacles, while some of these with their glasses on could not even see the length of the table. As Landevater or Father of his country, he felt bound to declare that such a state of things must cease. Naturally, such unsparing condemnation of the traditional system has created a feeling of consternation in the ranks of the old-fashioned schoolmen. The conservative newspapers too, are dumb-founded, and admit that the last vestiges of the ancient regime have been thrown overboard, while the organs of the liberal Progressists and Freisinnige parties laud their Kaiser as the most far-seeing of contemporary sovereigns.—*Exchange*.

Within College Walls.

This is a collection of ten short papers on matters pertaining to the college. The author is Pres. Chas. F. Thwing of Adelbert. The tone of the book is religious and ethical; its real subject, the college as a Christianizing agency. The author is of course right, when he dwells on the importance of the college in developing character, on its possible influence in leading to faith and to a sustaining trust in things divine. But just as distinctly he seems wrong when he insists that all this is the underlying principle and definite purpose of the college's existence. Every college, indeed, stands or should stand for the right; but its real aim is to assist in the search for truth. Its religious and moral influence is a means, not an end. This distinction between truth and right as the first aim of an institution of learning, is not a verbal quibble. Its practical test lies here: build up your college as Pres. Thwing would have it, and you run no end of risks. For instance: in engaging a professor, choose a good religious man who doesn't know his subject, in preference to a scholar who is less holy but more erudite; ask this new professor to make character-building his main work in the class-room: will this, or will it not, approximate toward the ideal

college? The author thinks it will. But the fact is that this plan has been tried disastrously over and over again. The scores of small and struggling denominational colleges that have followed the scheme, contrast pitifully with the no less struggling state universities to which the plan was impossible. Could the plan be fairly tried, the religious would at once crowd out the scholarly; and in the present system of our great universities the scholarly has never once crowded out the ethical. Lofty, then, as is the author's aim, it is the aim of the man who sees but one side of the question, and that, tested by theory and experience, the unsafe side.—*The Dial, Chicago*.

The Los Angeles, Cal., *Express*, says:

"It is a curious fact that while Americans all take a pride in the public schools of the country, and are ever ready to vote large sums to promote the cause of education, they are as a rule utterly indifferent to the personnel of the school board. A school election as a rule brings out scarcely a handful of voters, if it is held at a time when there is no other election. If the voters are asked, 'Are you interested in having good schools,' they would answer, with much indignation at the question, 'Yes, of course we are.' Yet they will not give themselves half as much concern about who are the candidates for the school board as they do about the election of a petty township constable."

QUESTION DEPARTMENT.

For J. A. P.—Hamblin Smith's Arithmetic, page 193, Ex. 8.

The wheat was sold for a certain amount, of which \$600 was paid for commissions and the remainder invested in silk. The \$600 was made up of 2 per cent on the whole amount (including, of course, the \$600) obtained for the wheat and of 4 per cent on the amount spent for silk. Now if 2 per cent had not been charged on the \$600, it would have been reduced to \$588, and then the commission on the sum invested on silk would have been 6 per cent.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \therefore 6 \text{ per cent of the investment} & = & \$ 588. \\ 1 \quad " \quad " \quad " & = & \$ 98. \\ 100 \quad " \quad " \quad " & = & \$9800. \end{array}$$

This is an interesting and easy problem when solved in this way. It can be made very clear if lines are made to represent the amounts.

For X. Y. Z.—Hamblin Smith's Arithmetic—(1) Page 273, Ex. 138.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{A can make 50 while B makes 45, or C 40.} \\ \therefore \text{B makes 90 while C makes 80.} \\ \therefore \text{B can afford to give C 10 points.} \end{array}$$

(2) Page 293, Ex. 339.

Solved in the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW for Feb., 1893.