the condition of France to-day. I cite a passage from an oration of Mr. Felton, of California, in speaking of the social condition and opinions of the different nationalities of that State: "If you compare the American with the citizen of that great country, France, so wonderful in all departments of manufacture, art and science, you will see why it is that the American is so much at home in a new country. In France the subject has had no hand in framing or making the law. A code adapted to every want of life regulates the minutest details of every relation. The Frenchman addresses himself to the law, to punish every little injury. It regulates for him his business and family relations. It goes with him to the market, and woe to the butcher who sends him the wrong piece of beef, or the baker who commits an error as to the number of ounces it takes to make a pound. It escorts him home, and sees that the porter lets him in and does not scold him for being out so late. If his wife, tired of the conjugal domicile, seeks variety in absence, the requisite number of constables conduct her back to the loving arms of the spouse." This witty, though, it may be, slightly exaggerated picture of French life, has so much of what is known by every Frenchman to be true, that it serves as an example of a people being over-governed, and yet acquiescing because they have been educated to a traditional reverence for the government. Now, though we have no such state of guardianship over the people here, we have such an instinctive reverence for law, that we often mistake in appealing to the law as a means of accomplishing that which can be effected only by what gives life and vigor to any law in a free government—the will, judgment and sentiment of the people. The consequence is, that we have ever so many laws upon our statute books, which are a mere dead letter. There is a prevailing evil in the community. It is something which concerns all, and can only be removed or suppressed by the combined action of all. Yet what do we see done again and again? It will take time, cost money, and occasion trouble and inconvenience to individuals to grapple with the evil themselves. It is easier to put it under the ban of the law. And so the officers of the law are called in to suppress it, and men look to the goverment—an emanation from the people—to do what the people themselves shrink from attempting to accomplish. The good citizen goes daily by the grog-shop to which he sees the drunkard resorting, and, without expending a word of expostulation upon the author of so much ruin, wonders why the law will tolerate such a nuisance, and throws off his responsibility upon the shoulders of the government. It is not that such a law is not well enough. It is that we associate with it some interposition from some quarter to carry it into effect. And we call upon the law-making power as the people of the despotic governments of the old world do in respect to their laws, and are surprised when we are told that we are calling upon ourselves to do as the governing power what each individual shrinks from as an irksome and uncomfortable duty.

The same may be said of sustaining institutions which owe their support to the aid of the law. Mere statutes do not make good highways, or build school houses, or employ teachers. The most they can do, is to declare what the duty of the citizen or the community in this respect is, and provide the means of its execution, and then to leave it to the citizen to apply these means with effect. If, on the contrary, it undertakes to do the work itself, to supply the various details which enter into the execution of its provisions, its effect is to relieve the citizen from his responsibility, and to attempt to accomplish by the formula of a law what can alone be reached by the exercise of moral power. Take the case of our schools. Suppose each town and district were to do just what the letter of the statute requires,—raise just the requisite amount of money, keep a school just the prescribed number of weeks or months in a year, hire the cheapest man or woman who can pass the requisite examination by the committee of the town, and do just enough to escape indictment for violating the letter of the law, what would soon be the condition of our schools, and how long would it be before, in the downward course of a people, educated in them, the law itself would grow degenerate too? It not only requires that the people should, in the first place, be willing by good laws to furnish proper means and facilities for establishing and maintaining schools, but, as a far more important element of success, it requires a heart and a will on the part of the people to apply these. The efforts of one such man as the late Dr. Bigelow, of Newton, in looking after the management of schools, and keeping alive an interest in their favor by his example, are worth a whole volume of statutes which only here and there one reads, and which seek by penalties and punishments to infuse animation into a torpid community. What but the generous zeal of gifted and intelligent minds operating in different localities in the Commonwealth, has raised our schools to their present condition? As types of public sentiment, statutes are most valuable and encouraging. But if public sentiment is not substantially up to what these statutes symbolize, they fall dead and become powerless. Our schools are flourishing because the people have been growing willing to take them into their own charge. They have learned to treat their teachers as members of a liberal profession, and to follow their lead in adopting improvements and reforms. And they cherish a generous pride in these schools as something with which the honor of the State itself is identified. The explanation of all this is, that the people of Massachusetts have been educated up to this sentiment by the friends of the system after years of untiring efforts. And we devoutly trust they will never be betrayed into the folly of putting their schools into the charge or keeping of any other power.

An Old Schoolmaster.

Massachusetts Teacher.

Some of the Mistakes of Educated Men.

"My first advise to young men pursuing or completing a course of liberal studies is, to take care of your bodily health. Without this your intellectual attainments will be shorn of more than half their value. I dwell upon this point, and emphasize it, because on every side of me, in professional life, and especially in the clerical profession, I see so many helpless wrecks. Verily there is some grievous mistake among us in this matter. Whether it be our climate, or our habits of student life, or our social and domestic habits, I am not prepared to say. But of the fact I make no doubt. Our educated men do not achieve half that they might achieve for the want of the necessary physical vigor. It is painful to see the dyspeptic, sore-throated, atenuated, cadaverous specimens of humanity that student-life so often produces among us—men afraid of a puff of air, afraid of the heat, afraid of the cold, afraid to eat a peace of pie or good roast beef—men obliged to live on stale bread and molasses, who take cold if they get wet, who must make a reconnoissance of a room to see that they can secure a place out of a draft before they dare to take a seat—men who by dint of coaxing and nursing and pampering drag out a feeble existence for a few short years, and then drop into a premature grave—martyrs to intellectual exertion!

"I do not recommend the fox-hunting carousals of the old time English clergy. We need not go back to the material apotheosis of the classical ages. But verily we have something to learn in this matter. We have to learn that high mental exertion taxes most severely the life-force. We have to learn that the man of superior intellect, who puts forth his power with resolute vigor, requires more bodily health and force to sustain the strain than an ordinary laboring man does. Instead of being pale, delicate, feeble, and sickly, the student needs to be stalwart and hardy. He should have tougher thews and stronger sinews, and a more vigorous pulse than the man who merely plows the soil. He need not have the brawn and bone of the athlete and the gladiator. He need not be a Spartacus or a Heenan. But he should be of all men a man of good, sound, vigorous, working bodily health."

He then passes to the importance of the habit of being beforehand in whatever you undertake, to the necessity of holding on to the calling one chooses, to the value of some fresh intellectual acquisitions every day, to the beneficial effects of a varied and liberal culture apart from one's speciality, and the propriety of cultivating the art of conversation. On the latter head he says truly:

"Excuse my dwelling a little on this point. There is among our best educated men, I am sorry to say, a large amount of *vis inertiæ* in regard to this matter of conversation. Very many such persons are disposed to rely for their success and their position in society solely upon their professional skill and industry. General conversation is a bore to them. They have never duly considered the advantages it might bring them. They are disposed to leave all that to those more ambitious of social distinction. When they are in company, they speak, indeed, if appealed to, or if it comes entirely in their way to do so, but they feel no responsability for keeping conversation afloat. Allow me to say, gentlemen, this is all wrong. Independently of all considerations of interest and policy, there is a clear duty in this matter. Every man who mingles in the society of his fellows is bound to contribute his quota to the common entertainment, just as much as in a joint excursion of any kind he would be bound to pay his share of the reckoning. Educated men, beyond all others, should settle it as a clear duty to learn how to talk well in company. Conversation is an art; but it is an art which can be acquired, and depend upon it no acquisition gives a surer or more ample return for the amount of effort needed."—*New York Evening Post.*