

ing results, according to the mental bias of the reader. Our own opinion, that such abolition would be unwise, has more than once been expressed. We do not now intend to bore our readers with a rediscussion of the question, but merely to point a moral from China. Residents of the United States are apt to poke fun at the Orientals and to conclude that they are hopelessly behind the times in all respects, but this may be too hasty a generalization, for the effete civilization of China and the Chinese may still have some points of excellence from which we progressive Yankees may learn a little wisdom. We are led to these reflections by the statement that it is more than one hundred years since there has been a failure of a bank in China. It is related that more than nine hundred years ago, in the reign of Hi Hung, a bank failed. Hi Hung caused the failure to be rigidly investigated, and to his great indignation it was found to have been due to reckless and shady conduct on the part of the directors and the president. Hi Hung at once issued an edict that the next time a bank failed, the heads of its president and directors were to be cut off. We are further told that this edict has never been revoked, and that it has made China's bank institutions the safest and soundest in the world. We merely wish to inquire whether in the opinion of the advocates of the abolishment of capital punishment, this condition would have been attained without the drastic punishment ordered by the distinguished Hi Hung, and also whether it is not probable, by the same reasoning, that if the death penalty were to be abolished, the crime of murder would flourish to an even greater extent than it does to-day, to the lasting disgrace of our much-vaunted civilization.—*Albany Law Journal*.