$\mathrm{N}^{0}$OT all customs that are ancient can be honored. For instance, the bloody rites of human sucrilice and the wild revelry of bacchamalian orgies have grown into disrepute with the advancement of civilization and moral refmement. Under this same category of condemmed practices should bo written in a bold hand the word "Huzing." A fow instances of this should-be-forsaken custom having come under our nowce, call for some comment. Apart from the special injustice in these particular cases, thero are general and valid objections to the custom as a whole. In the first place, no student or number of students have the moral right to inflict such discipline upon another. Though a body of students may constitute a distinct and peculiar society by themselves, they camot clam to bo exempt from those general laws which are fundamental in all social organization. These dony tho privilege of privato vengeance, and delegate the arbitration of disputes and the administration of justice to the properly appointed authorities of the whole body politic. Hazing is thus placed under ban. At best it can only claim to administer justice in that wild, primitive, summary manner characterized by the term "Lynch law." In either case the innocent are about as apt $h$ suffer as the guilty, while the true culprit stands back and hounds on the persecutors. In the second place, where action is so heated and hasty, the causes which seem to call for it are as eften imaginary as real. But little time is taken for consideration as to the real merits of the case, and hence mischicvous and untruthful representations, conceived in some evil, treacherous brail, and disseminated by slanderous tongues, are often mistaken for sufficient reasons for heaping indignities upon some unoffending person. Evidence of this is found in the frequent acknowledgments of misled but fair-minded students. In the third place, when the motives governing such action are analyzed, it appears very often that the ostensible end of coreecting faults is really subservient to a strong desire for the pleasurable stimulation of exciting scene, but little account being taken of the pain and disadvantage inflicted upon the victim. Still it may be urged that under somo circumstances such a course is absolutely necessary. We may again be allowed to question if it is ever necessary to adopt irregular courses of procedure in order to cerrect irregularities-to descend from
gentlomanly conduct it order to forco others to it. Wo heartily concur with our President in condemning such practices, and in conceiving that there is "a more excellent way."

TleRSic writing is the demand of the ago. The authors who will be read by futire generations arr those whose motto is mullum in parmo. The shortness of life, and the much that must be crowded into every useful life, makes this demand imperative. Superfluous words and clauses must give place to thought. Terse writing is not the product of unconscious cerebration, nor the spontancity of any man's brain; bo this result ever so good, putient thought would have made an improvement. Some may pride themselves on being able to write without much forethought; but such writing lacks the "Altic salt," and will soon be trodlen under foot. There is $\Omega$ striking comparison between the verbosity of Josephus and the terseness with which Julius Cesar described one of his greatest victorics:-Veni; vidi; vici. Close writing suggests hard work, while verlosity impresses one in the opposite direction; the man of earnest purpose will seize the former and reject the latter. Terseness, however, should never be sought at the sacrifice of clearness; we must not give Charybedis such a wide bertli as to land us in the arms of Scylla. But it is evident, that for the lack of terseness many good and wholesome works must find a place in the dusty archives of forgotten lore. The writers and speakers who are heard and read by thinking men are not those who pack their sentences with fine rhetorical figures, but with close and well defned thought, backed up by an earnest purpose. Should we compare the oratorical speeches of the eloquent Pitt, with the modern practical terseness of Gladstone, we will see that the spirit of the age tends to close writing and concise speaking.

WE would call attontion to the articlo in our present issue upon "College Confederation." It is an able criticism of the scheme, and comprehensive statement of the principal objections to it. The arguments aro well worthy of the consideration of all educationists, whatover the complexion of their viows upon this subject.

