

statutes are referred to wherever they throw light upon the meaning of the federal acts, and the important sections of all state laws regulating rates are collected for comparison. The rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission are catalogued in several convenient tables, and there is a chapter upon procedure before the commission, with an appendix of forms.

There are many typographical errors, due to haste in putting the book through the press, for which the authors apologize in their preface. There are also a few errors in substance, doubtless due to the same cause, such as the statement (§897) that it has been finally decided that transportation between points in the same state, passing through another state *en route*, is not interstate commerce. The contrary was held over three years before this was published. *Hanley v. Kansas City, etc., Ry.*, 187 U. S., 617 (1903). *Wight v. United States*, 167 U. S., 512, is cited (§724) as an authority against personal discrimination in rates, under common-law principles, even though the rates be reasonable. The case was really decided under the Interstate Commerce Act, and on the same day the Supreme Court unanimously said, in another case, that apart from statutes such discrimination was not illegal. *Parsons v. Chicago, etc., Ry.*, 167 U. S. 447 (1897). Such slips are, however, but small blemishes upon an excellent and useful piece of work.

JAMES PARKER HALL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL

---

*Industrial Education. A System of Training for Men Entering upon Trade and Commerce.* By HARLOW STAFFORD PERSON. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1907. Pages viii+86.

This essay is a Hart, Schaffner, and Marx prize essay. The essay can not be criticized on the ground that it is an incomplete discussion of the subject, because, as the author says in his prefatory note, "it is no more than a series of suggestions." We cannot criticize him, therefore, for not doing what he did not intend to do. Otherwise, serious fault would have to be found with the gaps in the presentation.

Undoubtedly, Dr. Person has grasped the main requirement of

a system of industrial and commercial education. The point of his discussion concerning which there would be the greatest difference of opinion is whether such a training should be highly technical.

By "technical" is doubtless meant thoroughgoing acquaintance with the details and methods of existing business organization and management. Schools of commerce may be divided roughly into those whose courses aim to give this, and those which aim to give a thoroughgoing training in the principles of economics and administration, leaving the technique to be learned principally by experience after the student goes into business.

Details of business organization and management change, and if our schools of commerce turn themselves to the training of technical experts in business their graduates are likely to meet the same criticism that the graduates of so-called business schools and commercial courses in high schools find themselves exposed to: namely, that they know one method and cannot adapt themselves to new conditions. In other words, such training may make experts; but it will deaden initiative and adaptability.

We disagree strenuously with the implication in the author's statement that "the training for work should not be weakened by having to carry the burden of training for culture." We contend that the training for work may fairly and easily be made a training for culture also. If Dr. Person's contention here is correct it is difficult to understand how he can claim that the industrial training he advocates would raise the general level of intelligence.

We take issue, too, with the author's belief that schools for industrial and commercial training should be independent of the existing schools in the public-school system. There may well be some independent schools for the purpose, but the larger part of the work had better be done by an improvement of our present school system.

Dr. Person also does injustice to some existing schools in his claim that their training is too general and not technical enough. They are right in insisting on a thorough study of principles, but some at least give, or aim to give, adequate technical information and training in addition.

The monograph is an interesting and valuable study.

DAVID KINLEY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS