committing a heinous sin. I shall not endeavour to show how all this recoils in very justice on parents, but I lay much of this wretched training to the charge of corporal punishment.

The office of the teacher is to instruct and discipline in knowledge and duty. But where pupils refuse to obey or violate moral law, then it is the duty of the parent to aid the teacher. If then the case justifies and demands corporal punishment, the parent is the proper person to inflict that punishment. It is the duty of the parent to compel the attendance of a truant child; it is equally the duty of the parent to compel the refractory child to submit to the just regulations of the school, and especially to compel and encourage respect for the authority of the teacher. That respect should in no degree be less than that demanded and encouraged to be shewn to the It is no degradation in clergyman. the parent to chastise his own child. Its necessity may be evidence of bad management, but the authority is vested in him—and only in him—by the highest authority, and, as the parent, it is not so likely that he will exceed what is right as the teacher. Examples will occur where parents refuse to attend to these their special obligations. But my experience convinces me that such cases form a small minority. The sanction of school authorities, trustees, and inspectors, and above all of public opinion, must unite to support every teacher who desires to expel corporal punishment from his school, and demands the aid of the parent when the child becomes refractory. When parents refuse or fail to secure the necessary obedience, then we may be assured that corporal punishment inflicted by the teacher will also fail. Then the State must interfere. the parent is unfit to govern his household, and in self-protection the State must take the charge from the parent if it wishes to save society from criminal consequences.

I press these views on the consideration of my fellow-teachers. The reform lies in their power. A unanimous resolve by them to expel all corporal punishment from the domain of their labours would lead to all necessary co-operation to secure from authority, by better regulations, what is supposed to be secured now by whipping; and the extinction of a degrading and unmanly duty would be one of the steps by which the best relations between teacher and pupil would be strengthened and ennobled, and the office of education respected and elevated.

THE COST OF RAISING A BOY. - The heaviest tax that can be imposed upon a nation is one that is paid in human lives. From whatever point of view the subject may be regarded, this conclusion is irresistible. If we look at it according to purely economical considerations, we may obtain very remarkable results. It has been estimated that an actual money cost of £300 is incurred in raising a boy, cradled among the poorest classes, from birth to manhood. does not require us to ascend very high in the social scale before we find that this estimate must be trebled. If we take what we may call the cost price of the human unit at any definite time, say at £500 on arriving at maturity, the producing power of the unit in question will bear some relation to that sum; the more costly and careful education producing, as a rule, the more valuable result, as to productive power. If the labourer who earns 14s. or 15s. a week adds £50 per annum to the wealth of the country, the physician, the scientific military or naval officer, the barrister, or the engineer, may look forward to the time when his yearly labour will be worth more than a hundred times that amount, even if appraised only by the price he is actually paid for his time. Taking any producing individual, whether valued at £50 or at £5,000 per annum, at any period of his career, no income tax to which he can be subjected can approach in its pressure the extravagant tax of death. For the payment of that tax at once annihilates the total earning power of which there was, until that moment, a fair mathematical expectation.—Popular Science Monthly.