

sickly sentimentality which builds asylums for paupers' cats while the paupers are let starve, raises an indignant cry against the brutal teacher who puts into practice the principle of the rod.

We do not wish it to be imagined that we are putting forward any argument in favor of a certain class of teachers who use corporal punishment to cover up their own failure, or to vent their spite or anger, or even—a not unheard of case—to gratify their innate cruelty and display their domineering disposition. But we do most emphatically assert that the moderate use of the rod is the remedy that nature suggests and that the common sense of mankind has always approved for repressing the evil tendencies and developing the good qualities native to every child. It is clear that some form of punishment must be resorted to by teachers. If corporal punishment be abolished, recourse must be had to either task-work or detention on holidays. In both of these cases the teacher and not the pupil is the greater sufferer. The task must be examined to see that it has been faithfully accomplished, and the examination is no pleasure if the punishment were the transcribing of the same word a few hundred times or the copying of some pages of Worcester's Unabridged. The pupils detained must be watched by the teacher, for boys who commit light faults in class under the teacher's eye will not scruple to do worse, if they are left alone during their punishment. If the opponents of corporal punishment only knew a few of the cunning devices to which even manly boys will resort, if they had a little experience of the open dishonesty that is frequently practised in the matter of task-writing, if they understood the intense hatred this kind of punishment arouses for school and study, we should likely hear somewhat less of the degrading influence of corporal punishment, and the general verdict would be that the wise and judicious

application of the rod is well adapted to correct untruthfulness, bad conduct and scheming, to implant noble qualities in their places, to preserve the authority of the teacher and inspire a wholesome respect for him.

INTELLIGENTI PAUCA.

With no desire to set ourselves up as censors of morality, but with a firm conviction of the righteousness of the cause we espouse, do we venture to pass a stricture upon a phase of college journalism that has attained a most undesirable development in the columns of not a few of our exchanges. We refer to the flippant and—not to use a stronger term—often indelicate references to women and "love" that form almost the whole stock-in-trade of the would-be witty men of many college papers. The evil is widespread and is of long standing, else we would not feel called upon to perform the, we confess, disagreeable duty of drawing attention to it.

And we now censure it, not so much that it is frequently in bad taste and is always the poorest kind of wit, or rather no wit at all, but because it is cowardly and unchristian. Those who are made the butt of this so-called wit are wholly incapable of defending themselves; they must suffer in silence. And will college-bred youths who pride themselves above all else upon being gentlemen—will they take advantage of their defenceless condition to lash them with their sarcasm or to make them the puppets of their foolish wit? Were the matter presented in this light there is not a student but would cry "shame" upon such conduct. Yet a moment's consideration will show that it should be viewed in no other.

But worse still, it is unchristian, for it indicates a loss of that chivalrous respect for the weaker sex, the evoking of which was one of the noblest triumphs of Christ.