

wife their companion and friend, and they will find no other pleasure as sweet, no companion as cheerful, and no friend as true, their money will go as far as when they were single, and the pleasure of spending it will be increased.

G. DOMLEO: For those who have nothing but their own efforts to depend upon, the weight of evidence is much against early marriages. As illustrative, take the case of clerks, on railways, in banks, factories, warehouses, &c. At twenty-one years of age the majority are not in receipt of more than £50 to £70 per annum. The typical clerk marries, and may perhaps manage to live in tolerable comfort for the first year or two; then family troubles and expenses commence, but his salary is not raised in proportion. He plods on for a few more years, vainly hoping for promotion, and then finding that what was barely sufficient to provide for two, is totally inadequate for the requirements of three, four, or five, as the case may be, he lays the matter before his employers, who either inform him they are sorry but cannot give more for his particular work, or possibly raise him a few pounds per year. In the latter case he perhaps endeavours to make the best of a hard existence, whilst if the former happen he is tempted to either take to drink, or stoops lower, and thus begins his downward course.

G. E. FYSON: Mr. Speaker,—Sir, Bachelors are, as a rule, less careful in money matters than married men: they have no idea of "household economies," are to a great extent at the mercy of their landladies, who generally cook badly and wastefully, keep their lodgers uncomfortable, and get a good picking out of them. Several of my friends who have early entered the conjugal state, assure me that married life is cheaper as well as happier than bachelorhood—they live better, at a less cost. There is such a deal in management, and a woman often makes one pound go as far as a man does two.

Other speeches on Opener's side received from:—A Young Wife, H. E. A. Coate, P. Jennings, B. Evans, A Working Man, Sarah, G. Wood, Lalla Rookh, Walter Lütber, Jessie Donisthorpe, Edward Horne, John Seage, A. J. Cockburn, E. Greene, A. D. H. M., Hugh Hughes, F. A. B., S. J. Vernon, G. Watkinson, W. Skidmore, Ethelroyd, F. J. L., Aniso, A. L. O. D., Alfred Kaye, Caroline Loam, E. Butler, W. Shearer, T. Dawson, A. Harcourt, J. B., E. C. Empson, M. K. Wrim, C. Bennett, Lumley Ferrers, H. M. Turner, Lucy C. Turner, Agnes Steele, M. A. J. Bowden, V. Rose, L. J. Allen, C. M. W., C. Claridge, W. King, J. O. Coleman, &c. &c.

Other speeches for the Opponent received from:—C. M. A., Beatrice, T. Clay, W. M. R., Mrs. Hume Fry, J. Wyles, M. Ashworth, Verema, A. B., W. G. B., "No. 8, C. H.," W. Speakman, J. T. C., E. Garter, Hymen, E. H. R., J. J. M. Davis, H. E. Southall, B. H. Ward, Mary Gardner, H. Malpas, T. Todd, J. R. Hand, M. R. P., Emma Smith, "Sour Eighteen," M. Muir, Jean Ross, X. Y. Z., M. F., W. H. Hathaway, Mrs. J. G. Oldfield, H. F. Harding, Louise Murray, Amateur, F. J. Harries, J. E. Saunders, Medicus, Alice M. Ridal, Mrs. C. Oliver, J. Cox, C. H. Venning, J. E. Swallow, G. K. King, W. A. Jubb, Common Sense, Sarah J. Whitby, J. Eaton Fearn, Ishmael Diogenes, Mrs. H. Webster, F. W. Randall, T. A. A. Amies, W. M. H., T. Purkis, J. W. Nelson, J. Taylor, Margaret Ritchie, J. Hatwick, J. T. Broadhead, Marian Gargerie, H. J. Turner, J. A. Archer, &c. &c.

The Honorarium of £1 is, has been awarded to H. K. ROADS, Foxton, near Royston, Cambs. The debate on Question III. will be closed in our next issue, when the successful speech will be printed. No further speeches on this question can be received.

#### VOTES OF READERS.

Attention is called to the Voting Paper on Question III., which will be found facing the Frontispiece of this Part, and which is to be filled up and sent to "The Editor of CASSELL'S MAGAZINE, La Belle Sauvage Yard, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.," in accordance with the directions given on page 250 of our last issue. The Voting Paper may be enclosed either in a stamped envelope or in a halfpenny wrapper.

### QUESTION IV.—SHOULD WE SEND OUR GIRLS TO BOARDING-SCHOOLS?

#### OPENER'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER,

Sir,—There is no lawful personal authority without love. The Creator, whose power is absolute, is infinite Love, so love dictates what power performs. One of the earthly shadows of this authority is that which a parent possesses over a child. He has almost absolute control; yet no child dislikes the authority when combined with love; on the contrary, children never feel so safe and happy as when they are with their parents. Now, to what are these remarks the prelude? Simply to the announcement that "Personal authority uncombined with love is a monstrosity and a tyranny, and that a child placed under such authority is in an unnatural and constrained position."

And where shall we find children living in this unnatural, unhappy position? In Boarding-schools. Much has been said and done about the rights of women, but one rarely, if ever, hears about the rights of children. Yet rights they have, in common with, and equal to, the rights of adults. Children are not the property of their parents, to be disposed of according to fancy and caprice, like a watch or any other senseless trinket. Parents are the guardians of their children, and it is the duty of guardians to act for those under their care as though they would have some day to give an account of their stewardship; they should jealously guard their children's liberty—liberty, the first and fundamental right of mankind, the property and possession of the new-born babe as

much as of the man. When a child lives at home it is free; when placed in a school it loses its liberty.

When a woman marries she expects to have a home, and to be permitted to live in that home. When a child is born its inheritance is a home. It has a right to the personal protection and training of its parents, and people do as much wrong in withholding from their offspring their presence and care, as a husband would do in denying his wife his society. A man has certainly no more right to turn his children out of their home than he has to turn out his wife.

The farming out of babies by their mothers has been justly condemned as unnatural, yet is it as the straining at a gnat and the swallowing of a camel, when we compare it with the farming out of older children.

Girls at least would never be sent to boarding-schools, could their fathers know what the life is like by experience, for men would write against it. But unfortunately men can only judge of boys' schools, and in them the restraint is not so great; then, again, as a rule (to which there are the usual exceptions) their affections are comparatively dormant, and their animal spirits so high that while they have plenty of fun they may not be utterly miserable, though, according to my judgment, they must be far happier at home. But girls are different; they are miniature women, and while a dull boy may turn out a genius in after-life, a dull girl never does; she simply gains experience. See that young girl: she is clever and trustworthy;

when at home she goes out at her leisure hours as she pleases, provided she says where she is going. While still under guidance and control, she can in a great measure use her own discretion, and when her mother is ill she is a most valuable little housekeeper. See that same girl at school: she is now an incapable baby; she is never allowed outside the house alone; she only has her daily walk in a string, with her schoolfellows, and looks with envy at the free children in the streets. Her wisdom and discretion are quietly put to sleep, and she becomes a machine moved entirely at the will of others.

If a life of irksome restraint were productive of some wondrous good (which it is not) ought we therefore to do evil that good may come? When a great sorrow falls upon a man through loss of a beloved wife or child, it may work good to him; his character may become less selfish through suffering. Should men on that account seek the death of those they love? No one denies himself happiness while he can get it, but takes care to enjoy all the good that falls to his lot; let him also permit those in his care to enjoy what good falls to their lot, and thus follow the golden rule of doing unto others as he would wish to be done unto. The future should be provided for, but not at the expense of the present. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. A man should not live on dry bread till middle age in order that for the rest of his days he may live on the fat of the land. Also, we should reckon the cost paid. A man might work seventy-two hours a week and thereby earn a penny. He might triumphantly show that penny, and none could dispute it as a penny gained. Yet the gain would be loss if set over against the seventy-two hours' work. If there is any gain in boarding-schools (which I have never been able to discover), is it worth having at the expense of a murdered childhood? I say murdered advisedly, for if not lived, if not enjoyed, it is murdered.

The remembrance of a joyous childhood is a priceless possession for life.

What I have described, Sir, may be thought an exaggerated picture. It is not; it is drawn from the life. I do not for a moment suppose that all suffer in the same degree, but all taste the same bitter cup. The dull, the cold-hearted, the coarse-minded, while they have enough to eat and drink may have the contentment of a beast. But the noble-minded, the loving, the high-hearted, the sensitive, the finely-wrought spirits, suffer intensely. Can they feed? can they grow? can they really live in a barren wilderness? Not in childhood while incarcerated, not in youth when emancipated, not in age when the past lies far behind, will such souls consent that they were rightly treated. Again, those who have only passed the last year of their education in a boarding-school do not suffer what the little creature endures to whom a week appears a month, who cannot look forward to the time when it will be allowed to leave for good, and whose horizon is bounded by the holidays, when it will be permitted to enter, for a short time, and as a visitor, that home which should be its abiding-place.

## OPPONENT'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER,

With all due deference to you, Sir, and without wishing to depart in any way from the fair field of argument, I cannot help suggesting that the opener of this debate must have had some very unfortunate—ay, more, some very bitter experiences of boarding-school life; and it seems to me that those exceptional experiences have begotten prejudices against all boarding-schools, of a kind decidedly hostile to the fair consideration of the question at issue. One of the speaker's opening statements—a statement altogether unobjectionable in itself—is sufficient to prove this. "Personal authority uncombined with love is a monstrosity and a tyranny!" True enough, but then the hon. member goes on to assert that children "living in this unnatural, unhappy position," are to be found in boarding-schools, implying that *all* children in *all* boarding-schools are thus sadly situated. Leaving boys' schools out of the question as no part of the present subject, are not the statements quoted a libel upon the many good and true and noble women who have spent their best years in the religious, moral, and intellectual education of the mothers—past, present, and prospective—of our race? and do not these good women out-number, in the proportion of tens and hundreds to one, those few who, forgetting their duty to God and man, take charge of girls from purely selfish motives, and, having so become responsible for them, neglect them in every possible way? How often is it that you can find a woman, whether married or single, who does not love children? And even admitting that there may be some few boarding-school mistresses who love them not, is it not fair to argue that they are as nothing compared to the number of unnatural mothers who, from love of pleasure, or from other causes, leave the care of their children at home entirely in the hands of hirelings?

In the majority of cases, however, there must come a time when—either on account of intellectual deficiency, lack of education, or want of leisure—the mother is unable to give her daughter that culture demanded by the civilisation to which we, as a nation, have attained. What courses are then open? Three, and three only. Either the girl must be taught at home by governess and masters, or she must go to a day-school, or she must be sent to a boarding-school. And it is at this juncture—with these three alternatives facing us—that we arrive at a fair stand-point for argument.

It may at once be conceded that wherever possible the first course is the most desirable: the home atmosphere—if it be a good one—is to be valued so far as regards religious and moral education; and since girls rarely require the highest intellectual nurture, the inferiority of home education in this respect need not to be taken into account. But for various causes—evident to all, and which cannot now be entered into at length—home culture of the kind referred to is often an impossibility, and one of the other courses must be selected. Either the girl must go to a day-school or to a boarding-school; which shall it be?

Now, Sir, I am not here to advocate the superior claims of boarding-schools in all cases, but rather to defend them from the charges brought against them. In my opinion, both day and boarding-schools have their merits, and special merits in special instances. If there be a good and satisfactory day-school in close proximity to the home, and if the moral atmosphere of the home itself be true and pure, then by all means let the day-school suffice. But if the home influences exerted by father or mother, or brothers or sisters, be in any way harmful; or if no thoroughly satisfactory school can be found; or if the day-school necessitate too long a journey to and fro, let a good boarding-school be sought out. If, as is sometimes the case, the home example be bad—if there be irreligion, or continual gaiety, or excessive vanity in the home, how much better that for some part of each year the girl should be removed to a purer atmosphere! And why send a girl to a day-school if the education given be of a low order, or if the companionship be objectionable? Or if a satisfactory day-school—whether high school or other—can only be found at some distance, why expose a girl to manifold dangers on her daily journey—ay, and to the risk of becoming vain and forward through her free intercourse with a strange world at too early an age? The opener of the debate speaks of the freedom of home—the freedom from restraint; has not this vaunted freedom too often been the cause of much evil? Is it desirable that our daughters should run about when and where they will?

And now as to boarding-schools. There are good ones and there are bad ones, but the good ones largely

predominate. And when I speak of good ones, Sir, I do not necessarily mean schools that can show a long list of accomplished mistresses and visiting masters, or that can boast an array of students successful at public examinations. I have in my mind schools presided over by *very* women; women who are gifted with large hearts, overflowing with sympathy and love; women who can enter into all the little joys and sorrows of those in their charge; women who are not infallible, but who, from lengthened experience, rarely misunderstand child-nature; women who, as true servants of God, are kind and tender-hearted to all His creatures, and specially to those for whose moral and spiritual welfare they are in a large measure responsible. Such boarding-school mistresses *do* exist—ay, and in large numbers. It is the duty of parents to seek them out, and then there will be no talk of sensitive spirits dulled or broken by cold neglect or by irksome restraint; there will be no possibility of "a murdered childhood."

TO OUR READERS.—The Editor will be happy to receive the opinions of any Readers on the above Question, on either side, with a view to the publication of the most suitable and concise communications in the June Part. Letters should be addressed "The Editor of CASSELL'S MAGAZINE, La Belle Sauvage Yard, London, E.C.," and in the top left-hand corner of the envelope should be written "Family Parliament." The speech should be headed with the title of the Debate, and an indication of *the side taken by the Reader*. All communications on the present Question must reach the Editor not later than April 12.

An Honorarium of £1 1s. will be accorded (subject to the discretion of the Editor) to the *best speech on either side of the Question*; no speech to exceed 50 lines (500 words).

## THE FAMILY MEDICINE-CHEST, AND WHAT SHOULD GO IN IT.

BY A FAMILY DOCTOR.



HERE is no need to enlarge upon the advantages of having a small and carefully-stocked medicine-chest in a family, especially where there are children; but great need to warn my readers of the danger, not to say folly, of flying to it upon every little occasion, or with every trifling ailment.

We should remember that we have a great *Mater Natura*, who is always willing, and nearly always able, to nurse us quietly back to health, if we would but leave her alone.

Much ought to be left to her, therefore, and much will be left by fathers and mothers if they but bear the following truths in mind:—1. No remedy is infallible. 2. Most medicines must do harm before they do good. 3. The *post hoc propter hoc* line of argument is wrong; it is a common one with non-thinking people, and cannot be too highly nor too often condemned by medical practitioners. It is based upon the belief

that because a patient gets well after having taken a certain drug, it is the drug that has cured him. Granted that the cure *might* have been owing to the potency of the drug, yet, on the other hand, the medicine may have done neither good nor harm, and nature may have worked the cure, or the medicine may have positively retarded the cure, and nature, defiant, come off triumphant. If people would only get to believe this, there would be far less quackery in the land, and consequently far fewer cases for the coroner.

A good medicine-chest need not be a very bulky arrangement, but it is far better to have a chest or box of some kind than to keep the medicines in a cupboard. Buy the chest and have it filled only from a chemist of known respectability, for drugs are greatly adulterated now-a-days, especially the more valuable sorts, such as quinine, &c.; but few escape adulteration if the process be remunerative. Having procured your chest, place it in a safe place, beyond the reach of children, and keep the key in your own possession. A medicine-chest is often very pretty and ornamental, and might look well beneath the

## THE FAMILY PARLIAMENT.

[THE RULES OF DEBATE will be found in the December or January Part. The Editor's duty will be to act as a kind of "Mr. Speaker;" consequently, while preserving due order in the discussion, he will not be held to endorse any opinions that may be expressed on either side, each debater being responsible for his own views.]

## QUESTION IV.—SHOULD WE SEND OUR GIRLS TO BOARDING-SCHOOLS?

(Debate continued.)

RIENZI:—The subject which my honourable friend has brought before the House, though of a homely character, is one of great importance. It is a matter concerning not only the present, but also the coming generation; and for this reason, if for no other, I beg honourable members to discuss it in a calm and dispassionate frame of mind. The contention of my honourable friend is that, in a boarding-school, girls do not receive that parental love which they may claim as their inheritance and their right. That view, so obvious, and so fair, is, I am sure, entertained by the majority of this House. The honourable member who followed my honourable friend does not, however, appear to think so; but we scarcely expected that he would, for I notice that whenever any subject is brought before the House from this side the honourable gentleman always gives it his most cordial opposition. Some of his arguments can, as usual, be well used against himself.

M. ROWLAND:—As a girl educated partly at school, partly at home, I must give my vote very decidedly in favour of boarding-schools. The Opener and Opponent have not touched on two of the most important effects of school education—first, the immense impetus which competition gives to learning. A child learning at home with her brothers and sisters may be cleverer than they, and finding herself far in advance of the rest, become in consequence conceited and idle; if she were at school she would find herself only on a par with, perhaps very much behind, children of her own age, and if possessed of an ordinary amount of ambition would strive to work well and equal her companions. Secondly, the routine of school teaches children orderly and methodical habits; they find that a day in which every hour has its appointed task leaves them happy and busy; had they been left to their own devices, not half the work would have been accomplished, and they would have been far more tired. At home, if their mother is their teacher, she is often called away to some necessary household duty, and cannot give the undivided attention to her pupils which is an essential in teaching; and if a governess is in charge of the home education it is little better; the authority is divided; father, mother, and governess seldom agree on the subject of punishment. Then, too, how easily a holiday is obtained at home! A drive with mamma, a very fine afternoon, an imaginary headache, are all excuse enough for shirking lessons, which at home are generally disliked.

C. B. BRIGSTOCKE concludes an admirable speech as follows:—The question before us is simply this, whether the education of girls is best carried on in the home or the boarding-school? and on this point it seems that the Opener of the debate and his Opponent are agreed. Both admit that home education wherever possible is the most desirable. Both, doubtless, would also admit that boarding-school education, if the only possible one, is infinitely better than none. Thus the Family Parliament is for once unanimous, and you, Mr. Speaker, are spared the responsibility of giving a casting vote.

FERGUS IMRACH:—Even supposing the home influences are not quite what might be desired, and that the school atmosphere is far superior, the chances are that a girl will yet lose more than she gains. As "home" and "mother" mean more to her than "school" and "teacher," any change of treatment will probably be resented by her simply because differing from that at home. She will then make common cause with those of her school-fellows who, considering school as banishment, pay to its rules the least attention possible, short of open resistance.

H. R. ROADS:—Surely the hon. Opponent is mistaken when he hints at "the inferiority of home education." I maintain that it is far more varied and complete than a boarding-school one, where the system is essentially cramping; while a girl acquires an originality and individuality, and preserves a freshness and purity, impossible except in a home. Notice the difference between girls of fourteen and fifteen, according to their respective educations. The home-girl amuses you readily and cheerfully, conversing upon most subjects, from politics, poetry, and books, down to the pet kitten; while the school-girl is shy and constrained, with apparently no ideas upon any subject.

MRS. JOHNSTON:—That home education is the safest and best for our girls few would deny, but in very many families this is wholly impracticable. I take one case out of the many, and that one of constant occurrence.

There is a family of some six or seven children; the eldest is a girl. She is an intelligent, clever child, and for some happy years she and her two brothers next in age keep pace in their study of algebra, Euclid, and Latin, under the home instruction of a morning governess.

But, alas! a day comes all too quickly when it is decided that "the boys must go to school." This matter once settled, a suitable school is soon selected, where amid the rougher natures of those with whom they now associate, the softness of home rule is rubbed off, and by contact with the outer world these boys begin to learn some of those stern realities of life in which they will soon be called to take their part.

But the sister! who shall replace to her those brothers? how is her education from henceforth to be conducted? The younger sister, some three or four years her junior, is but a babe in intellect compared with her elder sister; how then can her education be carried on together? Is the younger to be pressed forward to the standard of the elder, or should the elder be kept back and so brought down to the level of the younger? Either would be equally cruel and unjust. What then must be done? The only answer is, "She too must be sent to school."

MRS. HORSFIELD:—It appears to me impossible that any right-thinking woman could allow her daughter to be banished from home to a boarding-school. Granted that the school-mistress really loves her pupils, she cannot possibly know the disposition of each one, and therefore cannot give to each that sympathy which every warm-hearted girl craves, and which none but a mother can bestow.

JAS. BLACK:—While rising to support Opponent's view of the controversy, I cannot agree with him when he says that the hon. member opposite is right in using the sentence with which his speech commences, that "there is no lawful personal authority without love." This is a statement which cannot be too strongly condemned; it is simply telling people (school-girls in this case) that if they take a dislike to their superiors, those superiors cannot exact obedience from them. It is an assertion strangely at variance with that part of his speech in which he says, "A dull girl never turns out a clever woman, she simply gains experience;" does this not mean that the head of a school is the person capable of using authority in the best possible way, that she is the most likely person to win that loving compliance due to her as the representative of parents? When we take into consideration the great amount of worry and pain which school-mistresses have to undergo, we see more clearly that it needs a

woman of perhaps unusual nobility and kindness to win the respect of her pupils.

D. BEYNON:—In reading the memoirs of our eminent women, it will be found that they invariably sing the praises of home education and discipline. The heart and the head go hand-in-hand better in the work of imparting knowledge under the roof of home, than it is possible for any fashionable boarding-school to accomplish.

SILVERSTAR:—Now, Sir, is it not a fact that, after completing their terms, most young ladies return home from boarding-schools proud, arrogant, and scornful, with false ideas of modesty and dignity, disdaining the companionship of those who were once their dearest friends? They are said to be "accomplished young ladies." Yes! they are perfect in pride, and they have acquired a sound knowledge of all the cold forms of etiquette; but, alas! they know hardly anything (if, indeed, anything) of domestic duties, they know hardly anything of the duties they owe mankind, they know but half the duties they owe their parents. This may be considered strong language, but we should bear in mind that "facts are stubborn things," and no one can deny that I am speaking the truth. If those girls had been placed in high day-schools, they would have been for a few hours every day under the guidance of their parents; they would have been taught in domestic affairs; they would not have been in want of parental care, love, and advice; they would have mixed more in society, and been better able to discern good men from bad; they would have been more sociable, graced with more humility, and, consequently, free from that detestable affectation which is characteristic of the majority of young ladies who have received a boarding-school education.

J. ROBERTSON:—Allow me to say a few words in answer to the Opener's arguments against sending our girls to boarding-schools; I should think his ideas of boarding-schools must be gathered from his grandmother; perhaps in her school-days they were the sort of places he describes, a kind of female Dotheboys Hall; but about a century ago children had not so much liberty as now, and even at home there was iron rule.

Our honourable friend says, "Girls would never be sent to boarding-schools could their fathers know what the life is by

experience." A girl generally has a mother, and she knows from experience what the life is, and if she had been unhappy or had had her childhood murdered, the remembrance would remain with her always, and she would endeavour to save her daughters from such a "barren wilderness." Instead of that, a mother is generally the most anxious for her girls to go to a boarding-school; and what girl has not been intensely interested in her mother's tales of her school days, and longed for the time when she would be able to go too? At school a girl has a busy life, and this teaches her the habit of employing her time usefully; she has several companions, and the daily intercourse with so many different tempers makes her think less of self and more of doing some kind act for another. Girls at home often grow selfish and idle; take for instance one who is an only child, where her parents indulge her in every possible way; if that girl were educated at home she would perhaps be only half educated, some fancied ailment or some new pleasure would very often interfere with study, and from being always considered of so much importance she would grow up a selfish, egotistical woman.

Other speeches supporting Opener's views received from J. East Shattock, H. M. Holliday, F. J. S., A. B. Brown, Dr. Kegan, Norma, MacLean, J. Hinton, E. G. G., Jumbo, S. A. G., B. Mellor, Harold, Dulce Domum, Eta, Beatrice, Benedick, A. L. O. D., R. W. Williams, G. H. Le Neveu, W. King, S. E. C. Young, W. Wakeford, E. Milne, E. E. Hubbard, E. C. H. Stamford, W. Shearer, E. P., G. D. Clark, Annie E. Myers, W. A. Jubb, R. Over, and others.

Other speeches supporting Opponent's views received from J. M. D. S., Pierrepont, L. Hyth, Montgomerie, M. McMillan, E. H. James, J. Eaton Fearn, Mrs. Swindells, A. C. Eaton, Jeanie Tulloch, C. Snewing, "A Girl who has just left School," A. E. L., M. Horobin, C. J. C., L. Holmes, L. M. Paine, Jessie Donisthorpe, M. E. Rangdale, H. S. S., junr., T. G. Parrott, J. H. Goulding, E. Norton, E. M. A., L. A. W., J. Beckett, M. F., Myrle, Winifred Grey, W. J. Ritchie, W. Speakman, Sparkhall Brown, E. Butt, E. Carter, Millie Rundle, J. M., Isabella Elliott, J. J. M. Davis, and others.

The Honorarium of £12s. has been awarded to Miss Catherine D. Logan, 10, St. Stephen's Crescent, Bayswater, W., whose speech, together with the Opener's Reply, will be given in our next issue, when the Debate on this question will be continued and concluded. No further speeches can be received on this question.

## THE TINCAL TRADE OF ASIA.



WHAT is "tincal?" Considering the importance of this trade, and the fact that it is daily increasing, it is somewhat remarkable that the majority of people in this country are entirely ignorant of the existence of such a trade, and in all probability most of the readers of the heading of this article will be moved with curiosity to know what "tincal" is, prior to their

interest being awakened concerning the trade in it. It may be well, therefore, before treating of the trade in tincal to explain in a few words the nature of this important natural product of the East.

Tincal is crude or rough borax, which is imported from Calcutta in crystalline masses, which contain borax combined with soda and a fatty acid. The salt is never termed borax until refined or purified. It was very early known to the Arabians, but they applied the term "baurach" indifferently to carbonate

of soda, the *nitrum* and *natron* of the ancients, also found as an efflorescence on the soil. "Baurach" is among the many chemical preparations noticed by the Arabian, Geber, who lived in the eighth century. It was employed by him for one of the same purposes for which it is used at present, viz., to assist in reducing the oxides of certain metals to the metallic state. Tincal is a saline compound or combination of soda with boracic acid, and this acid is a compound of oxygen with an elementary substance to which the name of "boron" is applied.

Thibet is the natural home of this mineral salt, where it is found in extensive districts. Quantities are dug out of the earth and crystallised, and a great many of the shepherds of Thibet are engaged in collecting this substance. The earth in some districts of Thibet, especially in the neighbourhood of Tasso Lumbo, is so impregnated with it, that as the dew falls it becomes saturated with it, and the stunted vegetation is soon covered with this crystalline salt. Large masses of it are obtained from Lake Pelta. The

## THE FAMILY PARLIAMENT.

[THE RULES OF DEBATE will be found in the December or January Part. The Editor's duty will be to act as a kind of "Mr. Speaker;" consequently, while preserving due order in the discussion, he will not be held to endorse any opinions that may be expressed on either side, each debater being responsible for his own views.]

### QUESTION IV.—SHOULD WE SEND OUR GIRLS TO BOARDING-SCHOOLS?

CATHERINE D. LOGAN :—Mr. Speaker,—Being a governess, and having had fourteen years of personal experience in boarding-school life, first as scholar and then as teacher, I think I may be able to give a few hints regarding the all-important subject of sending our girls to boarding-school. Although I have been connected with the very best schools, in which the moral as well as the intellectual qualities in girls are cultivated and developed, I would on no account send my girls to boarding-school—at least until they have reached an age when their characters are formed, and they are fairly able to discern between right and wrong.

Girls who are early sent to boarding-school lose much of a mother's love and care, which can never be replaced by any one else, be the principals and governesses ever so kind. The children are liable to grow up without understanding their mother or being understood by her; for all will agree that to know a person thoroughly one must live with him or her constantly.

Thus it not unfrequently happens that when they leave school and go home for good, the girls get on indifferently or badly with the mother. Not having been brought much together, their dispositions clash, at any rate for a time, until they get used to each other.

Then, too, the conversation and manners of the elder pupils are of en anything but a good example to the younger ones, whose ears and eyes are always open, and who too readily pick up anything that would be better left alone.

They become "grown-up," talking of Stephen Heller's Tarantelles, and Macaulay's essays, when they ought to be playing at "shops" or nursing dolls.

If they are nervous they get bullied by the elder pupils, and thus may become cowed, reserved, and what the world calls uninteresting, to say nothing of their timidity leading them to falsehood or deceit.

I think that girls' ideas get narrowed by living for years shut up in a boarding-school, always being overlooked by a governess, never going out alone or relying on themselves, and seldom meeting visitors; so that when they do begin to mix with the world one cannot be surprised if they are awkward, silent, and peculiar. While I hold these opinions I do not disregard the many advantages that may be derived from girls mixing with others, and competing with them in their studies, which often result in the naturally idle and perhaps even stupid girls becoming

well-educated and bright women, but the preponderance seems to me to lie on the side of the disadvantages.

After all, a good education is not the only or chief thing we want for our girls, but rather a training that shall fit them to become good and useful women, well able to bear their part in the battle and bustle of life.

#### OPENER'S REPLY.

MR. SPEAKER,

Being fearful, Sir, of trespassing upon the patience of the House, my opening speech was very incomplete. Happily, some of my unuttered thoughts have found voice through my supporters. To my so-called Opponent I reply, "To express an opinion is not to controvert an argument." Hon. members on the other side have misunderstood the drift, and have not risen to the level of my reasoning. Standing upon higher ground, looking at matters in a broader light, and sounding the depths of things, I have ignored the trifles at which they have gazed with microscopic eyes, and have considered rather the weightier matters of Justice, Happiness, Liberty.

Parents may not wantonly delegate their authority, otherwise a child of ten years might have power over a girl of eighteen. "Authority unlawfully delegated may be lawfully resisted." Children may claim to be ruled by their parents, and by them alone. That is my answer to a certain hon. member.

Believing with Carlyle that all falsities die out, I rest assured that the fashion of parents handing over their families for other people to bring up will sooner or later cease to exist. The day is coming when the moral hideousness of the idea of tearing boys and girls from their homes, collecting them in batches like flocks of sheep, placing them in large buildings under the control of strangers who have no business to interfere with them, and making them lead the life of monks, nuns, and prisoners, will be clearly seen, and our posterity will condemn the barbarity of their forefathers.

SUMMARY OF SPEECHES RECEIVED ON QUESTION IV. :—Against Boarding-Schools for Girls—37; In favour of Boarding-Schools for Girls—42; majority of speeches in favour of Boarding-Schools—5; Total—79.

Two hundred and thirty-two votes were recorded on the question "Should we send our Girls to Boarding-Schools?"—resulting in a majority of twelve for the Opener of the Debate. A large number of votes had to be disallowed owing to non-observance of the published regulations.

### QUESTION V.—OUGHT TRIAL BY JURY TO BE ABOLISHED?

(Debate continued.)

G. H. RIMMINGTON :—On reading the speeches of the Opener and the Opponent, one can scarcely help feeling, from the general tone of the latter, that it is a very ingenious attempt to defend, with a number of far-fetched though at first sight plausible arguments, a system whose only recommendation is its antiquity. As an instance of this, I would call your attention, Sir, to that part of the speech in which the hon. gentleman is putting the question whether, if we were in the prisoner's place, we would rather confide our case to the decision of a judge or of a jury; where he says, "a judge who, if biassed at all, is biassed in favour of assuming the guilt of a prisoner before proof," &c. From what premises the hon. gentleman draws

this conclusion, he has thought fit to omit, and I must confess that, after carefully thinking the matter over, the reason for such a statement still escapes me. This may be due to my exceeding obtuseness of understanding, but that question must be left to the decision of the Family Parliament, in whose hands I place it with the greatest confidence. Then again, we have the quotation from Dean Stanley, but this, although expressing in a very pleasing manner most beautiful sentiment, can hardly be looked upon as satisfactory from a practical point of view. One could understand men who were simply listening in a disinterested manner deriving great pleasure, and it may be valuable information, from a visit to one of our courts of law. But this is not the