

an interest in his welfare, and will be rejoiced at his improvement. Where a course of this kind is pursued toward a pupil, you need have no fears of trouble in his case. But it may be asked what if after all this has been done a scholar becomes wilfully rebellious, what can we do but compel him to submit by force? We answer, that in a school properly conducted, such cases will very rarely, if ever, occur. Scholars, as a general rule, do not rebel, unless they have been driven to it by the injustice of the teacher, or when the character of the teacher is such as to convince them that they may do so with impunity. In either case, shall we punish the pupil for the fault of the teacher? It were manifestly most unjust to do so. But if a case of this character should occur, where the teacher was in no wise to blame, and the pupil is wilfully and maliciously disobedient, then we say that it is better to expel him from the school than to whip. We have shown that whipping will not reform him, and if he is so much depraved that no moral influence will reach him, it were surely better to have him removed from the school, than to remain where he not only receives no benefit himself but rather exerts an evil influence upon the rest of his schoolmates.

It is argued that the teacher stands for the time in the place of the parent, and that he may with the same propriety make use of the rod, as does the parent? We know that this is a favorite argument with many, but we deny the premises upon which it is founded. The teacher does not stand in "*loco parentis*." The teacher does not feel himself that this is the case, nor does the instinct of the child teach him thus. No respect or love will ever cause the child to feel toward the teacher as toward the parent, and no punishment will be received from both in the same spirit and with the same results. The argument, then, founded upon this theory, is false, because the supposition itself is erroneous.

Many other reasons, in addition to those already given, might be adduced, why we, as teachers, should discontinue this method of punishment in our schools, but these may suffice to call attention to this subject which, though not an original one, is yet of great practical importance as regards the prosperity of our schools.

9. UNWISE LEGISLATION IN NEW JERSEY.

By the new School Law of New Jersey, it is enacted (Sec. 80): That no teacher shall be permitted to inflict corporeal punishment upon any pupil in any school in the State. This, we believe, is the first instance of the entire prohibition of corporeal punishment in school by State enactment. It is natural that the opponents of the "birch" should rejoice at such an endorsement of their views, and consider the law a great moral triumph. Possibly it may be. The home training of New Jersey children may be so excellent, that punishment can safely be prohibited in the schools; but we doubt it. If we are wrong, and we hope we are, we may shortly begin to look for another law forbidding the imprisonment and other "corporeal" punishment of men and women: for if the unreasoning children of New Jersey may be kept in order by moral suasion alone, how much more may those who have arrived at years of discretion. Let the reform go on, and soon offenders against the law may cease to tremble with fear of "getting justice" in New Jersey courts.

We spoke of prohibition of punishment advisably. The law forbids the infliction of corporeal punishment, without limitation. Any infliction of bodily pain as a penalty for wrong doing is therefore prohibited. Is a boy required to stand upon the floor? That is bodily restraint; it is corporeal punishment, painful to the poor boy's legs, and if his sensibilities are not entirely blunted, it shocks his nervous system, and makes him hang his head in shame. Let it not be done, it is against the law. Is a boy kept in at recess, or after school? He is deprived of needed recreation; his body suffers, to say nothing of his brain. It is corporeal punishment, and must not be allowed. But, it may be urged, the corporeal punishment implied, is flogging. Then it should have been so stated: and common prudence might also have provided that on breaking the rod of correction, there should not be suffered in its stead substitutes that are worse. Punishments that task the mind, lacerate the sensibilities, or kill the affections, are infinitely more severe than blows which mark the body: and because they leave no immediate visible marks, are more likely to be carried to excess than the infliction of superficial stripes.

On the score of humanity, we believe the rod to be a more healthful and less dangerous means of enforcing discipline than many of the emotional tortures freely employed by those who would be shocked at the idea of "thrashing" a rebellious youngster. The great majority of school children obey the laws of school, as good citizens the laws of the State, not from fear of punishment, but because of innate self-respect and sense of right. These are seldom or never amenable to punishment. The loss of standing in school, and in the affection of their teachers, that follows upon wrong doing is sufficient penalty for any misdemeanors that they may be guilty of. But there are others who are not to be reached, certainly not

at first, by such influences. They are to be restrained only by fear of punishment. So long as they remain in school, good order and discipline cannot be maintained, except the teacher has power to inflict such punishment. Teachers are human, and power may be injudiciously exercised. But the danger of excessive use of the rod is certainly no greater, if it is as great, as the danger of an ignorant and unfeeling infliction of more severe, though less palpable penalties. If teachers are not to be trusted in the one case, no more are they in the other. If they are not to be trusted in either, they are not fit for their office.—*American Educational Monthly*.

10. A PLAN OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS IN SCHOOLS.

From a paper read before the English College of Preceptors by R. W. Biggs, Esq., LL.D.

The cultivation of industrious habits was the main direct aim of my "plan," and these indeed indirectly did much to prevent vice and promote virtue. Considering that *certainity* and *proportionateness* were two main requisites both of rewards and punishments, I set out with the principle of paying for all work according to its goodness, and fining for every bad deed according to its badness, and that in the same coin. It was quite in consistence with this principle that the best deeds were rewarded only with honour, and the worst (as a rule) punished only with disgrace. This was the sting of the punishment when little boys (big ones never did it) occasionally had their hands tied for striking; or boys guilty of falsehood were never asked a question, or allowed to make a statement of fact; or mischievous ones were forbidden to go out of sight without asking leave. Espionage I altogether disavow; and never received information of offences, except in one or two grave cases, when the whole school thought it right to make a formal communication. Yet so great, generally, was the spirit of obedience and order, that I could scarcely maintain my gravity (I have often laughed since) when a youth six feet high came down one night to my sitting-room to know if he might shut his bedroom door! i. e. a second door to the room, which was usually kept closed. Corporeal punishment, though not disclaimed for overcoming obstinate disobedience, &c., was almost unknown; was never inflicted for imperfect lessons. At the end of the day, each boy presented his "bill," or account of the day's work, with his own estimate of its value, which I was sometimes obliged to "tax." Written exercises of all sorts I priced in pencil. At first I paid these bills in tickets with money values printed on them. For this idea, as well as for the "coin" itself (as I called it just now), I was indebted to James Perry, whose system attracted much attention near forty years ago, and was partially adopted for a time by my father. His use of it was very different from mine. There was a collateral advantage in the practice of ready reckoning which it gave. As however the coin wore out, and its use was liable to some abuse, not so much by dishonest taking, as by giving in mistaken kindness to popular boys by those who had it to spare, I latterly kept the accounts myself. Each boy was required to earn a minimum of 5s. a day (after paying any fines he might have incurred). Those who had not 30s. to show at the end of the week were not entitled to the usual pay next week till the money was made up. Whatever was earned over that minimum might be contributed, when it amounted to £5, to the purchase of a day's holiday, or half-a-day for a proportionate sum. I gave no holiday—"could not afford it"—not even a half holiday in the week, or at the request of friends, unless the Queen herself should ask. The only holiday I ever gave was in celebration of peace after the Russian war; and I promised another when slavery should be abolished in America. This had not been done when my health obliged me to give up school-keeping. The compulsory hours of work were very short, not more than 3 or 4 in the day; but I took care that they should be well used, devoting myself to superintendence and direct teaching, giving help in preparation, &c. The classical lessons were heard out of school, or by my assistant in another room. There was no temptation or excuse for wasting a minute. When the appointed work was done, there was abundant choice of other; and a vast amount of entirely voluntary work was done out of school as well as in, thus cultivating habits of self-employment, and exercising taste and judgement in the selection of that employment. Drawing, mapping, calligraphy, modelling, committing poetry to memory—any good work was accepted and paid for according to its merit.

The holidays thus earned were generally spent in country excursions, or picnics of a very simple kind. So great was the zest both in the work and the recreation, that I have often known industrious boys, on returning from a day's excursion involving considerable fatigue, set to work immediately, as if with fresh energy, to get another holiday! Indeed, I never had the school in more vigorous working order, than when they were regularly earning one and sometimes two whole holidays a week. In these treats all participated who were not "behind" in their money. Thus the whole school were interested in the industry and progress of each, and the best