

sufferer in some form resents. He silently, or with curses not loud but deep, submits. The criminal may be hardened beyond hope, and society in its defence may fright him into submission; but that gives no proof of reformation. In a lesser degree it is the same in the school. Your corporal punishment will not exorcise the spirit of theft, or lying, or brutality, or impurity, out of a bad nature. The cane or the whip will only make the offender more secret in his bad habits. He will conceal his vices, but no whipping will make him love the opposite virtues. The effect therefore is never an advantage to virtue, even when the motive has been disinterested—when the teacher has inflicted the punishment in the spirit of a philanthropist and for the public good. But the probability and the danger is that corporal punishment, in the greatest number of cases, is inflicted under feelings of temporary irritation or of the heaviest anger, and that therefore personal resentment, more than a sense of duty, prompts it. Hence the evil and the danger. The personal resentment is *seen* by the pupil and therefore no moral good results. The offender is taught to conceal, not to reform; and the teacher, under the influence of anger, may inflict serious injuries on the culprit and render himself liable to the penalties of law and to public disgrace.

I am not denying here the expediency of corporal punishment in certain circumstances, under our imperfect social organizations. It is urged, and I do not utterly oppose the necessity, that it is practised in jails, in the army, and in the navy. I have considered its aspect in jails; and in the army and the navy the fact that corporal punishment, which once had as strong advocates in those institutions as it even now has in schools, is now greatly diminished, and motives for good conduct, rather than penalties for

bad, are encouraged, gives evidence of the reformation in that direction.

But this view of the question brings me to the second grand objection I have to corporal punishment in the school-room. *It degrades the teacher.* In the jail, the army, and the navy, it is not the governor of the jail, or the commanding officer, who inflicts the punishment; it is the vilest criminal or the lowest official. The commanding officer would throw up his commission and the governor would resign his office before he would degrade himself by whipping an offender. The teacher stands in the same relation to his pupils that these officers do to their charges, and the degradation is similar if not equal. The consequences of imposing this degrading duty on the teacher have been felt through all ages and in every country. In past times we have been subjected to the sneers and contempt of ignorance, because while enlightened views of our duties had animated thoughtful minds, the masses have looked upon us as objects of fear and coercion to children. Parents frighten their children with the terrors of the schoolmaster's whip. "Take care—you'll catch it when you go to school," is no uncommon threat held out to refractory children, and owes its existence to the fact that we have too often deserved the reputation it suggests.

But it degrades us. The parent who will hold up the teacher as an object of fear will not hesitate to hold him up as an object of contempt or ridicule. Hence the personal insults to which teachers are frequently subjected—ridiculed, called names, or mocked for any personal defects; and this without regard to sex, or age, or services. Mark the respect with which the clergyman is received. The probability is that if children were to speak of their clergymen as they are allowed by ignorant parents to speak of their teachers they would be rebuked for