

when the citizens of Cambridge would thank the present Board for not yielding to the pressure of temporary excitement."

After some further expression of opinion on the part of members of the Board, it was voted to postpone indefinitely the whole subject; but a statement having been made that a member, who was absent, wished an opportunity to debate the question, the vote was reconsidered, and the report was again laid on the table, to be taken up at the next meeting.

2. OPINIONS OF PRACTICAL TEACHERS.

A meeting of practical teachers belonging to Massachusetts was held on 16th March, when the question of corporeal punishment was discussed. The opinions seemed unanimous on the point submitted.

Mr. Chase, of Watertown, said:—That the right to punish corporeally is sometimes abused proves nothing. Nobody favors the abuse of it, and yet a single case in which it is abused, is made the occasion of fierce denunciation of all who use it. He believed there were modes of punishment far worse than whipping. He thought that the strenuous opponents of flogging often used methods far more objectionable. When teaching in the city of Washington, he was once talking with a teacher who was once a professed moral suasionist, and asked him what substitute he used. He for a long time evaded the question, but on being pressed, stated that he tied pupils by their hands to a hook in the wall, and there kept them till they were subdued. He also related another instance in which a little girl, only five years old, who had been at school but a few days, and was required by the teacher to name a letter which she persisted in saying she did not know. The teacher did not whip her but shut her up in a dark closet till school closed. She commenced screaming, and, after she was taken out, continued to scream during four days and nights, when she died. These are, it is true, extreme cases, but they show first, that there are worse punishments than whipping, and secondly that those who do not practise corporeal punishment are likely to resort to means that are far worse. He would say, let us use the means provided and sanctioned by Providence, and if we cannot use them without abusing them, let us resign. Let not this monster which we are now combating rear its head again among us.

Mr. Frost, of Waltham, stated that he had been a teacher for thirty-one years. He had, during all that time, been in the constant habit of observing carefully different modes of discipline and instruction. He did not hesitate to say that the doctrine lately promulgated at Cambridge would, if carried out, open the doors of every prison in the country. In fact, there must be authority in every organization; and there must also, of necessity, be submission. Authority which cannot, in case of need, enforce itself, is utterly valueless. All admit that in society, law must be enforced, and this is surely no less true in school. The rules *must* be obeyed, and to say that those who cannot be *persuaded* into obedience must be suffered to disobey, is to strike at the foundation of all government. That he might not be accused of favouring the indiscriminate use of the rod, he would lay down the following as his theory: that "the minimum of punishment is the maximum of excellence," other things being equal. So he would say that the fewer we can send to jail, consistently with good order, the better. This did not imply, however, that men should not be sent there when the public safety demands it, nor did the former rule imply that corporeal punishment could not be rightfully resorted to when demanded by the good of the school.

Mr. Walton, of Lawrence, went once to Cape Cod to teach, with his head full of the idea of governing by moral suasion. He tried every means, and actually grew thin with his efforts, and went through the term without striking a blow. The scholars, he thought liked him, and so did the parents; still he felt dissatisfied with the result. The next term he commenced again upon the same plan. Again he grew thin by his efforts to avoid the use of force. He succeeded as ill as before, and still felt that the session, so far as progress was concerned, was a failure. On one occasion he kept a boy after school for the purpose of "laboring" with him. He went through the stereotyped formula so familiar to teachers. He told the boy "how much better he would feel" if he did well; how it would please his parents, etc. He then went on to say that "if it had been Smith or Jones he should not have been surprised, but that from 'him' he expected better things;" when he was suddenly floored by the boy's blurring out, "I ain't no better'n the rest on 'em." After this he gave up his extreme ideas, and resolved to punish if the good of the school required it. The testimony of practical teachers seems to be uniform to the effect that force is sometimes necessary. Among the rules of his school was one that a boy who was tardy at recess was liable to be whipped; and, sometimes, by one blow of the ferule, judiciously given, the evil was checked for a whole year. He should be very sorry to see corporeal punishment abolished while the present system of instruction exists.

Mr. Thompson, of West Cambridge, being called for as one who

was opposed to corporeal punishment, said that he would correct that statement. He was not opposed to the judicious use of force. He thought it very liable to abuse, because it was such an easy method. It requires much self-control and sagacity to use it always properly. He thought if a boy was persistently obstinate and unruly it was cruel *not* to punish him. Expelling is foolish. Punishment may benefit, but expelling never can. If a scholar cannot be made to obey in school, he certainly would not do so in the world. He thought there should be a limit as to age. It was, however, difficult to fix any age, as the matter is controlled so much by circumstances. He would never punish in the presence of others. He had never punished in his own school. It was, however, a High School, where it was not generally supposed to be necessary.

Mr. Smith, of Dorchester, said that the question should be changed to "ought punishment to be abolished?" This was the real matter now at issue in this vicinity. If it should be done away with in school, it certainly should be in the world at large, where men are more developed. It was easy to draw a picture of schools or communities governed entirely by moral suasion, but let it be tried. Let Boston do away with its police force, and when a drunken brawl occurs, let those who think themselves so well fitted to reform by love, take the culprits and reform them. No one would be so insane as to propose this, and yet it is this same principle which it is proposed to establish in school. The evil effects of whipping, too, are very much exaggerated by those who know nothing practically of the matter. Do we not all know that if it is properly and skillfully applied, the boy is in most cases happier as well as better after it?

Mr. Collar, of Roxbury, thought that the discussion was more for the public than for teachers. Among those who are obliged to *do* the work of training large bodies of children there is scarcely any difference of opinion upon the subject.

Mr. Hagar, of the Salem Normal School, said, that were the question put to him, "are you in favour of corporeal punishment?" he should unhesitatingly answer, yes. If, however, he were asked, if he favoured the frequent resort to it, he should answer, as promptly, no. In whatever he might say, he wished to be understood as opposed to its common use. He was obliged, in the discharge of his official duty, to express his opinion upon the subject. His instruction amounted, generally, to this:—It may be proper for you to use force. If, however, you find yourself obliged to resort to it frequently, you may well question your fitness for the profession; use it only in extreme cases; if it comes to a question of obedience with the rod, or disobedience without it, choose the former. It is very easy, and very beautiful to theorize about managing entirely by love; but the real question is—Is it practicable? In the course of twenty-five years of teaching, he had resorted to corporeal punishment three times. He often doubted, however, whether he should not have done better if he had used it oftener. He should mention also, that he had taught mostly in High Schools, where the scholars were of advanced age, and required less forcing. In a school composed, as some schools were, mostly of boys of low character, he saw not how it was possible to do away with it. Mr. H. then reiterated his statement, that he did not believe the frequent use of it ever to be necessary.

Mr. Brown, of Boston (Bowdoin School), said, that he had recently listened to a discussion of this subject in the city of Boston where every opponent of corporeal punishment, and among them a member of the Cambridge School Committee, admitted that it was sometimes necessary. In imaginary schools, or in a theoretical world, it may be dispensed with, but in schools as they are, and in the world as it is, it must, he thought, be sometimes resorted to.

3. A SCHOOL WITHOUT CORPOREAL PUNISHMENT.

Mr. H. Y. Lauderbach, one of the Grammar-Masters of Philadelphia, describes in the *Massachusetts Teacher* his experience in the conduct of a school without resort to corporeal punishment. In the course of his remarks he says:—In a school, consisting of nearly three hundred pupils, coming from every grade in society, from the highest to the lowest, there must necessarily be many apparently naturally intractable boys, but I soon found that it was with just such boys that the good effects of the change were most plainly visible; and the experience of a few weeks satisfied me that in the case of many such seemingly incorrigible offenders the fault was not so much in them as in the unwise treatment and unfavourable influences to which they were subjected at home. In every such case, when persuasion and admonition failed to effect a reform, I made use of the power vested in me by the Committee, and suspended the boy, until an interview could be obtained with his parent or guardian, whose co-operation I endeavored to secure.

At the sacrifice of some time outside of school hours in receiving visits, or calling myself upon such as were prevented by circumstances from coming to the school, I became more or less personally acquainted with the parents, and soon found that acquaintance to