

them. But, granting that they are still practised, and that the *Witness* wishes to remove them, has it taken the proper method of doing so? Has it gone to the root of the evil? We think not. In the first place, it deals particularly with the evil as existing in colleges and graded schools, and, as will be seen from the remedy suggested, it is applicable only to these larger institutions. And here we are surprised to find that no remedy is proposed to counteract the same evil in the smaller schools, where it is far more frequently found than in the larger institutions. But passing over this, and considering only colleges and graded schools, we are still more surprised at the means it proposes for removing the evil from these institutions, namely, to re-establish the old office of "whipping master." Does not the *Witness* man know that by advocating such a method of punishment, he is taking a step backward? Does he not know that such an office is not even thought worthy of mention in any of the great American works on education? If he does not know these things, his knowledge of educational matters must be very limited indeed. And if this be so, he should not commit himself, by treating subjects which he does not understand. At least he should hesitate before offering such an antiquated, long-forgotten method of administering punishment, lest he draw on himself the derision of all practical teachers. In fact, it does not require a practical teacher to see that punishments should be administered by the one against whom the offence is committed, provided always, of course, that this one have the right to punish. Now, although there may be no law which gives the teacher the right to inflict corporal punishment, yet custom makes it law, for it follows from the very nature of his position as teacher that he must maintain authority, and must, therefore, have the means at his

disposal of maintaining this authority. No court has ever denied the teacher this right. Experience proves that he should have it, and, if the *Witness* man had any experience in practical teaching he would know that one of the best ways of lessening a teacher's influence over his class is to take away his right of inflicting punishment; and he would also know that if a teacher have to send a boy out of his class to be punished, that teacher will never obtain complete control over his class. If the *Witness* can point out one school, conducted according to modern methods, in which this system is adopted, we are willing to admit that our experience with boys has served us to no purpose, and that we are absolutely ignorant of child-nature. True, the plan may be serviceable to the unskilful teacher; it may be a boon to the weakling who is utterly incapable of administering an effective punishment; but for the weakling we have no room in the teaching profession. And here we see where the *Witness* has failed to go to the root of the difficulty. The mistake is not in granting to the teacher the right to punish, for, as we have said, this right grows out of the very nature of his profession. But the mistake is in admitting that those teachers who punish injudiciously have the right to occupy positions in the schools. It is these so-called teachers whom the *Witness* should have attacked. The very remedy which he suggests shows that he considers them unfit to govern themselves, and therefore unfit to govern others. Why, therefore, does he not attack the teachers themselves, for abusing their right, instead of attacking the right itself? We think if the *Witness* will look into the case more thoroughly, it will find that it is the abuse and not the use of corporal punishment by the teacher, against which it should make its crusade. Let it be remembered that it is only bunglers, and not teachers, who resort to corporal punish-