

s first offence. I have since discovered that telling a boy not to commit a certain act again, may, if one's influence is sufficient, prevent him from repeating it; but it has very little effect on his 300 companions. I see two or three boys lying on the damp ground; I tell them to get up and not to be so foolish again. Ten minutes later I come by and find three or four others doing the same. But suppose, on the other hand, instead of telling the first offenders to get up, I make an endeavour by means of my walking cane to counteract the chill which I fancy is creeping over their foolish limbs; I know that boys have so much sympathy with one another, that these will give a warning to their companions about to commit the same offence, of the unpleasantness of the reaction. No, we cannot always leave the punishment in Nature's hands, because of our own imperfections. Nature is patient, and can afford to wait; we are impatient, and demand retribution at once, as a warning to others. Thus we intensify the natural consequences in some cases, while in other cases, as M. Spencer allows, where there is a risk of broken limbs, or other serious injury, forcible prevention is necessary, and this, in many cases, can only be done by interposing artificial consequences at once. Let us take a case of habitual idleness. Nature's own punishment for this is not felt till years after. This will not do for us, because of the seriousness of the consequences, and because of the delay; we accordingly impose a penalty founded on Nature's principle, and declare that the inevitable shall not be avoided: if an allotted task is not done at one time, it must be performed at another. But this course of action cannot long be continued with the same boy, and artificial punishments must be had recourse to. The objections to artificial punishments I quite feel. They irritate both sides: the boy fails to see the connection between cause and effect, and feels aggrieved; the master is irritated because the result produced is so slight, and because he perhaps feels that he is not quite sure he has punished wisely.

But there is a more important objection to them, for they do little permanent good, and when the power of imposing them is removed, the check is at end. There are some perhaps who would raise the same objection to personal influence, in a slight degree, and it must be allowed to have some weight. Our duty, of course, is to teach our boys a rule of action which will guide them when all domestic and school restraint is removed.

Having, then, arrived at the conclusion that artificial punishments are necessary in a school, I would enquire how they can be made most effective and least objectionable. I think the true principle is that they should be as near as possible akin to the offence. Many actions which are a pleasure when indulged in voluntarily, are a punishment when enforced. I remember being told by a Captain of a Training Ship in the Thames, that when he caught any of the boys chewing tobacco, he punished them in kind. On one occasion, a boy declared that he had rather go without his meals than give up the practice, the Captain took him at his word, supplied him with strong Pigtail, instead of food, and saw that he chewed it. The culprit ultimately changed his mind. So I have at times found boys chasing one another up and down staircases, out of bounds, and have made them stand where I have found them for a couple of hours. I have never seen other boys playing thereabouts, so long, at least, as my scarecrows have had to remain; and I think the said scarecrows have appreciated the quasi-natural form of the punishment, and have felt that I was not unfair.

Severity is no essential part of a good punishment,

but certainty and quickness is. A punishment which is spread over a long period is more irritating, but not nearly so effective as one which is soon over; and this is, to my mind, one great argument for the use of the cane. My experience is that boys dislike the pain inflicted by that weapon, but that they do not dislike it as a form of punishment; and on more than one occasion, when I have had to set an imposition of some kind, boys have asked me if they might not have so many cuts with the cane instead. The journal to which I have before referred, is, I am told, most strongly opposed to all corporal punishments, as being degrading and brutalizing. I must confess to thinking that there is a great deal of sentimental nonsense talked and written on this score. If I were not a school-master, I could, I imagine, build a very pretty rose-water theory of discipline, in which the rod and other such punishments would entirely disappear; but my experience leads me to think that I should violate my principles as soon as I came to put them into practice. Not that I approve of the indiscriminate use of the rod in the class-room—the effect in the hands of most men is very pernicious, though the patient temper of the few may well be trusted. There are boys to whom the rod does a moral injury, there are others whose natures seem to require it. To discriminate wisely is our difficult but imperative duty; and this duty is rendered doubly difficult by the necessity we are under of both being and appearing just. If half-a-dozen boys have committed the same offence, they will think it very unfair if the same punishment is not given to all; and yet the punishment set, say it is so many lines, may take one boy four times as long to learn as it will another. In such a case it is wise to be unfair in order to appear fair; but with single cases the boy's nature and capabilities should be taken into account. A disgrace which will cause one boy's amusement, will break another boy's heart. I can call to mind a remarkable and somewhat amusing instance of the ignoring the differences of natures. Some 20 years ago I was at school at a fashionable watering-place in the south of England, and in the same town some near relatives were being educated at an "Establishment for Young Ladies." On more than one occasion I spent the evening with them, and I recall with singular pleasure—for now, even as then, I love this world's sweets—the brimstone and treacle which came round at prayers for the moral and physical improvement of all. I say "moral improvement" advisedly, because such was the simplicity of the *régime* which obtained in this school, that when a girl was fractious or had scored a certain number of bad marks during the week—I believe the cause was not taken into consideration—a dose of Gregory Powder was prescribed for the delinquent. One smiles when one thinks of this piece of quackery, though for my own part I suspect that, from the quantity and quality of the exercise then in vogue at girls' schools, in nine cases out of ten the supposed cause of the misbehaviour was the true one.

Let me now say a few words on a more serious form of punishment—expulsion. The question as to whether a boy ought to be expelled from a school or not, is often a most difficult one to decide. The gain and loss to the school have to be weighed against the gain and loss of the individual. It is so important a matter from all points of view, that I think in most cases the Head Master will do well to consult his Assistants—his own conscience will thus be set at rest, and a mistake will seldom be made. A despotic Tory friend of mine used to a very summary mode of procedure. If a boy came to him who seemed inclined to break the rules of his