

suasion. The teacher in most cases not properly supported in matters of discipline by the Board of School Trustees, is forbidden to keep a pupil in for more than a certain length of time after school. Corporal punishments must be reported and the tendency is to regard with disfavour the teacher reporting any considerable use of the ferule. The result is to my mind bad for teacher and pupil.

I am no great supporter of corporal punishment, and its constant use by a teacher is, to my mind, evidence of weakness in that teacher's control of his school. I do not think, however, we can altogether deny the truth of the old proverb: "Spare the rod and spoil the child." At times corporal punishment and very severe corporal punishment at that, is necessary and salutary. Let us look at the one or two instances East and West and compare results.

Some years ago in the Dawson School of Vancouver City, a teacher severely punished a pupil. The School Board investigated the matter from the standpoint of so-called new ideas of school administration, and dismissed the teacher. Those who taught in that school, and particularly those having to teach the pupil on whose account that teacher was dismissed, will know only too well what a sad effect the action of the school board had on the discipline of that school. Within a year that particular pupil had defied his teacher, knowing well that no serious results to him would follow such defiance. There is a proper method of determining whether or not punishment has been too severe. Let the parent take the complaint to the Courts and have it settled there as is done in other provinces. If the punishment is too severe, let the teacher pay the penalty. If it is not, let the parent learn to his cost what an unfounded complaint in a Court of Law means.

I will now quote the Eastern instance.

In the St. Andrew's Grammar School a pupil was guilty of disobedience, and instead of remaining, as directed by the master, for punishment, went home. The Trustee Board, learning of the matter, took action, notified the parent and pupil to be at the school a certain day. On that day in the presence of the parent the pupil was compelled to take a much severer chastisement than would have originally been given, it having to be done to the satisfaction of the trustees composing the board, as well as to the satisfaction of the teacher. The pupil was then expelled from school for one year. He subsequently attended that school the same time as myself, and is to-day a medical man of good standing. He has more than once in talking of the matter, assured me that while he thought at the time he was rather roughly treated, that the incident was really the making of him.

Would there not be less tax on the teacher and better discipline in our schools if the trustee boards and our school regulations allowed of the same wise administration and firm discipline? If teachers were allowed to keep pupils in till not later than quarter to six, and for not more than four out of six days of the week, and to deprive pupils of not more than 50% of their recesses for the purpose of punishment, would there not be many cases in which the teachers' struggle would be considerably lessened and the pupil taught discipline without recourse to corporal punishment? I thoroughly believe that the pupil should be made to understand from all sources that he is there to obey the teacher's instructions and do his work as directed. I should support to the last a teacher in maintaining discipline. At the same time I would unhesitatingly dismiss from the service a teacher whose methods of discipline were proven too harsh.