

pend upon his practising forbearance, why blame those who try to make forbearance universal?"

But this very common argument is only used by reason of insufficient knowledge. In every school a large number of children never need any admonition; they are industrious, obedient, and thoughtful by nature. Schoolmasters know well the type now mentioned. Then there are other children who are not bad at all, but who give a little trouble occasionally through sheer lightheartedness. When a class slackens work for a minute, these merry chatterers are very likely to begin making that low, distressing hum which teachers are bound to check. A look is all they require; then they smile in an apologetic way and settle into prim silence. But in almost every school there are certain children who are tainted with some really serious fault, and it is in dealing with these children that the teacher finds prohibitory regulations so grievously embarrassing. The black sheep often exhibit a diseased precocity in vice, and their lack of moral sense is sometimes astounding. Such faults as untruthfulness are easily cured, but if a lad is cruel, or thievish, or foul-mouthed, or insolent, there is only one way with him. A thoroughly insolent boy will poison a whole class, and, since he is usually conceited, he grows unbearable if he is left alone. The same observation holds with regard to the other serious delinquencies named. It may be said that a child is driven deeper into brutality if brutal means are applied to cure his brutal nature. There is only one reply to this contention: All experience is against it. If a boy is thoroughly bad (and amateurs can hardly imagine the badness to which a mere youth may attain), the only way of preventing him from tainting others is to make him, at all events, refrain from showing his real disposi-

tion. He may not be *essentially* improved by sharp punishment; but if he is sternly compelled to conceal his worst side there is less risk of his contaminating his class-mates.

We must now go on to a very serious consideration. It happens that no boys are so quick to learn and to misconstrue prohibitory regulations as are the very worst characters in a class. Since the rules of the London Board have been made public, it has happened not once, but a hundred times, that defiant children have said, "You ain't allowed to punish. It's in the paper, and you ain't going to do what you like with me." The teacher must then either humiliate himself by explaining a regulation, or appear to be showing an example of deliberate disobedience. What can be said of regulations which allow such an alternative to be presented? And can we approve a Circular which appears to give the sanction of the central Government to the very Code which brings about so much mischief?

Yet, even when the teacher is strictly within the law, it is not fitting that he should appear to the worst of his scholars as an arbitrary underling. All such rules as are hinted at in the Circular of My Lords hamper the good teachers without in the least restraining the half hundred bad ones who are aimed at. Why impose an unnecessary burden upon a vast majority of conscientious workers, only in order to keep in check a few incompetent persons who could easily be found out and promptly dismissed.

To change ground: it is continually said that certain elementary schools *are* carried on without corporal punishment. It is even said that many schools in rough neighbourhoods are managed by moral suasion alone. This may be true; although no institution of the sort has ever come under the writer's observation. There are schools where corporal punishment is