

we shall be able to deal with it dispassionately. We say, then, that it is an error to suppose that parents have a right to interfere with school discipline. We make this assertion because the circumstances of the case necessitate it, and any other assumption must resolve itself into an absurdity. The act of placing a child at school is the delegation by the parent of his or her authority, an authority given to the parent by Nature and by the State. That authority is to govern. Government is the imposition of laws for the benefit of the community, of which the governed forms a part, and there cannot be a law without a sanction, or, in other words, without a means of enforcing it. If this position does not hold, then the authority of the parent is not delegated, and the responsibility of the master does not accrue. As a matter of fact, the law holds that it is delegated, and that the master is only responsible to the State, whence the parent derives his authority, if in its exercise he violates the law of the land. But as a second matter of fact, militating against this happy state of things, the parent and master are in a false position relatively; i. e., the parent has, as things at present stand, the right of refusing to continue the supplies; and the poor master is compelled to listen to the whimwhings of weak-minded parents, and their still more officious friends, and to concede, for personal security, ruinous license. Parents should perhaps have the right to select a school for their children, but they should not have the right to withdraw the child, when once placed, without the permission of a governing scholastic authority, or the order of a magistrate, obtainable only on the production of valid reasons, any more than they should have the right to interfere between the apprentice and his master.

But to the consideration of the causes of interference; they are—1st, want of confidence in the delegate; and 2ndly, ignorance of the nature, object, effect, and spirit of punishment.

1. The want of confidence in the delegate must arise from his real or supposed incapacity for the duties he has undertaken; therefore the parent, in placing the child under him, is clearly guilty of a breach of duty, both to the delegate and to the child, by asking the one to do what he supposes him incapable of doing, and intrusting the other to a person unfit to have his custody. If the incapacity of the master is real, the act of the parent is criminal; if hypothetical, the parent was bound not to act till the fact was established. We apprehend, however, that acts of interference are for the most part unjustifiable, and are traceable to the fault of the parent, and not to that of the delegate, the presumption being—first, that masters do not punish for their own gratification; second, that they do not needlessly peril their own interests, which involve the retention of their pupils; third, that a child who requires much punishment at school must have been badly trained at home.

1. The sole object of punishment is the conservance of the law to which it is attached; this it accomplishes by its direct infliction upon the violator of the law, and by intimidation. Its efficacy depends upon its certainty of overtaking the law-breaker, its nature is akin to the law to which it is attached, and its spirit is the benefit of the punished and justice to those amenable to the same law.

If the law is righteous, and binding upon the whole school, the violator of the law should be punished for his own benefit, and for that of others, to screen him from the punishment he has merited, is to do him an injury and his comrades an injustice.

The efficacy of punishment depends upon its certainty. If human institutions could attach to their laws adequate punishments which would certainly overtake the law-breaker, there would be no law-breaking, at least intentionally, because presuming the punishment to be adequate, that is to say proportioned to the advantage gained by the commission of the crime, there would be a certain disadvantage to the criminal. No man will deliberately thrust his hand into the fire without the moral certainty of securing something more valuable to him than the pain he is certain to incur, but thousands will plunge their hands into other men's pockets, literally and figuratively, simply because they are buoyed up with the hope of escaping detection and punishment. From whatever source, therefore, failure in the attaching of punishment to the commission of crime comes, crime must increase, and the law fall into contempt. It is far better to have no law, than to suffer it to be violated with impunity. If schoolmasters have not the necessary power, or are placed in circumstances where they are in peril if they exercise it, they might do well to abolish all systems of law suited to civilized bodies in times of peace, and establish a species of school martial law, dealing with the case as the necessity of the moment may require; for, by so doing they will not teach lawlessness. But with modern example before them, they would do well to remember, that popular twaddling sentimentality keeps the halter round the neck of him who rules, more willingly than it places it round that of him who defies the ruler.

*The neglect of Physical Training.*—We have spoken of the five senses, and have endeavoured briefly to point to a few of what we consider to be the existing errors of omission and of commission respecting the mental training of youth. We have seen that the general tendency of the day is to overload the mind, that schools are regarded as places where youth is to be stocked with a certain amount of information—an amount too frequently considered sufficient to carry the instructed through life; enough to enable him, upon quitting his school or college, to throw down his books, and to regard his education as complete. With such notions prevailing, it is worthy of consideration whether examinations, at all

events those that are termed final, are not more injurious than the total non-existence of such examinations; for if the obtaining a given certificate or degree is an assurance to the fortunate candidate that he has done enough, would it not be better that he should never possess it, and thus go on labouring, ignorant of what others deem a maximum in any particular? It is to be hoped that the time will come, when this subject will receive the attention it merits; and when all professional bodies and universities will possess and exercise the power of conferring Degrees and distinctions upon all comers at all times, with results of their genius and prudence that may or can prove of service to society—a day when the members of all professions have substantial inducement not to be satisfied with the position of mere practitioners, and when art and science shall not compel its votaries, for the sake of bread, to prostitute their talents to popular bad taste.

But is it possible for any reflecting man to believe that a given amount of information, upon any given number of subjects, is education? Education, we apprehend, has for its object the fitting of the educated for the stern realities of life, and must therefore regard the physical as well as the moral and intellectual being. It must consider him as an individual, as a member of his immediate family; as a component part of that greater family, the State; as a member of humanity, and as a subject of the Almighty. As an individual, it must recognize the fact, that he is physical as well as mental; as a member of his private family, that his interests are inseparable from it, that as a citizen he is bound not merely to avoid being a burden, but that it is his solemn obligation to support and defend it; that his humanity is not limited to country; and that, as a subject of the Everlasting, his aspirations cannot be measured by time.

Mentally it is our business, not so much to instruct him, as to educate him to instruct himself; to give him that assistance that will enable him to overcome early difficulties which might prove insurmountable without it. But it is especially our duty to withhold any aid that would stultify his energy or pauperize his soul: for the want of self-reliance and perseverance is a curse for which no blessing can compensate. Self-reliance, and its attendant, nobility of nature, are inseparable from a good physique, we do not intend a burly animalism, but a mind holding in due subjection a sound nervous body. It is the province of the mind to govern—it is the duty of the body to obey; and a being who cannot hold himself in subjection must be the miserable slave of his own passions, and the ignoble tool of other men.

The fact that athletic sports are being largely replaced by semi-effeminate games, and that healthful recreations are giving way to artificial excitements, should awaken the attention and serious consideration of all interested in the perpetuation of our national prosperity.

We would direct attention to the very able remarks of Thomas Carlyle, in his "Shooting Niagara," upon drilling; and we would suggest to legislators about to take up the subject of education, that their attention should not be confined to schools for the poor, but that their Act should require all children at schools to be properly drilled for one hour per diem at the least—girls in an approved system of calisthenics, and boys in the regular military drill, and that the State may at the same time derive the double benefit of ready-made young soldiers and robust citizens, and not be guilty of inflicting a hardship upon youth, let the legislature expressly require that the time so devoted shall be taken from the regular school hours.

Educators, and all interested in youth, would do well seriously to consider this subject, to reflect upon the number of hours young students are kept in the fetid atmosphere of the school-room; to consider the position of the chest while bent over the desk, and to bear in mind that, long before the bloom of youth actually fades from the cheek, the seeds of its decay are being slowly though surely sown; that a little extra information is dearly purchased at the cost of a sickly or of an impaired constitution, and that when youth has once passed from the school to the house of business, the physical development can less easily be attended to than before.

*The Voluntary System, and the Duty of Government.*—It is really refreshing to hear that some able men are awake and beginning to rub their eyes. Voluntary system! Who in the name of reason ever heard of crime begging chastisement, of darkness seeking the light, of indolence praying for labour, or of ignorance delighting in intelligence? We know of ignorance envying and hating intelligence, of indolence coveting the reward of labour, of the evil deeds of darkness flying the light, and that chance punishments have had very little effect upon crime; and now, having slumbered far into the morning, we feel something like a nightmare of a French 1792, and begin to ask ourselves, What must be done? We have known, ever since we had knowledge, that the volunteer System was a myth in our own case: for when we were children, our going to school was *volens*; and when we had children of our own, their going was *volens volens*. Our sentiments, as children, regarding the school, and those of our children, were not unreasonable. The child cannot be expected to understand that it is for his good that he should be deprived of his freedom, nor is it easy for him to appreciate the wisdom of compelling him to work hard at something of which he cannot possibly conceive the use. Is not his case precisely that of the parent in the lowest stratum of English society? That parent does not know, and cannot understand, the use of school, either for himself or his children; and as in this he is but a child, so should he by the State be treated as a child.