

on scholars. They say in effect, "We believe that any school can be soundly disciplined if the teacher is strong enough to rely on moral influence alone. But some men give way to temper; they fail to sympathize with children, and they solve every difficulty connected with maintaining discipline by means of the sharp argument of physical pain. Indolence and ill-humour cause the cane to be used: we want to make the teacher shake off his indolence, and pause before he lets his ill-humour have scope; seeing that schoolmasters and schoolmistresses are so weak in temper and judgment, we must frame regulations to guard them against their own frailty." The spirit expressed in these words has taken shape in the regulations of the London School Board; the example of London has been widely followed in the provinces, and now the Departmental Circular comes as a climax.

The London regulations show the amateur in apotheosis. No more unwise set of directions was ever put together, for the teachers cannot render full obedience, however they may strive. Indeed, if the code were rigidly followed, three out of four schools would become inefficient. Again and again the Board have been challenged to name any schools in which their code is followed; again and again the challenge has been declined. For the sake of keeping up an appearance, the managers of the great London schools almost force their servants to be disingenuous. The amateurs say, "We know that our rules only insure partial obedience; but it is better that the teacher should be partially obedient than that he should be wholly free. Therefore we restrain the teacher." Now it happens that the very root of the matter lies in the fact that the teacher is better left without restraint. All his training tends to make him cau-

tious, and his self-interest renders it absolutely essential that he shall never inflict punishment excepting under pressure of extremest necessity. The humane regulations are usually put together as though no such necessity ever existed, and the teacher is treated as though he were a truculent person with a latent tendency towards bullying. Six months of steady work in an elementary school would serve to do away with that idea.

The elementary teacher is obliged to get the greatest possible quantity of work out of his lads, and to manage that he must be popular. An unpopular teacher cannot live, and an unjust teacher cannot be popular. Knowing this, the average modern schoolmaster tries to make school a happy place. If his lads are dull, the work is bad, and the teacher very soon finds his position unpleasant. If he scolds or threatens, his influence is gone at once, and he learns, long before he has finished his apprenticeship, that a set of youngsters cannot be kept going unless their guide is bright, patient, and good-tempered. There is a other consideration: competition between schools is now as keen as the competition in trade. Now, children are the keenest critics of ability and conduct. They do not reason—they see; and if a man is hard or unsympathetic they simply desert him, and persuade their parents to send them elsewhere. The bright and kindly head master always has a full school; the bright and kindly assistant always has regular attendance in the section which he teaches; but no one ever knew any school to be well attended if the master took no pains to make youngsters like him.

Here the humane individuals may say—"This is precisely our contention. Why not carry your argument through to the end? Since it is good to be kind—since the very professional existence of the teacher de-