

and most industrious boys, so far from being regarded with jealousy and dislike, as is so apt to be the case, especially when they alone receive prizes, were the most popular, as being the best holiday-earners.

The fines ranged from 1d. poundage for every article carelessly left about (which I had to pay myself sometimes to the holiday fund); 3d. for any unnecessary speaking or noise (in school time) or other interruption of others, (no speaking was then allowed, except to me, or my presiding assistant, on business; and so complete was the silence, that even a whisper was seldom attempted. My notice of any infraction of order was generally by holding up three fingers, which the guilty party alone was pretty sure to see); 1s. for the use of any "opprobrious epithet" (appropriate epitaph, as some of my wags called it), including, of course, most nicknames. This was thought by some at first very strict. I was once or twice caught transgressing, and of course had to pay 1s.; 1s. also for romping in the school-room, a play-room being provided. The highest fine was 5s. for disobedience to a direct command, or wilful violation of a known rule, e. g., straying from a walking party beyond reach of communication; when this did not appear to be intentional, the mitigated penalty of 2s. 6d. was levied. In our very free rambles this was the commonest offence. Of course it was everybody's interest to prevent offences as well as to promote industry. The process of fining was most simple and expeditious, free from the irksomeness and heart-burnings, which are apt to accompany "impositions." And lessons—literary work—instead of having disagreeable associations as the instrument of punishment, was rather the means of escaping punishment as a suffering. By industrious boys a fine was scarcely felt, except as a slight disgrace.

The Rev. G. Henslow, the Chairman, remarked that such a system as that described by Dr. Biggs could probably only be carried out successfully by the inventor, and would be difficult of adaptation to different circumstances. In reference to the details, he could not see why it should be necessary to mark a money value on the tickets, when they were not paid for in money; but this was not a material point, if the object of the system had been attained. There would be some difficulty in introducing any system of the kind in London schools, because boys living at home lose their zest for holidays through the indulgence of their parents in frequently keeping them from school. Corporeal punishment might very well be disused, except in cases of extreme obtuseness of the moral sense.—*English Educational Times*.

11. OPINION OF THE HON. N. BATEMAN, OF ILLINOIS.

The prevalence of the sentiment which would sweep every form of corporal punishment from the school-rooms of the country, and even render its infliction, under any circumstances, an unlawful act, by positive prohibitory legislation, must be regarded with grave apprehension by all who rightly understand the true office and nature of punishment in the family and in the school, and its momentous relations to the welfare of the state. The great end of a system of popular education is, to fit millions of the nation's children for the high duties and privileges of a free citizenship; and this is done not half so much by the knowledge gained, as by the discipline of the school-room. It is a grand thing to endow the youth of the country with the elements of knowledge, and to arm them with the power conferred by even a rudimentary education; but it is a grander thing to clothe them with the garments of gentleness and docility, and give them back to the state with habits of obedience and truth, a sense of the inviolability of law, and a sincere reverence for whatever is venerable, just, and good. This is the supreme work of the schools of the state; the highest conception of their influence and value. And to what unspeakable importance is this thought exalted when it is remembered that one-fourth of the whole population of the country are, or should be, in the public schools. When it is considered that strict subordination and obedience is a prime and absolute necessity to the success of every school, and that every teacher must, of equal necessity, be invested with a very large discretion in the choice and use of means to ends, what folly to say that all other agencies may be resorted to except those which would lead to obedience through the ordeal of physical pain, and to denounce these as always and intrinsically savage and barbarous. Who does not know that there are punishments a thousand times more terrible than those of the rod, and which could be inflicted with impunity, though every vestige of authority to use the rod should be denied or repealed by statute? Is the soul less dignified than the body? Is the heart less tender in the sight of the law, and of Christendom, than the skin? Are the moral susceptibilities and feelings less vulnerable to pain and torture than the flesh and muscles? What resources of anguish abide in the insensate fibres of a wooden rod, compared with those which lurk in the tongue, and voice, and eye, of a bitter and unloving man or woman? May not cruel words and tones of irony, sarcasm, or invective, cut and bite and sting the shrinking sensitive soul of a child, as well as the sharp blows of the rattan? Who would not prefer that, if his

child must be punished, the blows should fall upon its body, from the hand of a firm though conscientious and gentle-hearted teacher, than upon its heart and spirit from the fiery tongue of a moral savage or virago? * * *

The argument of the courts is—parents are justified in the reasonable and moderate use of the rod, when necessary to secure obedience; the teacher stands, for the time being, and for certain purposes, *in loco parentis*; therefore, the teacher is warranted in a moderate and reasonable use of the rod, when necessary to proper discipline in school. But is it true that humane, conscientious parents ever resort to corporeal punishment in the discipline of their children? It is not necessary to answer this question. The agency of physical suffering, the rod, is resorted to, when occasion seems to require, by the wisest and most kind-hearted parents on earth, as all the world knows; resorted to by them because they are wise and tender-hearted, loving their children too well to omit any reasonable means to turn their erring feet from the ways of vice and folly. And a comparison of results is not feared. Those families whose children are sometimes made acquainted, in loving firmness, with the "relic of barbarism," are at least as well and as successfully governed as those who claim to have learned a more excellent way; and the sons and daughters of the former are at least as likely to become worthy men and women, as those of the latter. The wild epithets so flippantly applied to the regulated use of the rod in school do, therefore, by logical necessity, glance from the heads of teachers to those of all parents who approve a like use of that means of discipline; and every assault made upon physical chastisement in school, as a remnant of a savage and brutal age, is, per force, levelled also against all the families in Christendom which adhere to the "antiquated theory of parental government." This, I am aware, does not prove that corporeal punishment is right, but it comes as near to it as the rash fulminations against it do toward proving that it is wrong. Assertion may as well be met with assertion: corporeal punishment is not, in itself, brutal, or a relic of barbarism, but is an agency that may, under proper circumstances and conditions, be rightfully and beneficially employed; and those who will not resort to it when all other means fail, rather than those who do, should be the objects of apprehension to all true philanthropists, Christians, and patriots.

Without doubt the best teachers do, as a general rule, use the rod the least: not, however, because they have a nicer sense of the "dignity of the age," or are of a higher type of civilization, but simply because they have a more perfect personal discipline, and command a wider range of mental and moral resources from which to draw in dealing with the wayward and erring. It may be that, if we were wise enough, some other remedy might be found in every case. I cannot say. But it is quite certain that, so far as we can judge of cause and effect, cases arise, at one time or another, in the experience of most teachers, when the timely and judicious infliction of corporeal punishment seems, both at the time and ever afterward, the wisest and best thing that could be done. When nations beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more, the mission of the rod will be ended—perhaps sooner, but I think not. At all events, the moral millennium will not be hastened, whether for nations or school-masters, by passing laws based upon the negation of the most palpable facts of humanity.

The only possible rule, is to allow teachers all necessary discretion in respect to the infliction of corporeal punishment, and all other forms of punishment, and then hold them to a just accountability for abusing the authority conferred. This is the essence of all the decisions of the courts, and is the only rational view that can be taken of the subject. Our school-laws are silent upon the whole subject, but the rulings of our courts have harmonized in nearly every instance with those of the distinguished jurists of other states, and with the spirit of the remarks which have now been made. Let our teachers and school officers carefully study the opinions cited, and act in their spirit, in the fear of God, and with love and charity toward all, and they will not go far astray, and need have no fears of being molested by the law while in the plain path of duty.—The above is from the *Illinois Teacher*, and the Editor says:—"We should think the widespread wickedness and lawlessness of the times, manifested too often by our youth, would teach people that we need discipline—quick, unhesitating obedience to law because it is law, and that obedience enforced by penalty. It is said children are not depraved, they need only to be started aright, they have no inclination to wrong. Perhaps so; but we should like to have these theorizers deal with the miscellaneous mass gathered in our schools from all classes and conditions of people. Some good people, say expel all obstinate cases: we have seen this proposed in an educational journal; but this seems to us merely shirking our duty, avoiding the hardness of our calling, finding enjoyment in its pleasures merely. Besides, the state demands of us not their ruin, but their salvation."