

small districts containing only 15 or 16 children, and very materially lessens the amount justly due the larger districts, while the stimulus afforded by apportionment on the basis of average attendance is unknown. A "census marshal" is annually appointed for each district, who must "take a census of all children in his district under seventeen years of age." This census is taken in June.

The law also provides for a Library Fund, which consists of ten per cent. of the annual State School Fund, unless that ten per cent. exceeds fifty dollars. In cities not divided into school districts the Library Fund consists of the munificent sum of fifty dollars for every 500 children between the ages of 5 and 15 years. This fund must be expended in the purchase of apparatus and books for the school library.

The following statistics will probably be interesting—they refer to the school year ending June 30th, 1878: Whole number of children in the State between five and seventeen years of age, was 205,475; of these 154,069 were enrolled in the public schools, while 15,310 attended private schools. The fact that many if not the majority of schools admit no scholar under six years of age, will account for part of the difference between the number of children in the State and the number attending some school. There were 1,920 school districts in the State, and 2,578 schools. The schools were kept open an average of 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ months of 20 days each. The number of teachers was 3,298; of these, 2,101 were females. The value of school property was \$6,343,369. The State school tax amounted to \$1,292,485.81; county school and poll taxes, \$728,360.05; while the total receipts from all sources were \$3,820,661.20—a sum of which even the "Golden State" may well be proud. Of the above amount, \$2,272,551.19 were paid for teachers' salaries. The total expenditure for each census child was \$15.86: for "average number belonging," \$30.63; while the average monthly salary paid to male teachers was \$83.95; to female teachers, \$68.25; and the average salary per annum, \$690. In addition to the above expenditures, the State paid the munificent sum of \$33,000 for the support of our Normal School, and for the University about \$100,000.

Though the above figures are probably as many as most readers will care to peruse, it may be well to give a few more, not taken from the official reports, but just as accurate. Rural schools are open usually about six or seven months, though not a few must be open even a shorter time. Teachers are only paid per month of 20 teaching days. No holidays are paid for in California. So, if a person is employed at \$70 per month, and teaches even eight months, his salary for the year is only \$560, not \$840. He is, however, paid at the end of each month. Occasionally a teacher closes school in one district, because the funds are exhausted, and immediately begins in another district. One, a shrewd Canadian, lately told me that last year he actually taught over 11 school months, and thus realized about \$1200. The opportunity of doing that is constantly lessening, in consequence of the alarming facility with which teachers are manufactured. In the northern part of the State I understand the salaries are much larger in the rural districts than here. In this county they range from \$50 to \$100 per month, and are perhaps rather lower than in any other county. The expenses of living are much higher than in Canada. I do not know what is paid for board in the rural districts. Many teachers ride on horseback several miles to their schools. Board in towns and cities will range from about \$36 to \$45 per month, including washing. Clothing is also dearer than in Canada.

There are far more teachers than are needed, and they are being turned out, full-fledged, by wholesale. The college graduate fares no better than the man who manages to cram enough to answer mere facts and to guess conundrums. The examinations,

regarded as tests either of scholarship or of teaching power, are little better than a farce. The absurdity of attempting to crowd into three days written examinations in 19 different subjects, is so apparent that the perpetuation of the attempt is remarkable. The examinations are hard, because they are not tests of scholarship; and in the attempt to hurriedly answer what only requires a good memory and ready wit, the man whose mind has been broadened and whose intellectual powers have been strengthened by a thorough high school and collegiate course, without special preparation, is more likely to fail than the raw youth just newly stuffed with facts and dates. It would, however, be very unfair to judge of our teachers as a body by these examinations. There are amongst them graduates of the best Eastern colleges, including Harvard and Yale, and many others who had in early life the advantages of the academic and high schools that abound in the New England States. These have been a leaven that has leavened the lump, and prevented the narrowness and shallowness that would have been the inevitable result of entrusting our schools to persons possessing simply the legal qualifications. I fully appreciate the necessity of professional training, and cheerfully acknowledge the advantages California has derived from the attention "methods" have received. I believe that no one should be allowed to engage in teaching until after some special training, and am not a little proud that Ontario has far outstripped all her neighbours in this respect. But knowledge must precede "methods." No amount of training or study of "methods" will enable any one to teach what he does not know—a fact which seems to be overlooked by some of those in "high places."

Many of our schools are excellent. This is particularly true of the lowest grades. I know several schools, one especially, in which the primary work surpasses any similar work Ontario could exhibit a few years ago. As we ascend to the grammar grades, less favorable results are obtained. The fault here is not so much in the teachers. They are just as faithful and as capable. Our great difficulty is the text books; and when teachers are compelled to use only a few prescribed text books, a poor one is an unmitigated evil. Ours are simply detestable—they have not a redeeming feature. Our readers are insipid and childish; our arithmetics filled with "lumber," though they are the best texts in the lot; our geographies are sure to kill all love a class may have for the study, if followed with any degree of closeness; our history (Swinton's) is probably the worst book ever put into a scholar's hands, being simply a mass of names and dates; as for the word analysis—it is scarcely on a par with the rest. The style of examination questions to which I have referred encourages "cramming" instead of teaching. In looking over published examination papers one is struck with the large proportion that simply tax the memory. All these influences necessarily affect the schools injuriously, but I apprehend the memorizing plan is less prevalent than formerly. This is particularly the case in cities, where salaries secure first-class teachers. Even in such cases, however, the results obtained might be secured in less time if the text-books were free of all useless matter. As compared with the corresponding classes of the Ontario schools of about ten years ago, our Public Schools in the higher grades are superior in efficiency. On the other hand, with a few exceptions, our High Schools are inferior to the Ontario High Schools of that period.

It is frequently claimed that our schools are the best on the continent; or, at least, that they equal the Boston schools. I occasionally meet teachers from Michigan, others from Wisconsin, and others from other States, who claim that the school system of their respective States is the best. Which is entitled to the palm I know not. California has just reason to be proud of the efficiency of her schools. A State 28 years old, that has established