

the fitness to teach Euclid of a teacher whose course of study covers twenty-six propositions of the First Book of Euclid and who then passes on a $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent basis! But this is not the worst. A candidate who has absolutely failed in these important subjects may go in for a Junior Leaving, provided he is not more than 100 marks short of the total. Then, all through his future course, his weakness on these lines is no disadvantage to him, as far as securing authority to teach is concerned.

Let us notice now a few peculiarities in the construction of some of the Examination Papers, and the curious results that may follow. Grammar and Rhetoric constitute one paper, and, under the Regulations, the values are to be as two to one; that is the value of the Grammar part is to be 133 marks, and the Rhetoric 66. At the last Primary Examination there were four questions on the Grammar part of the paper, and three on the Rhetoric, but only two of the latter were to be attempted. The candidate had to secure sixty-six marks for pass, and this he could do by answering the two questions in Rhetoric, and not touching the Grammar at all, or he could answer two questions in Grammar and omit the Rhetoric. The paper on Algebra and Euclid was similarly constructed. The Algebra part contained six questions valued at 133, and the Euclid part three questions valued at sixty-six. The candidate could make his pass by fully answering three questions on the Algebra part and "jumping" the Euclid, or by fully answering the Euclid part and "jumping" the Algebra. This may be denominated, "Passing made easy," since he must be a poor candidate indeed who could not pick out "here a little and there a little," in such papers, and make a pass. This furnishes a significant comment on the plea of "wider culture" for teachers.

To sum up. Under fair conditions, teachers may justly be held accountable for the deficiencies of their pupils. The results of Entrance Examinations show that pupils are deficient in Arithmetic and Grammar, particularly the latter. Therefore the teaching of those subjects must have been poor. The statistics of Primary and Junior Leaving Examinations, and the observations of Examiners and Inspectors lead to the same conclusion. Such a result is what might reasonably be expected from the nature of the examination papers, and the low grade of passing accepted.

What is the remedy? In the first place raise the standard for Entrance—really raise it—not by additional subjects, but by requiring a thorough knowledge of English and Arithmetic within the limits already laid down, so that before entering the High School pupils must be thoroughly grounded in the elementary work, and thus the High Schools relieved from the necessity for doing Public School work. These pupils will then make strong candidates at subsequent examinations.

In the next place, divorce examinations that, by reason of their incompatibility, ought never to have been joined. Make teachers' initial qualifying examination a separate one, and the only gateway to the teacher's calling. Exact from the candidates a thorough acquaintance with the subjects they are required to teach, especially English and Arithmetic. Then if wider attainments be practicable, secure such, but not by lowering the standard on essential subjects. Thus will they have such knowledge as will enable them to profit more fully by their Model School training, and to do better and more efficient work in their own teaching afterwards.

Virtue and a trade are the best portions for children.—*George Herbert.*