

Those presented in Standards I—III. were 342,642 under 10 years of age, and 102,398 over that age.

In Standards IV—VI. there were 21,881 under and 125,084 over 10 years of age.

The number of complete passes was 234,995 under and 70,618 over 10 years of age, in Standards I—III.; while in Standards IV—VI. the numbers were 11,776 under and 71,386 over 10 years.

The total amount of those who passed without any failure was 42.6 per cent. Irregularity of attendance appears to be the great cause of these figures not being more satisfactory. This again partly arises from the migratory habits and capricious preferences of the poor, by which it happens that the same child attends many schools in the course of its school life, or even in the same year.

In reading, the average of passes was 90.71; in writing 87.59; in arithmetic 76.28. The Inspectors express themselves best satisfied with the writing, least so with the arithmetic, and doubtful what value to put on the reading. Poetry is generally read badly. Some inspectors would omit it; but in this opinion my Lords do not agree. Mr. M. Arnold thinks that the selection is bad.

My Lords record their precautions against the dangers of merely mechanical instruction arising from individual examination, and quote from the Report of the Royal Commission the reasons for such examination, and refer to the favourable opinion of its results expressed in some of the Inspectors' reports.

The Inspector's duty of seeing that the schools are satisfying all the requirements of the Revised Code, and not merely producing good mechanical results, is strongly insisted upon.

In the case of religious knowledge the complaint of there being more information than intelligence is still made.

My Lords next notice the unnecessary multiplication of schools, which produces no result of efficient education at all commensurate with the expense incurred. They then express their regret at the unwillingness of some school managers to place their schools under Government.

The Inspectors generally advocate the extension of the Half Time Act to all employments. Some also advise compulsory attendance as a last resort.

The general neglect of Mr. Denison's Act, as reported by Mr. Blakiston, is noticed, and the Report concludes with the statement of the maintenance of the provisional arrangement under which the grant is administered in Scotland.—*Papers for the Schoolmaster.*

### 3. OPINIONS OF ENGLISH SCHOOL INSPECTORS ON COMPULSORY EDUCATION. (REPORT, 1867.)

Mr. Arlington thinks that Compulsory Education would effectually cut the knot of the difficulty of keeping children at school, but does not seem to advocate it.

Mr. W. Arnold writes:—

"Throughout my district I find the idea of Compulsory Education becoming a familiar idea with those who are interested in schools. I imagine that the newly-awakened sense of our shortcomings in popular education—a sense which is just, the statistics brought forward to dispel it being, as everyone acquainted with the subject knows, entirely fallacious—the difficult thing would not be to pass a law making Education compulsory; the difficult thing would be to work such a law after we had got it. In Prussia, which is so often quoted, Education is not flourishing because it is compulsory; it is compulsory because it is flourishing. Because people there really prize instruction and culture, and prefer them to other things, therefore they have no difficulty in imposing on themselves the rule to get instruction and culture. In this country people prefer to them politics, station, business, money-making, pleasure and many other things; and till we cease to prefer these things, a law which gives instruction the power to interfere with them, though a sudden impulse may make us establish it, cannot be relied on to hold its ground and to work effectively. When instruction is valued in this country as it is in Germany, it may be made obligatory here; meanwhile the best thing the friends of instruction can do is to foment as much as they can the national sense of its value. The persevering extension of provisions for the schooling of all children employed in any kind of labour, is probably the best and most practical way of making Education obligatory that we can at present take. But the task of seeing these provisions carried into effect should not be committed to the municipal authorities, less trustworthy with us than in France, Germany, or Switzerland, because worse chosen and constituted."

Mr. Bonner, after speaking favourably of compulsory rating proceeds:

"Forty-five per cent. of the accommodation provided in my district (Salop and Stafford) is still unoccupied; and I feel sure that if managers generally were sure of due attendance, which implies a large amount of income both in school pence and grant, complaints

of inability to provide requisite funds for a certificated teacher would cease at once; in other words, I believe that compulsory attendance would render compulsory rating needless: It is irregularity of attendance which is the sore point in our schools; which frustrates the efforts of the most energetic teachers, and deters managers from engaging in what may turn out to be useless expenditure. It is confessedly difficult to apply the principle of the Factory Acts to agricultural labour. A simple half time system is impracticable; but it might be provided that all children employed between the ages of 8 and 12, or 10 and 13, should be compelled to produce at the beginning of each year a certificate of attendance at school for 75 or 100 days in the course of the year preceding. If this rule were made applicable only to children living within a mile and a half of a school with unoccupied room, all ground of complaint would be taken away. I cannot see any abridgment of liberty in compelling parents to provide for the education of their children. A father who leaves his child to starve is liable to be criminally punished; and it is no less injury to the person whose rights are first to be considered, i.e., the child's, to keep him in ignorance, and thus to condemn him to a permanently lower station in life, and to deprive him of those higher pleasures which chiefly make life worth having."

Mr. Moncrieff:—

"I have reserved for the close the expression of an earnest hope that the time is at hand when something effectual will be done to secure a fair chance for our schools, and brighter prospects for our poorer children. Confining myself strictly to what is within my official knowledge, the state of those children who do, more or less, attend inspected schools, I have for years held the same language—that all our teaching was powerless for effective good so long as nothing was done to compel the attendance of children up to a reasonable age. It is with no small pleasure that I have seen that this ugly word "compulsion" has lost some of its terrors for the public mind. I do not, indeed, see my way quite clear to the advocacy of compulsion in its full and proper sense—the direct forcing of the parent to do his duty to the child. Nevertheless, if the choice were to be made between compulsion in its broadest form and the indefinite postponement of the attempt to secure the real education of the people, I cannot see how any educationalist could hesitate between the two. For our national school children it is a narrower question. Our main hinderance here is not absolute neglect but the encroachments of juvenile employment. I trust it may not be long before a measure is passed to regulate such work as brick-making, and to place some restrictions on the less tangible occupations of fruit picking, hop-picking, and other miscellaneous harvests, as well as the desultory employments of watering places. To most of these, I fear, the half-day principle would prove inapplicable, on the ground that every child capable of the work is wanted at the same time. Yet I should be glad to see the question fully considered, having from my old Yorkshire experience more faith in half time than in any other expedient. If this may not be, it would not be difficult to devise a scheme for rendering steady attendance at school during winter, the condition of employment in summer. The very abundance of work in summer might thus be made to secure a minimum of regular schooling. The minimum should be set high, not less than 200 half days in the year, so as to restrict the time of work to the months when it is really necessary. There should also be a minimum age, below which a child should not be employed at all. One, at least, of the above named modes of employment—brickmaking—would require separate considerations and possibly restrictions."

Mr. Oakeley:—

"In alluding slightly to Compulsory Education, it is, of course, beyond the scope of my report to consider it in any sense as a political question; but I cannot omit to refer to the most important point which vitally affects Education in my district generally, particularly the evil of the extreme irregularity of attendance amongst the children actually at school. Without compulsion in some form or other, whether direct or indirect, a number of children will never be educated at all, and those actually at school a considerable proportion (those who leave for permanent work before they have come up to the exceedingly moderate degree implied by the second standard) will continue to forget everything they have learnt by the time they are twenty years old. That an inconvenience would at first be felt on the introduction of any compulsory system may be conceded. Most great beneficial changes (to wit, the introduction of machinery) have caused dislocation, greater or less, in society, but I venture to predict that twenty years afterwards the compelling every parent to take care that his child shall learn to read and write will be considered (as it is now in Germany) of the same order of importance and necessity as that parents shall clothe and feed their children."

Mr. Renouf:—

"It is by no means surprising that a large number of managers, finding it hopeless to overcome such difficulties as the irregularity