

and learned, he must not hope to be considered a specialist, and all because he did not take a certain standing in honours at the university.

It is true that provision was afterwards made by which such teachers can obtain the desired certificate on passing certain examinations. But what shall be said or thought of the consideration that would send a graduate back, it may be twenty years afterwards, to pass a certain examination over again; or of the judgment which professes to regard success in obtaining honours at such an examination as a better proof of a man's fitness to rank as a specialist than ten or fifteen years of successful experience as a teacher?

Besides, look at the nature and restrictions of the examination:

1. The applicant must undergo examination in work which he will never be called on or even allowed to teach in his school.

2. He must take the examination in the month of May, about the very worst time for him in the year to leave his classes, or to make any special preparation for it.

3. He must be absent from his school for ten days or a fortnight, at a time when he can ill afford to spend a day from his classes.

4. If a natural science man he must make up his mind to be absent from his school for at least a college term, in order to do the practical work required for the examination.

5. He must submit to the indignity (in common with the university examiners, to be sure) of having the H. S. Inspectors sit in judgment on the examination papers and marks, and then, if successful, be left in doubt whether he has won his standing on his merits or received it as a favour.

It is not to be wondered at then, when all these considerations are taken into account, that strong protests have been made from time to

time against these arbitrary and unjust resolutions, and that pressure has been brought to bear on the Department to modify them so far as to provide for special cases. I believe I am not violating any confidence in stating that at the close of their work as examiners in August a deputation of masters injuriously affected by the regulation waited on the Minister, and laid their grievances before him; and that after hearing their statement and noting the grounds on which their claims were based, he virtually admitted the injustice done them, and gave them reason to hope that a clause would be framed sufficiently liberal and flexible to include not only them but other deserving applicants. For myself I believe that if left to himself the Minister would have framed such a regulation, but unfortunately some sinister influence overruled his liberal intentions, and the result is the insertion of a proviso (see Regulation 60) which seems to have been carefully framed to allow a favoured few to pass, and to exclude others equally deserving—a proviso which is at once unfair, illiberal and absurd. If any one thinks these epithets unwarranted let him briefly consider the restrictions.

In the first place, why are undergraduates excluded from benefiting by the proviso? If none but graduates were ranked as specialists there would at least be consistency though not justice in the ruling, but when undergraduates are allowed to qualify under the General Regulation, why are they excluded from this? Can it be that the restriction had a special object in view?

Again, look at the unfairness of the senior matriculation test. A master may have been prevented by the circumstances of his school from undertaking to prepare candidates for senior matriculation with honours. In how many "two or three master schools" are teachers in a position to undertake