

have compiled a table,* in which the fullest information on the subject is given. The result shows that the number not examined in the standards in which they have been studying during the year is as follows: Second presentation, 61; withheld by teachers, 54. From this, however, should be deducted 10 in Standard V., and 2 in Standard VI., whose retention is justified by a special resolution of the Board's; also the 13 examined again in Standard VI., there being no higher class into which they could be removed. This will leave a total of 90 children in the district considered by their teachers to be unfit for promotion, or unable to pass in their respective standards. In reference to this matter, it may be pointed out that there is a distinct verbal contradiction between the second clause of "The Standards" and the explanatory note attached. In the first it is ruled that "no scholar shall be examined in a standard he has already passed." In the second, after providing for the removal of certain children to a lower class under certain circumstances, we are told that "such child shall be examined with the lower class to which it has been found necessary to remove him." It appears to me, however, that the two should be read together, and that the contradiction is more apparent than real; the first merely prohibiting the examination in order to prevent the returns being unduly increased by the entering of the same children twice as passing the same standard.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR 1882.

				Average Age on 1st July, 1882.	Examined.	Passed.	Percentage.	Percentage in 1881.
				Yrs. mos.				
Standard I.	...	...	...	8 2	287	219	76	94
Standard II.	...	...	...	9 5	284	185	65	94
Standard III.	...	...	...	10 1	349	210	60	74
Standard IV.	...	...	...	11 11	265	184	69	66
Standard V.	...	...	...	12 10	143	109	76	54
Standard VI.	...	...	...	13 9	42	39	93	83
				...	1,370	946	69	83

The note alluded to states that "as soon as it becomes apparent" that a child is for any reason unable to keep pace with his class he should be removed, &c., and I am of opinion that this is a valuable privilege to which the teacher is certainly entitled; but the late examination has convinced me that it is a privilege that should be carefully restricted within well-defined limits. It is not unreasonable to expect that a teacher should discover the weakness of any scholars within two months from the commencement of the year's work, and I therefore propose that any re-classification thought necessary shall be effected before the end of March, and that the examination schedules shall contain the names of all children who are classified under the several standards in that quarterly return. This would not prevent the promotion of any unusually clever child from the primer or any other class to a higher one, and the names of any who might leave the school in the interval could be indicated in the schedule. Special cases, such as serious illness, absence from home, &c., would probably be met by the minimum limit of attendance, but, if not, could be considered on their merits. But the standing rule should be that every child must be presented for examination in the standard in which he is enrolled in the March quarterly return.

Another feature in Table A deserving of attention is the number of absentees. This number (66), though not excessive in the aggregate, is not very evenly distributed, and the absence of scholars on examination day, if passed over without notice, might open the door to a serious abuse. It will be seen that there were more absentees at Kanieri than at either of the two large schools, whilst Stafford, Ross, and Woodstock contributed more than their fair quota. The percentages of scholars on schedule who were absent at the principal schools are—Greymouth, 3 per cent.; Hokitika, 3·7 per cent.; Kumara, 0·6 per cent.; Ross, 4·5 per cent.; Stafford, 7·7 per cent.; Goldsborough, 4·5 per cent.; Kanieri, 13 per cent.; Brunnerton, 3·6 per cent.; Cobden, 2 per cent.; Paroa, 0 per cent.; Woodstock, 17 per cent. Some endeavour should be made to arrest the progress of this evil, and one method of doing so would be to consider all absentees as having failed, unless good and sufficient reason could be given for such absence. In connection with this I may remark that when the teacher's own children are kept away from the examination he can hardly expect other parents to be scrupulous on the subject. Yet this has been done to my knowledge in several instances.

In comparing some of our figures with those of the neighbouring district, I find there is, on the whole, very little difference in the apparent results; but of course such a comparison is of very questionable value, and proves nothing either one way or the other, inasmuch as the schools in the two districts may be, and probably are, working under widely differing conditions. The figures are inserted merely because the public attention has been specially directed to the comparison during the past few days by writers in the local papers:—

Districts.	Number on the Roll.	Examined in Standards.	Percentage of Roll Number examined.	Percentage of Scholars examined who passed.	Percentage of Roll Number passed.
Nelson ...	4,102 ‡	1,962	48	74	†35
Westland ...	2,933	1,370	47	69	32

* Not reprinted.

† This is 31 in the printed report, but it is evidently a mistake.