two raw students will have to be appointed. It will be two or three years before they will be equal to criticizing students' work, and in the meantime their experience will be gained at the expense of the students, to say nothing of the children.

Perhaps the least satisfactory work in connection with the College is the practical teaching of the students. The problem is to give sufficient opportunity for practice without interfering with the students' own studies unduly. I can see no possibility of ever doing the practical training in a thoroughly satisfactory manner until the students enter the College already equipped with the necessary knowledge for teaching purposes. Then the whole time can be devoted to methods of training in how best to present that knowledge to children. This is the plan followed in the best American and Canadian normal schools, and is, in my opinion, the only satisfactory one. An attempt is made in England to get over the difficulty by requiring the students to follow their own studies during term-time, and postpone all their practical teaching to their vacations. This is not satisfactory, for many reasons. In the first place, the students who have worked hard want their vacations for recreation purposes, just as other students do, and feel a distinct grievance at the deprivation. What is more important, there are so many students requiring practice at the same time that several schools have to be used for the purpose—schools differing widely in character, with methods in use that no young teacher should see. There are obvious advantages in having all practice in the Normal School, with methods in use that have official sanction, so that theory is not divorced from practice. Further, teaching by young students that is not criticized by competent authorities is largely useless. It is the criticism that is so valuable to beginners: they learn from it what should be done and what should be avoided. It is obvious that the Principal of a college cannot supervise personally the work of a hundred students, scattered amongst a dozen schools, all in session at the same time. Hence the work of the students is very inadequately criticized, and faults become firmly rooted.

I have been much struck with the work of Division B students during the last three years. I have noted many instances of students who, with some aptitude for the work, have after two years' work under sympathetical critical guidance, taken higher places in our final classification than students who have had the same training and an additional four years' pupil-teachership. Faults have crept in during these four years that have not been eradicated in the course of training—faults due to lack of criticism of an intelligent kind in the first instance.

After very careful consideration, I think the plan adopted by us for giving practical work is he best that can be devised under the circumstances—much better than the English one. Every student gives the whole of two weeks to his school-work during each of three terms. His own studies are done at night-time, the whole of the day being occupied with class-work. As the University lectures are all given at night-time, this does not seriously interfere with the continuity of work, certain Training College lectures and time for private study being missed. A fortnight spent with a class gives opportunity for good insight into the work required from that class. The lessons after the first two days (during which the class-teacher is observed) are all given by the student. They are planned out beforehand, and written out in a special notebook, and criticized both before and after delivery. The class-teacher, who is always present, criticizes the lesson as it proceeds, writing the criticisms down in the notebook, and talking them over with the student afterwards. The headmaster of the Normal School and Principal of the College also move round the school, from class to class, criticizing as occasion demands. From time to time during the fortnight the students are called together, and common faults are pointed out, and steps taken to eradicate them.

Following this plan for two years allows every student to visit each of the standard classes in turn for two weeks, so that a general bird's-eye view of the school-work is taken. Character-sketches are written out at length, one for each school section, so that some definite work in child-study is attempted. It is urged that, as the class-teacher is always present, the student never has the opportunity to keep order himself—that his disciplinary powers are never tested. This is quite true, but it must be remembered that the power to keep order depends entirely on strength of character and innate power. No training can ever give this. A student who has not the power can be bolstered up in some measure by good training, but if he has not the power in some degree then he should not be a teacher. The rule-of-thumb teachers, who are opposed to training on the ground that the only way to learn how to keep order is to practise with large classes, would probably cease their opposition if they reflected that a student leaving the College at, say, twenty years of age has forty-five years before him in which he can get the very practice they advocate, and, moreover, can start that practice on right lines as a result of his training.

To see that ex-students are carrying on their work in the spirit taught in the College, the Board of Education have directed their Inspectors to send in a special report on the work of the year. The first set of reports to hand, and are very gratifying. The men received an average mark of 80 per cent., and the women one of 66 per cent., which, though much lower, is easily explained by the fact that, as sole assistant, in many cases they were face to face with large classes and harder conditions, which, at any rate for the first year out of college, are very trying.

The old students held their first reunion on the 23rd April, when all but four attended. Great enthusiasm prevailed; and if the same spirit pervades each succeeding year, the Principal will be well content to let the College be judged by its representatives.

In conclusion, the Principal would like to thank the Board for the sympathetic consideration always given to his suggestions. It is living in a new world indeed to be free from the cast-iron rules and regulations that are so harassing in England, and the Board can rest assured that all that can possibly be done by the Principal to make the institution a pronounced success will be attended to *totis viribus*.

H. A. E. Milnes, B.Sc. (Lond.).

The Chairman, Education Board, Auckland.