

teachers fresh from college are called upon to undertake the teaching of them. But I have no fear for the ultimate success of our students. They will soon adjust themselves.

Again, it is said that the training-college course does not do justice to the rural-school problem; that the training, such as it is, is chiefly for the city school, and that the needs of the country school are receiving but scant justice. Mr. P. B. Fraser, in a recently published pamphlet, makes a great deal of this point, and it is just as well that the college point of view should be given. What does the college do for the rural school? (1.) It gives instruction in those subjects that are likely to furnish material for the teacher's work—biology, botany, zoology, literature, and agriculture. It prepares him in a more special way than he has ever been prepared before. (2.) It gives him a course of lectures dealing with the rural-school problem in a practical manner—i.e., it gives him a time-table, a plan of work, &c. (3.) It gives him at least two weeks in the rural school—most of the men of last year had four weeks. During this period he is in contact with this important department of work, and, under the guidance of an expert, he is attempting to solve it. In these three ways the college is doing much, perhaps not all it might, to prepare the teacher for his work in the country. The real seat of the problem raised by Mr. P. B. Fraser lies much deeper than the course of training. It has its roots in the fact that at present the supply of teachers is inadequate to the demand, and consequently the "small school," which outnumbers all others, suffers. It is quite possible, too, that our present scheme of training will never adequately meet this need. The small school—below, say, fifteen scholars—may after all be an insoluble problem so far as the fully trained teacher is concerned. I shall return to this question, if possible, at a future time.

The colleges are too ideal—not sufficiently practical. More practice is needed; less theory. Unless I am greatly mistaken, what is wanted always, and what is wanted especially at the present time among all classes of teachers, both secondary and primary, is just ideal and outlook—begotten of reading and thinking. Let me quote here a sentence or two written some years ago by Dr. F. H. Hayward, one of the foremost of English educators (p. 11, Preface to "Secret of Herbart"): "British education, above everything else, needs views of some sort; at present there are practically none, as is shown by the fact that no teacher dreams of calling himself a Herbartian or a Pestalozzian. . . . All talk about educational progress, whether at political caucuses or at teachers' conferences, is unmitigated nonsense until some definite views, theories, or ideals are possessed by the teachers of this country. Once these exist there is a basis for criticism and progress; a basis, too, for the establishment of professional dignity on firm foundations. But without views, teachers will ever be the catspaws of managers and officials no wiser than themselves, and such a thing as a unified and manageable curriculum will not exist." A college discusses theories and presents ideals; it presents also, as far as it can, the best of educational practice; it shows how these are related, and seeks to form in the mind of the student teacher a proper attitude of earnestness, enthusiasm, and intelligent outlook, joined to confidence in personal fitness and personal worthiness. In one sense, a college cannot be too ideal; in another sense, it cannot be too practical. Its outstanding value to the community is that it is both. If it cannot be, let it go. Mere apprenticeship will give better practice than it can give if that only is needed; the university will give the theory if that only is needed. The supreme reason for a training college—a professional school for teachers—is that it gives both, or supplements both, showing how they are related.

I have said these things not so much by way of defence of our present system, but in order, if possible, to stimulate thought and inquiry about subjects we are so apt in the course of time to take for granted.

My best thanks are due to those who have helped towards the work of the year in one way or another—to the staff, for willing and ready co-operation; to Mr. and Mrs. Lee, for continued hospitality; to those who contributed towards the College funds—Messrs. J. G. W. Aitken, J. Kebbel, H. R. Elder, W. H. Field, W. Allan, G. Wilson, S. Mackay, G. Wilton, R. Parker, Smith and Smith, Whitcombe and Tombs.

I have, &c.,

The Chairman, Education Board, Wellington.

WM. GRAY.

*Roll of Students, arranged according to Districts.**

Wellington, 33; Wanganui, 34; Hawke's Bay, 14; Nelson, 5; Marlborough, 3; Westland, 4; Grey, 2; Otago, 3; Taranaki, 2: total, 100.

* The number of students only is reprinted.

CANTERBURY.

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL FOR THE YEAR 1910.

SIR,—

Training College, 21st February, 1911.

I have the honour to present my annual report on the Christchurch Training College for the year 1910.

At the beginning of the College year we had 49 students remaining for a second year of training, and we admitted 50 new ones, giving a total of 99. Of the 50 new ones 47 came in under Division A, and 3 under Division B; and of these 50, 40 were female and 10 male. Of the whole total of 99 we had 84 under Division A and 15 under Division B; and of this whole total, 78 were female and 21 male. Of the second-year students, 1 was absent on leave through illness for the whole year. One student of the first year was permitted to attend without allowances. Ten were permitted to withdraw before completing the year for one reason or another; of these, 6 were allowed to withdraw shortly after the beginning of the year in order to devote all their time to university study; 3 were allowed late