

is based must for this year be ascertained by adding the number re-presented to the total failures before subtracting the exceptions proposed. Schoolmasters will, no doubt, appreciate the principle of exclusion, by which it is sought to remove from their shoulders the burden of responsibility for the failures of bad attendants; but I think most of them will agree with me that the rule applied is scarcely comprehensive enough to afford adequate relief. Any effort that may be made to induce the authorities to adopt a more generous definition of the term "exceptions" will have my fullest sympathy.

The following table (Table A) shows the general result of the examination in each standard. More detailed information in regard to the separate schools is contained in the Appendices I. and II., added to this report. [Appendices not reprinted].

TABLE A.—General Result.

[N.B.—In this table no account is taken of fourteen pupils who had already passed Standard VI., and of whom thirteen were present at examination.]

—	Enrolled—i.e., pre- sented in Standard Classes.	Absent.	Average Age in Years and Months on the 1st July.	Examined.	Passed.	Failed.	Re-examined in Stan- dard already passed.	Proposed Exceptions.	Percentage of Passes on Number en- rolled—i.e., pre- sented.	Percentage of Passes on Number ex- amined.	Percentage of Failures (net).	Number of Schools presenting.
(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.) Yrs. mos.	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)
Standard VI. ...	43	1	14 0	42	26	16	...	1	60.5	61.9	36.6	8
Standard V. ...	97	4	13 3	93	52	39	2	2	53.6	55.9	42.8	15
Standard IV. ...	143	6	12 3	137	71	63	3	3	49.6	51.8	47	15
Standard III. ...	210	12	11 1	198	124	49	25	2	59.05	62.6	36.8	16
Standard II. ...	195	13	9 10	182	145	22	15	6	74.4	79.7	17.6	14
Standard I. ...	184	8	8 5	176	161	7	8	2	87.5	91.5	7.5	17
Totals ...	872	44	11 5½	828	579	196	53	16	66.4	69.93	28.7	17

By Tables B and C I have endeavoured to convey some idea of the comparative strength and weakness of classes and subjects, by showing, first, the number of classes in which the answering was highly creditable, and, secondly, the number of those in which it fell more or less below a satisfactory limit.

TABLE B.—Number of Classes in which the Answering rose considerably above the Ordinary Standards, being reported as good, very good, or excellent.

—	Reading.	Spelling.	Writing.	Arithmetic.	Geography	Grammar.	History.	Total.	Possible Total.
Standard VI. ...	1	5	2	3	1	2	2	16	56
Standard V. ...	3	3	3	1	3	3	4	20	105
Standard IV. ...	4	2	3	4	5	5	2	25	105
Standard III. ...	5	5	5	8	5	10	1	39	112
Standard II. ...	6	12	7	6	11	42	70
Standard I. ...	10	16	14	11	51	68
Total ...	29	43	34	33	25	20	9	193	516
Possible total ...	85	85	85	85	68	54	54	516	...

TABLE C.—Number of Classes in which the Answering fell more or less below a Satisfactory Limit, being reported as defective, weak, poor, or very weak, and including Cases in which no Papers were presented in History.

—	Reading.	Spelling.	Writing.	Arithmetic.	Geography	Grammar.	History.	Total.	Possible Total.
Standard VI. ...	0	0	0	2	5	2	2	11	56
Standard V. ...	0	6	1	8	9	9	6	39	105
Standard IV. ...	2	4	4	2	4	3	10	29	105
Standard III. ...	1	3	3	4	7	1	10	29	112
Standard II. ...	0	0	3	3	1	7	70
Standard I. ...	0	0	0	0	0	68
Total ...	3	13	11	19	26	15	28	115	516
Possible total ...	85	85	85	85	68	54	54	516	...

Table B gives a general result of 193, and Table C of 115 classes, out of a possible 516, or percentages 37.4 and 22.3 of conspicuous merit and defect respectively.

As the estimates are formed, not on the labour and skill expended, but on the proficiency of the children in the course laid down, it is not surprising that Standards I. and II., with their comparatively narrow requirements, should, in these tables, occupy the most favourable position; but,