stands, the practice will only work much harm in course of time.

The framers of the New Zealand syllabus say that "the work appointed to be done in drawing has a direct bearing on the industrial and decorative arts." The drawing syllabus displays a complete ignorance of the latest methods based upon the experience of skilled continental educationalists. In the lower standards antiquated drawing books on the square system, and the deadening method of copying from the flat, are in vogue. The pupils are first to draw rectilineal figures with ruler, then without ruler, and simple rectilineal figures are to be drawn as dictation exercises. In Leipsic, from the earliest stages, the drawing is done in blank books, or on slates, and, what is most important, *from models*. No instruments are allowed till the later stages; all measurements are to be made by the eye; the Germans aim at developing the intellectual eye, at strengthening the judgment and the sense of proportion of the pupil. Their's, too, is a reproductive method, one form suggesting others; thus it develops the pupil's originality, and provides him with a wealth of forms for practical application in the arts of life. The freehand drawing of the boys is from solids, the girls draw leaves fixed on paste-board, flowers, plants, etc.; they too, never copy from the flat; their drawings are from nature and provide them with patterns for their subsequent exercises in needle-work and embroidery. In the New Zealand system drawing from models is not allowed till the pupil reaches the sixth standard; in Germany it is adopted from the very start. The trail of the cram system is over the whole syllabus, not even the drawing escapes; little children of seven or eight years in the first standard have to draw to dictation vertical, horizontal and oblique lines; they must burden their minds with the meanings of such words as "isosceles," "altitude," "apex." It doesn't matter whether their powers of observation are developed, whether their judgment is strengthened, if only they can, when the inspector comes round, define these geometrical terms, a knowledge of which is not required till they reach the higher stages of geometrical study. In the second standard the same pernicious method is followed. A further set of geometrical definitions is stuffed into the children's heads—chord, segment, rhomboid, rhombus, scalene. In the third standard the new figures are trapezium, polygon, hexagon, octagon. The pupils have to draw these figures to dictation, and recognise them when drawn on the board or when a model is produced. The syllabus does not require strict geometrical definitions of these figures, but I have known teachers to write the definitions on the board, directly from Todhunter's Euclid, and make the weaklings under their charge commit them to memory.

The first three years of the children's school life (seven to ten) are spent in the dull uninteresting work of recognising exact geometrical forms, and of writing them to dictation. The framers of our syllabus may have been teachers; but they seem to have been ignorant of the primary principle of teaching, that we should proceed from the *indefinite* to the *definite*.

In Standards IV., V. and VI., the work is of a more practical nature; plane geometry, scale drawing and solid geometry are taught with fair results.

The drawing syllabus calls for considerable revision, especially in the lower standards; freehand drawing from simple models should be introduced at a much earlier stage, and should take the place of the geometrical definitions which involve such a cruel cram.

In my next article I propose to continue this subject of the syllabus, dealing especially with the teaching of grammar, composition, history, object lessons and science, geography and singing.

[ED. NOTE.—This article was in the press before the recent Educational Conference met at Wellington. Our contributor has, perforce, therefore to reserve any reference to it's deliberation for his succeeding articles.]