

frequently omitted. In the upper standards there was a great deal of inaccurate working, especially in multiplication of money and in practice. Fractions also were poorly known in Standard V. and Standard VI., and in interest the slightest variation from the ordinary stock text of an interest sum was sufficient to puzzle many. The almost universal habit of multiplying money by large numbers in one line is, I think, conducive to inaccuracy. If, instead of multiplying by, say, 165 in one line, the numbers $10 \times 10 + 10 \times 6 + 5$ were used, pupils would not only have more practice in tables, but also they would, when the sum was completed, more readily detect any chance inaccuracy. At some schools, where the former method was employed, it was nothing unusual to find the product in the pounds column made less than the multiplier. I have in former reports frequently mentioned the importance of arguing out problems from data first correctly written down; but still at few schools is this practice properly carried out, while at some schools pupils absurdly enough write the data after the working of the sum. Tables of weights and measures were frequently not known in the upper standards. Lineal measure and square measure were often confounded. In Standards I. and II. arithmetic has continued to improve, but the manner in which the work was put down varied very much—from disgraceful at a few schools to excellent at several. At many schools the figuring in the upper classes was far from what it ought to have been. Mental arithmetic does not receive the attention which it deserves. In Standard III. and Standard IV. I seldom found children able to divide pounds correctly when any reduction was needed. Thus, to the question, "Divide a pound amongst three people," the answer "6s. 2d." would be given. In mental subtraction also pupils were very weak. There was great reluctance shown above Standard II. to make any effort to find an answer, the majority of children in a class preferring to leave the work to a few bright and industrious ones. Counting on fingers, I noticed, was very prevalent in many schools, not only in Standard I. and Standard II., but also in Standard III., and occasionally even in Standard IV. Such a practice should not be allowed above the preparatory classes.

Grammar.—Grammar, with composition, shows a lower percentage of passes than any other subject, though there is an improvement of nearly 7 per cent. on the numbers for the previous year. The results are lowest in Standard VI. and highest in Standard V. In grammar, inflexions often were not well known; and parts of speech were judged from the appearance and sound, rather than from the functions of the words. In Standard III. pupils seldom picked out nearly all the parts of speech asked for, and the requirements of the syllabus with regard to pronouns had apparently not been taught at many schools. In the upper classes analysis had improved. If analysis were begun earlier than at present, I think grammar would be much benefited. I consider that a pupil in Standard IV. cannot have an intelligent idea of case unless he understands something of analysis and of government by a preposition. Composition improves slowly, but there is still much to be desired. I am afraid several pupils wrote composition from memory. The frequent use of pronouns and of the conjunction "and" to begin sentences should be avoided. In letter-writing pupils still continue to be very careless with regard to endings and addresses.

Geography.—In Standard III., Standard V., and Standard VI., where geography is a pass subject, the percentage of passes has improved; but there is a great deal to be desired yet, especially in Standard V. and Standard VI. When examining papers I have often wondered whether it was laziness on the part of pupils, or their inability to mentally picture a map, that led to some questions being either disregarded or very poorly answered. Thus, I generally found that if the question were, "State the exact position of each of the following mountains:" it would be fairly well answered; but if it were, "Name the mountains of Asia running from west to east," it either would be passed over or but a poor attempt would be made to answer it. One reason for this was, I am afraid, that the latter question required a little more thought and trouble to answer it than the former. In Standard V. commercial maritime towns seldom were well known. Intelligent teaching should lead even Standard II. pupils to observe the fact that at the mouths of rivers towns are generally to be found, and the reason for this should be adduced: later on the names of towns not already picked up incidentally would be learned. Another matter I would lay before teachers is, that sufficient attention is not paid to the relative importance of geographical features. To give an example, I noticed that pupils throughout the district had a strange weakness for the Guadiana and Guadalquivir rivers, and for the Eastern and Western Ghauts ranges; but they omitted, as beneath their notice, the Volga and Danube rivers, and the Hindoo Koosh and Altai ranges. It would be better to omit altogether the less important features than to have them remembered at the expense of the more important. Indeed, I am of opinion that children's brains are burdened with far too many names in geography. In the use of the terms "continent," "country," and "colony" more care should be shown. North America was almost invariably spoken of as one country, and it was not unusual to find pupils looking upon the United States as part of the British Empire. In physical geography at only a very few schools were questions at all fairly answered. From the work in this subject in Standard V. I am certain that the requirements—river-systems, mountain-systems, and distribution of land and water—were not taught at many schools. Mapping, more especially mapping of the district, was generally poor; but at Hawera and Wanganui Boys' excellent maps were shown. Lines of latitude and longitude should be drawn before the outline, and names should not be printed in capital letters. Marking in the lines after a map is drawn is of like absurdity with writing down the data after the working of a problem in arithmetic. New Zealand geography was seldom well known. It will hardly be credited that to mark in the chief rivers, towns, and mountains on this coast in anything like proper order was beyond the power of very many pupils in Standard V. and Standard VI. Geography is a class subject in Standard II. and Standard IV. In Standard II. the mechanical work was exceedingly well known. I would recommend teachers to interest their pupils in this class with a little very general information regarding the peoples of the various continents, and the climate and productions of the zones. In Standard IV. the mapping was very poor, and the rest of the work moderate.

History.—History is a class subject in all standards in which it is taught—namely, Standards