

candidates taking only four subjects to attain the possible maximum. He might say shortly that the object of this motion was to lessen the overpressure which he thought existed on boys and girls who were competing for Junior University Scholarships. A resolution to that effect was passed at the last Secondary Schools Conference.

Miss MARCHANT said this was a matter she had always had very much at heart, and she had great pleasure therefore in seconding the resolution.

Mr. STRACHAN was afraid that if four subjects only were accepted it would mean that Latin would be chosen practically in every case, and that science would be altogether neglected. In preference to that he would rather see a lower grade of examination all round, and retain the wider programme.

Professor GILRAY said the B.A. Examination in English was much stiffer than the Scholarship Examination.

Professor THOMAS hoped the Conference would not pass the motion. It appeared to him that it would be altogether a retrograde step. He feared that the object of the motion was that science should be left out. A wish had been expressed that special assistance should be given to those who were strong in languages. But where was the assistance or encouragement given to those who were specially strong in science? There was no assistance. It was discredited. The majority of the members of the Senate had no sympathy with science and its aims. They belonged to the old literary school. In saying that he hoped nobody thought he was in any way antagonistic to literary culture. He would be very sorry indeed to see literary culture excluded even from the science degrees of the University. A branch of study so important as science in our modern life should not be cold-shouldered, neglected, or discredited in our secondary schools, and thereby also in the University. Since the so-called reform of the Senate there had been a distinct retrogression in the study of science in New Zealand. He trusted that the motion would not be carried. There was another point: Could you remove the strain of overcompetition in examinations by diminishing the number of subjects? No; the strain would be as great with four subjects, because the competition would be greater.

Mr. HUGHES, as a primary-school teacher, would like to say this: that, while he agreed that undue pressure was to be deprecated, still a wide training was the foundation of all university culture. He thought in this case they would possibly be taking a retrograde step if they narrowed the curriculum for our secondary schools.

Mr. FLEMING sympathized with the desire to remove the strain of the examination for the Junior University Scholarships, but he thought the majority of the Conference would agree with Professor Thomas in regard to the teaching of science.

Mr. FIRTH thought that if the number of subjects was lessened it would give the students more time to "browse" on their subjects. Junior University Scholarship students now had no time to read anything outside what they wanted for their examination. If the number of subjects was lessened the result of the work would be better, and certainly the harmful results would not be so great as under the present system.

Mr. GRAY moved, as an amendment, to omit all the words after "That," with a view to insert the following: "it be a recommendation to the Senate that the Junior University Scholarships be awarded on the results of the Matriculation Examination."

Mr. GOYEN seconded the amendment.

Miss McLEAN did not think that reducing the number of subjects would reduce the overpressure as long as the system of competitive examinations existed.

Mr. HOWELL thought that if they reduced the number of subjects from five to four they would not diminish the strain to any appreciable extent.

Mr. HILL said he never could understand why more marks should be given for Latin than for English, or why less marks should be given for science than for mathematics. The present system of allotting marks was grossly unjust to those students who had a bias for science.

Professor KIRK agreed with those speakers who thought that the main object of the motion, to lessen the strain, would not be reached by passing the motion. He agreed with what Professor Thomas had said in regard to science. It seemed to him, however, that the amendment did not go quite far enough. It ought to be made clear what subjects, how many subjects, and what differential weight, if any, should be attached to particular subjects.

Mr. VERNON intended to vote against the motion, because he did not think it would remove the strain.

Professor HASLAM thought it would be better to preserve the Junior Scholarship Examination at all events for some time, until they got a superior Matriculation Examination. He was in sympathy with the motion. He failed entirely to see the force of the arguments of those who said that overpressure would not be diminished.

Miss MARCHANT thought that Professor Thomas was labouring under a mistake in saying that science would be cut out. Perhaps there might be an equality of marks arranged for, but that was for the Senate to say.

Professor WHITE thought that to reduce the number of subjects of instruction in any given examination would be, to some extent at least, to reduce the amount of strain. It was not the number of subjects, but it was the sphere of work covered by a particular subject that had to be considered. He quite admitted that it was possible to have only three subjects, and at the same time so enlarge the sphere of work in each that the strain would be the same; but he did not suppose that Mr. Bevan-Brown anticipated that there was to be a material increase of work in the four subjects.

Mr. BEVAN-BROWN.—Certainly not.

Professor WHITE said he assumed that from the beginning; and the assumption was, he thought, in favour of reducing the mental strain if they carried the motion. He did not think the mover of the motion intended that the present system of marking should be continued. Ob-