

The adjustment of the curriculum is also recommended whereby more language study would be required in the lower forms to admit of having arithmetic and grammar on Junior Leaving.

In reducing the subjects for Junior Leaving opinions greatly vary, there being almost as many as there are answers. One is reminded of the old story of the Mohammedans and the hog, there being this advantage, however, on the side of the educationalists that they are pretty well agreed that more arithmetic should be required for teachers' certificates.

ii. Another remedy suggested is the division of the Junior Leaving into two parts. Seven or eight suggest this. Here is one of the answers: "Instead of dropping subjects from the Junior Leaving I hope to see a good stiff paper in arithmetic and grammar. If you mathematical men do not support a division of the Leaving Examination, I am afraid grammar and arithmetic will have to go."

iii. Eight or ten answers voicing the opinions of thirty Masters do not think that the curriculum would be overcrowded.

Here is a typical answer: "We do not think that the overcrowding of the curriculum will be nearly as injurious to the welfare of the pupils as leaving out these subjects has been."

iv. Another opinion is that the old regulations with Latin compulsory would be the best change that could be made.

v. Another is to make no change.

vi. Lastly, some demand a high percentage in these subjects, with the privilege of taking them again in a subsequent year in case of failure.

To sum up in brief the replies from all sources we may say there is a strong opinion that arithmetic is not receiving its proper share of attention; especially do the Inspectors emphasize this in the case of candidates for teachers' certificates.

Very few think that arithmetic and grammar should be added to the Junior Leaving work as at present constituted, and some change is necessary if these subjects are to be restored to that examination. The changes most in favor are: (1) Divide the Junior Leaving into two parts, and (2) reduce the number of languages or optional subjects, returning as nearly as possible to the old options.

The objections to the first method are: (1) That relief to the student is given at that period of his school life when he is best able to endure hard work, and not in the earlier years, where the strain is still heavy and over-pressure greatest, and (2) those who have had experience in Senior Leaving work during the past two years know that students work less on the few subjects of one part than they formerly did on those subjects when they had the whole examination to take at once. Habits of negligence are inculcated, the few subjects are despised and time wasted. (3) Would not the dropping of a subject for a year, taking it up again, dropping it, and again taking it up, not result in serious loss of time and prove a decided detriment to good progress in any subject.

The second method of returning to the old curriculum with the then options would be commendable, but would scarcely meet with much support. We would have the old battle to be fought over again among the Classical, Modern Language and Science men that was the origin of the resulting pressure and inefficiency now complained of.

A third method might be suggested (a hint of which is given in one of the answers); it is this: Leave the curriculum as at present, being nearly adequate for matriculants, and for teachers place the burden of additional instruction in arithmetic and grammar on the Normal School and Normal College.