

4. It reported that the training colleges should be subject to the control of the local Education Boards?—Yes.

5. Perhaps you would explain to us why that report of the Committee's was questioned in the confidential memorandum of the 23rd June that was sent out?—I suppose that I have the responsibility of advising the Minister, and I questioned that part of the report because it was so strongly my belief that for the success of the scheme the training colleges ought to be under the Central Department, and before any decisive step was taken I thought the matter ought to be considered. It was not discussed by the sub-committee at all last year. It was taken for granted. I do not think any weight was given to the considerations that appealed to me. I was not aware of its being given, and I was present all the time.

6. Upon that matter you differ from the Committee, do you not?—Yes. But I do not wish to ride that difference to death. In other words, I put the establishment of training colleges in any way before a matter of that sort. I would rather see the training colleges established under the Boards with the risk, as I think, of their not being carried on quite in the way in which one would like to see them carried on—I would rather see them established than ride that point as to control to death. I am most anxious to see them established. That is the thing which stands first with me. I have given my reasons there, and I have stated the opinions of all those who are considered experts in the Colony. Other experts, like Mr. Frank Tate, Director of Education in the State of Victoria, have expressed the same opinion.

7. You are aware that the Committee last year recommended that in addition to the local Boards there should be a Committee of Advice?—Yes.

8. Do you think there would be any difference of opinion which might lead to unfortunate results between the Committee of Advice and the local Board?—It would be a committee of advice, not a committee of control.

9. But assuming the advice given were not followed?—I think it quite possible that there might be a little feeling sometimes, but there would be more feeling if there were not a Committee of Advice.

10. You do not think there would be any real difficulty?—No. For instance, the feeling in Southland now is extremely strong—I do not say it has any foundation, I merely say the feeling exists there—that by the establishment of a training college in Dunedin, or the keeping-on of the one there, the Southland people are left out in the cold, and they ask for something themselves. Well, it seems to me it is impossible to give them that. If they had a representative on the Board of Advice, at all events their wants would be given expression to.

11. At any rate, it could be tried as an experiment?—Yes. I think that under the Department there ought to be a Committee of Advice. I do not believe in exclusive departmental control even of such a thing as a training college.

12. I forget now whether you suggested whom the Committee of Advice should consist of: Have you made any suggestion as to that?—Yes. In the report there was a suggestion.

13. We made a suggestion?—Yes, based I think on mine.

14. The one that you laid before the Committee and which the Committee adopted—that the Committee of Advice should consist of say, the Chairman or other member of the Board of Education, an Inspector of the Board, a representative of the Professorial Board of the University College, and a representative of the other Boards of Education, if any, in the same university district.

14A. Do you wish to modify that in any way?—No. I have considered what was put before me—that a representative of the secondary schools should be there—but I do not think their interest is sufficiently direct to warrant my recommending it.

15. That is the only other suggestion—that there should be some representative of the secondary schools?—Yes, but I do not think the interest is sufficiently direct. You might in the same way plead for technical schools to be represented.

16. Have you anything further to suggest with regard to control or the Committee of Advice?—No.

17. Coming to this letter of the 10th February, and Part 1 of it headed "Entrance to Training College." There are four separate headings to clause 1. A candidate entering the college must comply with all these four, and not with one of them only. Is that so?—Yes.

18. That is to say, he must have completed his pupil-teacher course, passed the Matriculation Examination, given satisfactory evidence as to health, character, and ability to teach, and have made a declaration as to his intention to become a teacher. He has to fulfil all those conditions?—Yes.

19. As to the first condition, that the candidate must have completed the pupil-teacher course: Will you tell us shortly what that means under the existing regulations?—It means that he must have had at least two years, and in most cases four years, as a pupil-teacher. Some have been pupil-teachers for two years, but the great majority have been pupil-teachers for four years.

20. Have the two-year ones passed the Matriculation Examination before entering as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

21. Then in that case a person who had been two years a pupil-teacher, but who had passed the Matriculation, under existing conditions might enter the training college?—Yes.

22. It is a four-year course?—Yes.

23. And the conditions of entry?—They vary with the different districts.

24. Generally speaking?—I could hardly make any generalisation.

25. Would they be the Fifth Standard?—Some have taken them as low as the Fifth Standard, but such cases have been very few (if any) lately. Generally it has been the Sixth Standard, and often a good deal above it.

26. What would the age be?—The age has tended to become about fifteen or sixteen, and even higher in the case of girls. In Otago seventeen is almost the minimum.

27. You have suggested some alterations in the pupil-teacher regulations?—Yes.