

1904.  
NEW ZEALAND.

# EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

REPORT ON TRAINING COLLEGES.

*Report brought up, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, the 25th October, 1904, and ordered to be printed.*

## ORDER OF REFERENCE.

*Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

FRIDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JULY, 1904.

*Ordered*, "That a Committee be appointed to consider all matters relating to education and public instruction generally, public-school training of teachers, higher education, technical education and manual instruction, and such other matters affecting education as may be referred to it; to have power to call for persons and papers; five to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. J. Allen, Mr. Baume, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Ell, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Fowlds, Mr. A. L. D. Fraser, Mr. Graham, Mr. Hall, Mr. Hanan, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Hogg, Mr. Lethbridge, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Major, Mr. Massey, Mr. T. Mackenzie, Mr. McNab, Sir W. R. Russell, Mr. Sidey, Hon. Sir W. J. Steward, Mr. J. C. Thomson, Mr. Wood, and the mover.—(Rt. Hon. R. J. SEDDON.)

## REPORT.

THE Education Committee have the honour to submit the following report:—

### A. CONTROL.

We are unable to agree with the recommendation of the Inspector-General in memorandum of the 23rd June, 1904, to the Minister of Education, in which he suggests that control of the Training Colleges should be with the Education Department. The sub-committee, after again carefully considering the question, adhere to the report of last year—viz., that control should rest with the local Education Boards, aided by a committee of advice, as recommended in paragraph (j) of the report (see E.—1E, 1904).

### B. DETAILS AS TO MANAGEMENT, ETC.

The sub-committee are of opinion that a pupil-teacher course prior to entrance to a Training College is not satisfactory; that our future teachers should be encouraged to continue at secondary or district high schools, to matriculate at the University, and pass through the Training College before being employed in teaching.

This reform must, however, of necessity be gradual, and we therefore recommend that the proposals of the Inspector-General be adopted, with amendments as shown.

#### 1. Entrance to Training College.

It is proposed that the following shall be the conditions—students to be admitted under clause 1 or under clause 2:—

*Clause 1.*—(a.) That the candidate shall have completed the pupil-teacher course in some education district of the colony.

(b.) That he shall have passed the Matriculation Examination of the University of New Zealand.

(c.) That he shall give satisfactory evidence as to health, character, and ability to teach.

(d.) That he shall make a declaration of his intention to become a teacher in a public or secondary school in the colony.

(e.) That the parent or guardian shall enter into a bond to return the amount paid in allowances in case the student fail to complete two years of teaching.

[N.B.—(b) may be modified for one or two years with the approval, previously obtained, of the Minister of Education.]

*Clause 2.*—That he shall have kept terms for at least one year at the University College, or have gained credit at the Junior Scholarship Examination of the University, and satisfy conditions (c), (d), and (e) of clause 1, and such conditions as to probation in teaching as the Principal of the Training College, with the consent of the Minister, may require.

That the following allowances shall be paid to students at the Training College:—

For the first year—

To those under clause 1: £30, together with University College fees, with an additional £30 when the student has to live away from home.

To those under clause 2: A bursary of £10, together with University College fees, with sixteen scholarships: £30 additional when the student has to live away from home.

For the second year—

To those under clause 1: £30, together with University College fees, with an additional £30 when the student has to live away from home.

To those under clause 2: A bursary of £10, together with the University College fees, with sixteen Scholarships: £30 additional when the student has to live away from home.

The estimated expenditure on account of allowances is shown in Return Z attached hereto.

That while we do not deem it advisable to recommend allowances for teachers who have no certificate who select to take a course at the Training College, yet we think that opportunity should be offered to teachers who have no certificate, but have taught to the satisfaction of the Inspector for three years, to take a course at the Training College.

To encourage improvement and to keep the teachers in touch with the Training College, arrangements should be made to give to those already in the teaching profession opportunities to attend classes specially suitable for them.

## 2. Curriculum

The curriculum should include attendance at the University College in English and in some other subject approved for each student by the Principal of the Training College; and, in considering the course to be taken up by any student, the requirements of the Teachers' Certificate Examination, and, if possible, of a University degree, should receive due weight. The curriculum should also include—

(i.) The several branches of the subject of education, as defined by the regulations for the examination of teachers in classes A, B, and C, the instruction being given either at the University College or at the Training College, except as regards methods of teaching, which must be given at the Training College.

(ii.) A special course of kindergarten work and science for public schools, including nature-study and elementary agriculture.

(iii.) A course in drawing, singing, needlework, &c.

(iv.) A course in other subjects of manual instruction.

(ii.), (iii.), and (iv.) would be given at the Training College.

(v.) Practice in teaching at the school connected with the Training College.

## 3. Size of School.

We recommend that the two schools in existence should as soon as practicable be brought to a number of pupils approximating to 460, including 40 secondary school pupils and a model school of 40.

That two new schools—one in Auckland and one in Wellington—be immediately established, each to consist of approximately 330 pupils, including secondary and model schools as above; and that provision be made on the estimates accordingly.

## 4. Staff, Salaries, &c.

We recommend that the staff and salaries be as detailed in Returns 5A and 5B attached hereto, and that provision be made for the additional £140 per annum required for the two smaller colleges.

## 5. General.

That a conference of the Directors and Method Masters of the Training Colleges, and the Inspector-General, be held every two years, and that every two years and alternately with the previously mentioned conference a meeting of teachers and the staff of the Training College be held in each Training College centre.

The evidence of the Inspector-General, the correspondence and tables showing the estimated cost of four different schemes for allowances to students, and the estimated receipts and expenditure of Training Colleges, are attached hereto.

| TRAINING COLLEGES.                                                                                          |     |     |     |                           |       | Estimated.     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|---------------------------|-------|----------------|
|                                                                                                             |     |     |     |                           |       | £              |
| 1. Additional cost of salaries if pupil-teachers are abolished                                              | ... | ... | ... | ...                       | ...   | 12,550         |
| (Including consequential additions to salaries of other assistants—viz., £5,100).                           |     |     |     |                           |       |                |
| Estimated Cost if Students at Training Colleges under Clause 1 given £40 or £60, with Fees, for first year. |     |     |     |                           |       |                |
| 2. First year, clause 1                                                                                     | ... | ... | ... | 90 at £40                 | ...   | 3,600          |
|                                                                                                             |     |     |     | 30 at £60                 | ...   | 1,800          |
|                                                                                                             |     |     |     | 120 at £8 University fees | ...   | 960            |
| 3. First year, clause 2                                                                                     | ... | ... | ... | 40 at £18                 | ...   | 720            |
| First year                                                                                                  | ... | ... | ... | ...                       | ...   | 7,080          |
| 4. Second year                                                                                              | ... | ... | ... | 120 at £40                | 4,800 | 8,480          |
|                                                                                                             |     |     |     | 40 at £60                 | 2,400 |                |
|                                                                                                             |     |     |     | 160 at £8 fees            | 1,280 |                |
| Second year, say,                                                                                           | ... | ... | ... | ...                       | ...   | 6,000          |
| Total, two years                                                                                            | ... | ... | ... | ...                       | ...   | <u>£13,080</u> |

5A.—RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of Training College and Normal School (estimated), exclusive of Allowances to Students.

| School of 290 (including 40 District High School Pupils). | Salaries under Public-school Teachers' Salaries Acts. | Other Allowances.     |                            |                   | Total Salary and Allowances. | —                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                                                           |                                                       | As Normal School.     | As Lecturer or Instructor. | House Allowances. |                              |                             |
| Director ... ..                                           | £ 275                                                 | £ 187                 | £ 100 (a)                  | £ 40              | £ 600                        | (a) Education.              |
| A.M. ... ..                                               | 185                                                   | 115                   | 50 (b)                     | ...               | 350                          | (b) Methods.                |
|                                                           |                                                       | (95)                  | ...                        | ...               | (330)                        |                             |
| Mistress ... ..                                           | 125                                                   | 50                    | 25 (c)                     | ...               | 200                          | (c) Kindergarten.           |
| A.M. ... ..                                               | 100                                                   | 115                   | 25 (d)                     | ...               | 240                          | (d) Elementary science.     |
|                                                           |                                                       | (95)                  | ...                        | ...               | (220)                        |                             |
| A.F. ... ..                                               | 80                                                    | 50                    | 25 (e)                     | ...               | 155                          | (e) Needlework.             |
|                                                           |                                                       | (40)                  | ...                        | ...               | (145)                        |                             |
| A.F. (for P.T.) ... ..                                    | 40                                                    | 60                    | ...                        | ...               | 100                          |                             |
|                                                           |                                                       | (40)                  | ...                        | ...               | (80)                         |                             |
| A.M. Secondary (District High School grant)               | 270                                                   | ...                   | 30 (f)                     | ...               | 300                          | (f) As special tutor.       |
| Model School of forty ...                                 | 155                                                   | 40                    | 25 (g)                     | 20                | 240                          | (g) Elementary Agriculture. |
| House allowances ...                                      | 60                                                    |                       |                            |                   |                              |                             |
|                                                           | 1,290                                                 |                       |                            |                   |                              |                             |
| <i>Other Grants.</i>                                      |                                                       |                       |                            |                   |                              |                             |
| Manual and Technical Institute.—Special                   | 150                                                   | ...                   | ...                        | ...               | 25                           | Woodwork.                   |
| Manual and Technical Institute.—Capitation                | 125                                                   | ...                   | ...                        | ...               | 25                           | Cooking.                    |
| Lecturer on Education ...                                 | 100                                                   | ...                   | ...                        | ...               | 50                           | Drawing.                    |
| Grant to Training College                                 | 600                                                   | ...                   | ...                        | ...               | 50                           | Singing.                    |
| Drill ... ..                                              | 25                                                    | ...                   | ...                        | ...               | 25                           | Drill.                      |
|                                                           | 1,000                                                 |                       |                            |                   |                              |                             |
| Total receipts ...                                        | 2,290                                                 | Total Expenditure ... |                            |                   | 2,360*                       |                             |

\* Could be reduced if necessary to £2,290 by substituting salaries in brackets.

Number of pupils:—In main school—Primary, 250; secondary, 40; in model school, 40; total, 330.

Cost per head (omitting District High School grant), £3,138 (£3 2s. 9d., nearly).

5B.—RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of Training College and Normal School (estimated), exclusive of Allowances to Students.

| School of 420 (including 40 District High School Pupils). | Salaries under Public-school Teachers' Salaries Acts. | Other Allowances.                 |                            |                   | Total Salary and Allowances. | —                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                                                           |                                                       | As Normal School.                 | As Lecturer or Instructor. | House Allowances. |                              |                             |
| Director ... ..                                           | £ 300                                                 | £ 160                             | £ 100 (a)                  | £ 40              | £ 600                        | (a) Education.              |
| A.M. (= H.M.) ... ..                                      | 205                                                   | 95                                | 50 (b)                     | ...               | 350                          | (b) Methods.                |
| Mistress ... ..                                           | 135                                                   | 40                                | 25 (c)                     | ...               | 200                          | (c) Kindergarten.           |
| A.M. ... ..                                               | 110                                                   | 105                               | 25 (d)                     | ...               | 240                          | (d) Elementary science.     |
|                                                           |                                                       |                                   |                            |                   |                              | (e) Needlework.             |
| A.F. ... ..                                               | 100                                                   | 30                                | 25 (e)                     | ...               | 155                          |                             |
| A.F. ... ..                                               | 85                                                    | 15                                | ...                        | ...               | 100                          |                             |
| A.M. ... ..                                               | 80                                                    | 40                                | ...                        | ...               | 120                          |                             |
| A.F. ... ..                                               | 80                                                    | 20                                | ...                        | ...               | 100                          |                             |
| A.M. (secondary) (District High School grant,             | 270                                                   | ...                               | 30 (f)                     | ...               | 300                          | (f) As special tutor.       |
| Model school of 40 ...                                    | 155                                                   | 40                                | 25 (g)                     | 20                | 240                          | (g) Elementary Agriculture. |
| House allowances ...                                      | 60                                                    | ...                               | ...                        | ...               | ...                          |                             |
|                                                           |                                                       |                                   |                            |                   | Special Teachers.            |                             |
| <i>Other Grants.</i>                                      |                                                       |                                   |                            |                   |                              |                             |
| Manual and technical instruction—Special                  | 150                                                   | ...                               | 25                         | ...               | 25                           | Woodwork.                   |
| Manual and technical instruction—Capitation               | 125                                                   | ...                               | 25                         | ...               | 25                           | Cooking.                    |
| Lecturer on education ...                                 | 100                                                   | ...                               | 50                         | ...               | 50                           | Drawing.                    |
| Grant to Training Colleges                                | 600                                                   | ...                               | 50                         | ...               | 50                           | Singing.                    |
| Drill ... ..                                              | 25                                                    | ...                               | ...                        | ...               | 25                           | Drill.                      |
| Total receipts ...                                        | 2,580                                                 | Total expenditure at each college |                            |                   | 2,580                        |                             |

Cost per head (omitting District High School grant), £2,848 (£2 17s. nearly).

Number of pupils:—In main school—Primary, 380; secondary, 40; in model school, 40; total, 460.

## X

£20 and £50, with University College Fees<sup>7</sup>

|                         |     |     |     |   | £                                                                  | Estimated.<br>£ |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2. Clause 1             | ... | ... | ... | { | 90 at £20 ... 1,800<br>30 at £50 ... 1,500<br>120 at £8 ... 960    |                 |
| 3. First year, clause 2 | ... | ... | ... |   | 40 at £18 ... 720                                                  |                 |
|                         |     |     |     |   | —                                                                  | 4,980           |
| 4. Second year          | ... | ... | ... | { | 120 at £20 ... 2,400<br>40 at £50 ... 2,000<br>160 at £8 ... 1,280 | 5,680           |
| Second year, say,       | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                                | 4,000           |
| Total, two years        | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                                | <u>£8,980</u>   |

## Y.

## £30 and £50, with College Fees.

|                         |     |     |     |   | £                                                               | Estimated<br>£ |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|-----|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 2. First year, clause 1 | ... | ... | ... | { | 90 at £30 ... 2,700<br>30 at £50 ... 1,500<br>120 at £8 ... 960 |                |
| 3. Clause 2             | ... | ... | ... |   | 40 at £18 ... 720                                               |                |
|                         |     |     |     |   | —                                                               | 5,880          |

## £30 and £50, with College Fees (Clauses 1 and 2).

|                   |     |     |     |   | £                                                                  | £              |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 4. Second year    | ... | ... | ... | { | 120 at £30 ... 3,600<br>40 at £50 ... 2,000<br>160 at £8 ... 1,280 | 6,880          |
| Second year, say, | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                                | 4,800          |
|                   |     |     |     |   |                                                                    | <u>£10,680</u> |

## Z.

|                                                                |     |     |     |   | £                                                               | £                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2. Clause 1                                                    | ... | ... | ... | { | 90 at £30 ... 2,700<br>30 at £60 ... 1,800<br>120 at £8 ... 960 |                       |
| 3. First year, clause 2                                        | ... | ... | ... |   | 40 at £18 ... 720                                               |                       |
| With sixteen scholarships, £30 additional for country students | ... | ... | ... |   | 480                                                             |                       |
| Total, first year                                              | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                             | 6,660                 |
| 4. Clause 1                                                    | ... | ... | ... | { | 90 at £30 ...<br>30 at £60 ...<br>120 at £8 ...                 | £5,460, but say 4,000 |
| Clause 2                                                       | ... | ... | ... |   | 40 at £18 ... 720                                               |                       |
| With sixteen scholarships, as for first year                   | ... | ... | ... |   | 480                                                             |                       |
| Total, second year                                             | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                             | 5,200                 |
| Total, two years                                               | ... | ... | ... |   | ...                                                             | <u>£11,860</u>        |

The Committee recommend that this report be referred to the Government for favourable consideration.

FREDERICK E. BAUME, Chairman.

Parliament Buildings, Wellington, 25th October, 1904.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

MONDAY, 17TH OCTOBER, 1904.

GEORGE HOGGEN, Inspector-General of Schools and Secretary for Education, examined before the Sub-committee.

1. *The Chairman (Mr. J. Allen).*] Last time the Committee met we commenced by asking Sir Edward Gibbes some questions upon this letter of the 10th February, 1904, from the Secretary for Education to the Education Boards. It is on this Paper E.-1E. I think we had better take that as the basis of our inquiry to start with. The first part of it deals with the entrance to the training colleges?—Shall I state under what circumstances the letter was written?

2. Yes, please?—After the recommendations were made by the Education Committee last session the Minister instructed me to make arrangements to meet the four Boards at Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, and to consult with them as to what steps should be taken to carry out the recommendations of the Committee. I did so. Unfortunately the sub-committee of the Board appointed to meet me at Auckland could not meet me, except the Chairman and two of the Inspectors. One of the Inspectors was not there all the time, but the other was, also the Secretary to the Board. We went into the matter in detail, and I was taken round to two schools that it was suggested might be used—at all events for a time. It is to this that I refer in my memorandum to the Minister in which I say there are one or two schools that could be used temporarily. The Chairman then said—of course, he could not speak for the Board—that perhaps on the whole he agreed with the Inspector, that it was better for the Department to manage the Training College at Auckland. Then in Wellington a sub-committee was also appointed to meet me. It consisted of three or four persons—I do not remember whether it was three or four—but two of those were present, Mr. Bradey, the Chairman, and Mr. Lee. The two Inspectors were also present, and the Wanganui Inspector. I believe they invited the Hawke's Bay Board to be represented and they may have invited other Boards, but as to that I do not know. The meeting agreed to the general outline of the scheme, which was roughly the same as is laid down here, and they agreed without any great amount of discussion, after Mr. Lee and two of the Inspectors had spoken in favour of it, that the Training College ought to be under the central Department. They asked me whether in that case the Government would find all the money, and I said I supposed that, if the Department took the responsibility, the Government would have to find all the money directly—probably it would indirectly in other cases, but it would find it directly if the Department took the thing over. Then I went to Christchurch and met the sub-committee there twice. We had perhaps the most satisfactory sitting in Christchurch in one respect, in that every member of the sub-committee appointed attended, and so the discussion was very full. Two of the Inspectors were there on one occasion, and all three of them on the other. On one of the occasions practically the whole of the North Canterbury Board was present. Mr. Inspector Wood expressed the opinion that the College ought to be under the Department, but none of the other Inspectors expressed an opinion at the meeting. The Board expressed the opinion very clearly that they thought it ought to be under the Board. We discussed several details. One of the chief difficulties was the size of the existing school, the Normal School, and the supplying of the school wants of Christchurch if that school were reduced below its present attendance. The other difficulties were not of such great importance. The allowances, I fancy, the Board thought were a little on the liberal side for the first year. Mr. Inspector Wood was very strongly of opinion that the course should be two years, and several members of the Board agreed in that, but this opinion was not so strongly expressed as it was at Dunedin. That was the general result of the two meetings at Christchurch. At Dunedin the Board held the same opinion with regard to administration. I do not think the Inspectors expressed any opinion at that meeting. The details were discussed pretty fully. I forgot to say that at Christchurch Mr. Watkins, the Acting-Principal of the Normal School, was present, and at Dunedin Mr. White, the Acting-Principal of the Normal School there, was present. I understood that it was the desire of the Otago Board—in fact, it was conveyed to me by the Secretary—that Mr. White and I should confer beforehand as to certain details: and I conferred not only with Mr. White, but with the Inspectors, and the consequence was that we got through the whole business in about two hours and a half. We dealt chiefly with points of detail. They did not think so strongly as the Christchurch Board that the allowances were on the liberal side. These were more liberal than the Board had been paying before, but there was present in their minds the thought that if they offered less than the salary of a fourth-year pupil-teacher very few boys would be likely to go into the Training School. I do not say that their opinion was stronger than that at Christchurch, but there was a stronger expression of the view that the training should be for two years. After these conferences I informed the two Boards that the result of the conferences would be put before them as a definite proposition in the form of a letter, and this is the letter of the 10th February.

3. You have touched upon the matter of control, and I would like to ask one or two questions about that before going on to the letter of the 10th February. You are aware, of course, of the Committee's report of last year with regard to the question of control?—Yes.

2—I. 14A.

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.

28. Those have not been put into force yet?—No.

29. Will you please tell us shortly what the difference is in the new regulations?—I only want to deal with this in connection with the pupil-teachers' entrance into the training college?—The difference is to require everywhere what most Boards in practice now look for—the Sixth Standard or something above it. It puts the Sixth as a minimum. It also aims at giving advantages to those who have passed the Civil Service Junior Examination, which we regard as the test of a two years' education in the secondary classes of a district high school or in a secondary school. It is generally accepted as that everywhere now, and it is the test for the continuation free places. The alteration aims at giving those who have passed the Junior Civil Service Examination an advantage of one year, and those who have passed the Matriculation an advantage of two years, without making it permissive—giving them the right to ask for that. Well, then, instead of four examinations, which, for nine or ten of the Boards were conducted by the Boards themselves, it proposes to give what has been asked for by the Inspectors, by a good number of the Boards, and by the teachers—uniform examination at the end of the second and fourth years, instead of having four examinations, one every year, as there is now. At present a pupil-teacher is doing double work—student work and teaching-practice—and he has to pass a specific examination at the end of each year. This has been felt to be a burden for a great many years. The proposal reduces those examinations to two. Perhaps the circular to the Boards was not quite specific enough in one way: It was stated that the Boards might hold other examinations at the end of the first and third years. The idea was not that those should be examinations in the same subjects at all, but that besides the subjects for the Civil Service Examination and the literary part of the D examination there were such subjects as singing, sewing, manual work, school method, and so on, and what was suggested was that, in the first and third years, the pupil-teachers should, if the Board required it, pass examinations in those subjects; but it was thought, and I still think, that those examinations might be left to the Boards. We might vary the regulations finally drawn up by saying that a Board might hold examinations in other subjects than those for the second and fourth year in the first and third years, and then there would not be any clashing in the subjects of examination. The object of the regulations was practically to make it possible for every pupil-teacher who passed through his course to be fitted under the conditions for admission to the training college.

30. I do not want to go into the question of the regulations for the pupil-teacher course, except so far as they affect entrance to the training college. But, generally speaking, your suggested regulations would raise the age and increase the standard for entrance upon a pupil-teacher's course?—Yes; they would increase the standard that nominally exists, but not the standard that practically exists in nearly every district.

31. The suggested regulation would bring them all up to the same minimum standard?—Yes; but I think there is hardly a district in the colony that would have any difficulty in reaching the minimum that we suggest.

32. The second condition of admission to the training college is that a candidate must have passed the Matriculation Examination. In suggesting that was it your idea that all the pupils being trained for teachers should have matriculated, so that they may, if they see fit, have the benefit of the full University course?—Yes, I think they should all have matriculated. It is stated, later on, that it is expected that they should attend at least some lectures at the University.

33. Will there be any difficulty in getting them up to the matriculation standard? I do not think so now, especially if preference is given, as is indicated, to those who have been two years at a secondary school or a district high school. It is suggested that preference should be given to them. No objections have been made to that by the Boards.

34. Assuming that the supply cannot be kept up in that way, and you have to take young people even though they have not been two years at a secondary school?—I think the modification now in practice, agreed to temporarily, might be introduced.

35. You are aware that some Boards say they are doubtful if their pupil-teachers could get up to the matriculation standard?—We have agreed, temporarily, in Dunedin, that if they have passed the fourth year of their pupil-teacher course, or have obtained a partial D, they should be admitted. But if the Boards properly appreciated the point, they would understand that the Matriculation Examination was a little easier than that test. The objections to the condition are from want of understanding that the Matriculation is really easier than the alternatives suggested. It has five less subjects than the D.

36. Do you think it necessary temporarily to suspend the regulations?—I would suspend the condition in this kind of way: I would say that you could admit all those who had passed in the Matriculation. I would admit all those, and if a certain number were not made up by that means I think that for a time you might give a certain allowance to certain districts; you would name a minimum that you would allow to any district to come if they had passed the fourth-year pupil-teachership.

37. I do not quite understand you?—Supposing that in any year there should be admitted to a training college forty teachers and you could only get thirty who had passed the Matriculation. There would be ten places open, and you would take from each district a student, or two students, who had certain lower qualifications—who had passed the fourth-year pupil-teacher examination, or had obtained a partial pass. Then, if that did not make up the forty, I would say that without restriction to districts you would take candidates in on the lower qualifications.

38. You would give preference to those who had fulfilled these conditions first of all?—I think so, first of all, if you can get them. They are of the quality you want. Matriculation is not a very high standard. I do not think there will be any difficulty about it at all in the future.

39. With regard to subsection (d), some Boards say that the declaration suggested is not sufficient—that candidates ought to be bound more closely: Do you approve of that?—I think they ought to,

but the difficulty is in doing it all at once. The only way to do it is by bond, and that means security, of course. I think that might be kept in view; but what we want now is to get hold of the teachers; we do not want to make the conditions too stiff at first.

40. *Mr. Fowlds.*]—There is one stipulation that has been suggested which we think might be added, and that is that in addition to the declaration of intention to become a teacher in a public or secondary school in the colony, candidates should also bind themselves down to continue in the district from which they come?—I am against that.

41. How are you going to get over the difficulty of Southland and other districts similarly circumstanced having to send all their pupil-teachers away to another place to be trained, where they may be picked up by the Education Board there and never go back to the district that has supplied them?—That might be a slight difficulty in the case of local control; but I do not think the difficulty likely to arise. Two years is not such a very long time for a teacher to be away. If they are not appointed in one district they will be in another. The salaries are the same everywhere.

42. *Mr. Hardy.*] With regard to Mr. Fowlds's question as to a boy going from Southland to Otago and the Otago people getting him, I think it would be a good thing even if the Otago people did get hold of him, because this might enable the Southland people to get an Otago teacher and there might be an interchange?—There would necessarily be an interchange if you trained only the number required.

43. Subsection (c) provides that a candidate "shall give satisfactory evidence as to health, character, and ability to teach." Would you approve of a doctor being appointed at each of these centres to examine the pupil-teachers before they are appointed?—I think it would be a very good thing, but I do not think you need appoint a doctor. The Local Health Officer would do the examining. He does it for the Government Departments at a fee of 10s. 6d., and if you appointed a special doctor you would have to pay him a retaining-fee as well.

44. It has perhaps not come within your knowledge that we in North Canterbury have asked for the certificate of a doctor, and we have found that very often the family doctor will give a certificate that is perhaps not everything that the Board desires. In order to get over that difficulty would it not be wise to employ a doctor whose fee would be 7s. 6d. and who would not require a retaining-fee, because he would have a good number of young people going to him?—I suggest that the Local Health Officer be employed. He is generally a man of some standing, and he is pretty rigid. We find from experience that it is fairly satisfactory to get him.

45. Would you approve of the course which has been adopted by the North Canterbury Board of Education, that is, to employ a doctor who has been examining for the Government Life Insurance Department and who has himself been a schoolmaster and knows exactly what is wanted? To this man the North Canterbury Board expects that every pupil-teacher shall go to be examined. Would you approve of such a course as that?—I think he would be a suitable man, but the Civil Service candidates are at present examined by the Local Officer of Health, and I do not see any reason to choose between one and the other. I think the Government Life Insurance man would be just as good. I approve of an independent officer examining the candidates.

46. Not the family doctor?—I should not call it satisfactory evidence unless you got somebody that the Government or the Board nominated itself—a person not nominated by the candidate.

47. You know that it is the custom at the present time for Boards to accept certificates from any medical officer?—Some Boards do, but some require an independent officer's certificate.

48. *Mr. Baume.*] With regard to the recommendation as to local control or central control: The communications that you have received from the Boards have been subsequent to your interviews with, say, the Chairman, in Auckland?—Yes.

49. That is to say, although you told us the Chairman himself favoured central control, the Board as a whole favours local control?—Yes, that is so.

50. Subsequent to your interview?—That is what I gather.

51. Auckland, Wellington, North Canterbury, Otago, and Taranaki favour local control where the four colleges are established?—I do not know that Taranaki favours local control.

52. It is stated here that "Taranaki suggests control by Education Boards if four colleges established, but by Department if only one established"?—Yes.

53. There is not one single Board that favours absolute central control?—What about Southland? Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland, as I understand, favour control by the Department with representation by the Boards.

54. There is not one of them that favours the matter being left entirely to the Department. It says here that those three Boards "favour dual control"?—Yes; that is the way in which it is expressed—the colleges to be under the Department with representation by the Boards.

55. What do you mean by central control with representation by the Board? Do you mean simply a Board of Advice?—That is what I understand.

56. What does this mean in this document?—It means that the training college should, in the opinion of the Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland Boards, be under the Department.

57. What is "dual control"? Does "dual control" mean dual control or does it not?—Before expressing a very definite opinion on that I should like to see the communications. I know perfectly well the opinions of the Boards as they were expressed to me in two of those places, but I do not know the opinion of the Westland one.

58. You are not prepared to say what this means?—No; I should like to see the details, but that was the way I took it. Perhaps I am reading into their letter what I know of in other ways, but I am sure that that is what they mean. It is quite natural that the Boards in the four centres should want local control.

59. The point I want to get at is this: There were thirteen Boards communicated with, and the only three that have stated they are prepared to have anything to do with central control are Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland?—Yes; but take the case of Hawke's Bay. The Board there appointed a sub-committee, but it could not get a meeting and so they did not send an answer. I do not think that represents any opinion at all. It is not even negative evidence of a decided character.

60. You say in your memorandum that the Education Committee last year adopted this recommendation with regard to local control without discussion?—Yes.

61. Do you not remember that we had at least two or three days' discussion over the matter?—I said "almost without discussion." It was taken for granted by nearly every speaker. There were practically no reasons given.

62. Did you not yourself contend very vigorously for central control, and were you not opposed by nearly all the members of the Committee?—It simply amounted to an expression of opinion. Discussion involves the giving of reasons and grounds for opinions. Expression of opinion does not amount to a discussion. I am judging by my own recollection of what took place and my own recollection is very clear about it.

63. *Mr. Hardy.*] There was a great deal of talk, was there not, whether it was discussion or not?—I speak to the best of my recollection. In this paper, which is a memorandum to the Minister, I spoke to the best of my recollection and belief, and I know of nothing to lead me to say that my statement is incorrect.

64. You have had an expression of opinion from the four Boards of the districts in which the colleges would be established—Otago, North Canterbury, Wellington, and Auckland?—Yes.

65. And it is natural, you say, that these people should wish to have the control?—It is natural for people to like power.

66. They have already had control in Otago and North Canterbury?—Yes; they already have control.

67. They were able to speak with experience, I presume?—Of local control, not of departmental control.

68. They were able to speak of the control which they already had?—Yes; which they themselves had exercised.

69. And they spoke firmly because they believed that in consequence of their control in a measure it was a success?—That might be their opinion.

70. Are they not as much entitled to their opinion as you are to yours?—Yes. I was expressing my own opinion to the Minister.

71. Surely we must hold that if we are fit to be members of Boards our judgment should be of some value?—I do not dispute that at all. I have not said anything whatever to throw any reflection on the Boards. I have not said anything whatever to indicate that I believe that the members of the Boards were not entitled to their own opinions.

72. I was getting round to that. I was speaking about the members of these four large Boards?—I do not think the members of the Boards are experts in the matter of education in connection with training colleges. They are not experts in education.

73. Do they not know a little about it?—Oh yes, as popular Boards do in course of time, by doing the work of administration and doing it well; but they do not get to be experts.

74. Still, as we grow accustomed to the work, do we not get some knowledge?—Yes; it depends upon how long members of Boards have been at it, how far they have gone into the details, and how far they are in a position to see how it affects the subsequent careers of the students.

75. Do not these Boards make use of their Inspectors and are they not in this way becoming possessed of expert knowledge?—To what extent do they make use of their Inspectors for the training colleges?

76. In every instance—I can speak for North Canterbury?—Well, ask Mr. Inspector Wood and let him tell you.

77. Mr. Wood has retired from the service of the Board?—Yes; but he has been an Inspector of the North Canterbury Board for a great many years, and what was his opinion at the meeting at which you and I were present? He said it wanted total and radical reform.

78. I heard a different opinion expressed by two other Inspectors who were present?—Yes.

79. Do you not think those two other Inspectors had an equal right to express their opinion?—They did not express any opinion on that point at the meeting.

80. Yes, they did?—That it had been a success under the Board.

81. Yes?—I do not remember. I do not want you to think Mr. Hardy, that I do not think the Boards are as much entitled to their opinion as I am. I was asked to give an expression of my opinion, and I gave it.

82. *Mr. Baume.*] The difficulty was that you put it that we made our recommendation "without discussion," whereas there was a great deal of what we considered to be discussion?—Well, I am very sorry, but that is my impression, and I cannot alter it. As I say, I am anxious that the training colleges should be established under any suitable conditions whatever; but I do not know any solid reason why they should be under the Boards at all.

83. You spoke of Mr. Frank Tate just now. Did he not say that the system of decentralisation in New Zealand had worked extremely well?—Not in regard to training colleges. You will see from the Press reports that Mr. Tate was uncompromisingly and very strongly in favour of central control of the training colleges, and went so far as to prophesy failure if they were not under central control.

84. *Mr. Hardy.*] Did Mr. Tate not express one opinion when he was in the colony and another opinion after he left?—No, not on the subject of training colleges. In regard to the control of the schools he was very strongly in favour of decentralisation, but not in connection with the thing that was essentially central in its character.

85. Coming to the Boards of Advice. In the case of North Canterbury there would be South Canterbury, Westland, and Grey—I presume Grey would come into that district?—Grey comes into the Wellington District nominally, and Westland too. Under the Victoria College Act they are in the Victoria University College district. I was not free to make any other division.

86. What is the Otago University district?—Does that take in Southland?—Yes.

87. Well, in order to give increased interest to South Canterbury, and Westland if it comes in, would it not be wise to appoint additional members of the Board of Advice from those districts?—I have already said so.

88. We are already doing that in North Canterbury?—Well, I have suggested—and the Committee last year adopted the suggestion—that the Board of Advice should include representatives from any other Boards of Education in the same university district.

89. At the present time we have in North Canterbury one member from South Canterbury; I do not think we have any others?—No; you have no other Board in your university district. That is how the matter stands.

90. Would it not be wiser to have an increased number—to have, say, two representatives from, say, Southland?—The chief objection is this: Supposing the Wellington Training College were put under the Wellington Board; there are eight Education Boards concerned, and you would have then eighteen men, because you would have in addition to the sixteen, the Inspector and the University College representatives.

91. Would it not be wise to give say, Southland increased representation, and do it on the basis of the number of schools? Supposing there was a representation from Otago of three for 200 schools, would it not be wise to give Southland two for say 120 schools, providing those were the proportions?—The number in Southland is about 150 as against 220 in Otago.

92. Could you get over the difficulty of the local jealousy by appointing half the number from Southland?—The jealousy between Southland and Otago in that respect is a thing that will die out in time if Southland gets what it considers fair play.

93. Then that question could be fairly answered with regard to Southland wanting central control, that it is in consequence of jealousy that they want it?—It is the fact of their being under the impression—I do not say I justify the impression—that they could not get their pupil-teachers trained. The feeling exists because of that impression. I do not say it has ever been exactly true.

94. If it would be natural for the four Boards that have already got control to want to continue to have it, is it not equally natural for those who have not got control to object to it?—Yes. If your contention were right the opinions of the Boards would count for nothing, because they would go against one another.

95. The four Boards have control of a very large proportion of the children of the colony?—Yes, they do control the majority. They are the ones whose teachers would not be left out in any case. It is the others, whose teachers would not be on the spot, that would feel the pinching of the shoe. I have tried to work it out fairly.

96. *The Chairman.*] Do you think it advisable that the training colleges should be brought under one scheme, or would it be better to allow play to the four university districts to, to a certain extent, experiment?—I think the matter is past the stage of experiment, because it has been so well discussed in other countries of the world. The only difference we want to make is the difference suitable to our own land.

97. Is that not a portion of the experiment?—I do not think the range is wide enough for a lot of experiments. If the training college is under the central department, or under the Board, there ought to be a director who is good enough to be allowed play for his own individuality. I do not think you want any more experiments than that.

98. Is it not a good thing to allow individual play to the director?—Oh, I would do so.

99. Would it not be all cut and dried under the Department?—Not any more than under the Boards. I have never heard of the Department being likely to interfere with the director in such a way as to make his work cut and dried.

100. Of course, it is a matter of opinion. That seems to me to be the danger of departmental control, that it would be cut and dried, and individuality would be killed?—You might think that, and on the other hand you might have inefficiency or rather, I will not say “inefficiency,” because I do not think that under any of the large Boards of this colony inefficiency has ever existed, but you might have decreased efficiency. It is rather difficult for me—with members of Boards present—to express my unbiassed opinion.

101. We want it?—Well, it is that it is not worth the money to carry on the school at Christchurch as it has been carried on for several years, and is likely to be carried on. There is not a proper return to the colony.

102. *Mr. Hardy.*] You say that the school in Christchurch has not been successfully carried on?—Yes, during the last few years.

103. A large proportion of the young people who have been trained in that school are now employed by our Board?—I said, during the last few years.

104. Are their literary attainments up to the mark?—They have passed the examinations.

105. Have we not got more university graduates in the ranks of our school-teachers in North Canterbury, in proportion to the total number, than any other district in New Zealand?—From those who have gone through the Normal School in the last few years, no.

106. Speaking generally?—I will not say generally. I say as the school has been carried on for the last few years, and is now being carried on.

107. Have we not got more university graduates, and a greater number of men of attainments, in the service of the North Canterbury Board than there are in the service of any other Board in New Zealand?—That is not to the point of what I said just now.

108. I am asking that question?—I could not say without counting them up. I doubt it. I think Otago has more; but I would not like to say definitely without counting them up.

109. In view of the number of teachers that we have who are men of university attainments, is it not a fact that the bulk of them have gone through that training college during the time it has been established?—I must refuse to make my words stretch beyond applying to the last few years.

110. You think that of late the Normal School in Christchurch has not been doing good work?—Yes; but I do not think it is right that I should say that without stating why—that there have not been the arrangements that would enable it to do good work.

111. The question I put to you is this: You think that the Normal School of late years has not been doing good work?—I think it has not been keeping up with the demands that we should make on those trained in our training colleges. What I said really was that the money being spent on it did not give a fair return. I did not say it was thrown away, or anything of that sort. It is simply the want of the most efficient arrangements.

112. And that it was in consequence of the bad management of the Normal School that you suggest that it should be centralised and a better system thereby instituted?—No, I did not say that. I did not mention “bad management.” I did not put it in that form. I simply gave that as one piece of evidence among several that had influenced me in arriving at a conclusion. I took that as an example; I do not cast any reflection whatever on the Board. But I think that the system in which they are attempting to meet the wants of those students by giving them teaching to do for half the day and substituting lectures at the Normal School for lectures at the University College—has been carried on for years past to such an extreme point that those students are losing the degree of university education—taking one thing among many—that they might get.

113. *The Chairman.*] But have we not provided for that in the report of last year?—Even so, in carrying the programme out the North Canterbury Board wishes to make such arrangements that it is hardly possible for many of the students to obtain the benefit of lectures at all at the University College.

114. *Mr. Hardy.*] Is it not a fact that the teachers in North Canterbury who have been trained in this school are men of as high attainments as any in New Zealand?—I referred only to the last few years.

115. *The Chairman.*] Now we come to clause 2 of the section. The clause that we have been dealing with relates to pupil-teachers entering a training college. Clause 2 does not?—No.

116. Is this a new suggested entrance?—There are a good many who have entered in Otago, and there have been a few this year in Canterbury, who have not been pupil-teachers, and some of them have been just the very people we are glad to get hold of in the teaching profession—those that have gone straight forward from school to a university degree. They are junior scholars of the University, some of them, and occupy other positions, and it would be very desirable to get them into the secondary or primary schools. They have gone into both in times past. Well, you must make some way for these people to get their training. It is universally agreed that it is desirable that all kinds of teachers should be trained in methods of teaching; and this provision was made to enable such persons who had not been pupil-teachers but who were desirable candidates—they would have to prove that they were to get their training.

117. I want to ask you a question dealing with the generality. You are speaking as an expert, and I want to know from you as an expert whether you think it advisable for us to aim in future at getting rid of entrance to a training college through the pupil-teacher system in favour of entrance direct from either the secondary school or the University?—I think that if we did away with pupil-teachers altogether we should make the biggest advance that we have ever made.

118. That being your opinion, is this clause 2 suggested in order to approach towards your ideal?—Yes, partly.

119. Your idea could not be carried out now, could it?—No.

120. It is practically impossible at the moment?—It could hardly be carried out at present. I know that it would cost a certain amount of money; but I think we should get a return for our money in increased efficiency.

121. This suggestion of yours is that persons should enter from a university college or after having gone through a junior scholarship examination and been at least one year at the University. Do you think that is a sufficiently easy entrance to encourage students to enter under this scheme?—“He shall have kept terms for at least one year at the University College or have gained credit at the Junior Scholarship Examination of the University.” I think it would admit all the best ones at present.

122. You would not suggest that a secondary-school boy who had matriculated should be allowed to come in under this clause 2?—I see another danger there. Some would be glad to get their university college fees paid, and in the absence of any bond to compel them to teach for a certain time they would be getting a university scholarship without paying.

123. *Mr. Baume.*] Assuming that the conditions were that they must have passed the Matriculation Examination and that they must enter into a bond, would not that be sufficient?—The only difference I would make between these students and ex-pupil-teachers would be this: On a report being made by the director of the training school, if necessary supported by an inspector of schools, that a candidate had proved himself unfit for teaching, in their judgment, he should not be allowed to continue. He has had no previous probation.

124. *The Chairman.*] Assuming that a boy had matriculated, and that his secondary-school master had accredited him and an inspector had also certified to the fact that he was likely to turn out a good teacher, would you offer inducements to that boy to go direct to the training college?—Yes, if there were a period of probation.

125. What probationary period do you suggest?—Not less than three months.

126. Three months at the training college ?—There is no reason why it should not be at the training college. No great harm would be done if one in twenty or one in twelve had to be sent away.

127. Would you consider it wise to modify this subsection 2 in that direction, or do you think this is a sufficient inducement ?—"Such conditions as to probation" is included here.

128. But this is more than Matriculation ; this is one year at the university or else a junior Scholarship Examination ?—I would not make it so as to keep out any pupil-teachers who had qualified.

129. Assuming that the pupil-teachers who were eligible to come in did not fill all the vacancies, would you modify this in order to get the vacancies filled ?—Yes, I would be quite willing to bring it down to the Matriculation.

130. Assuming that there were several pupil-teachers available, would you still suggest that boys should come in under clause 2 as you have got it, to the exclusion of certain pupil-teachers ?—No.

131. You say you must bring in all the pupil-teachers ?—All that qualify, yes, I think so. I think the colony is committed to training them.

132. Can you suggest any other method than this for getting towards your ideal of gradually doing away with the pupil-teacher system ?—I think the pupil-teacher regulations, if they are adopted, will make the first bridge.

133. That is one of the objects ?—Yes. It is as near as you can go within the present law.

134. I understand you to be very strong in your opinion and advice that gradually we should do away with the pupil-teacher system and train our teachers direct from the secondary schools or universities ?—Yes.

135. *Mr. Hardy.*] How much do you think the proposed change would cost—to do away with pupil-teachers, practically ?—I should not like to give an estimate at the moment. I did make an estimate, but I do not recollect what the amount was.

136. *Mr. Fowlds.*] Would it be £10,000 a year ?—More than that, I think, because you would have to put the substitutes down as junior teachers, and then you would have to raise the salaries of all the teachers above them. You could not leave half a dozen juniors all at the same salary. You could not put in all assistants at £80 instead of pupil-teachers.

137. *Mr. Hardy.*] Would you take a boy or a girl, and after examinations, train him or her in a two-years course ?—Not less than a two-years course.

138. And after that you would send them out as assistant teachers ?—Yes ; after they had passed a period of probation in the training colleges. They would have had practice in teaching while they were in the training colleges.

139. Do you not think it would enormously increase the cost ?—Not what I should call "enormously."

140. Had you that in your mind when you were raising, as you did a year or two ago, the pupil-teachers' salaries—that you wanted to bring up the expense of the pupil-teachers so that the increased cost in doing away with them would not be felt much ?—No. When I suggested an increase in pupil-teachers' remuneration I should not have thought it right to have any ulterior motive. I proposed the increase in pupil-teachers' salaries that was included in the Teachers' Salaries Act because I thought they were the minimum that ought to be paid in order to compete with other callings. I thought they were low enough. As a matter of fact they are not high enough now.

141. You know that you increased the salaries, and the reason why you increased them was because you thought the pupil-teachers were not getting enough, and whether you continued the pupil-teacher system or not you thought it only fair that they should get what was sufficient remuneration for the work ?—I should have given them more, but we were limited for teachers' salaries and Boards' expenses to £4 a head. We could not increase the salaries beyond a certain amount.

142. You cannot tell us from memory how much it would increase the cost if pupil-teachers were done away with ?—It would not take me very long to estimate it, but I am not prepared to say at the present moment what the cost would be.

143. *The Chairman.*] We will ask Mr. Hogben for a return showing that ?—Of course it would depend also on the increases given to the other teachers. It would depend on the amendments that were consequential in the Teachers' Salaries Act.

144. Would an amendment of the Act be required to do away with the pupil-teacher system ?—Yes ; although, legally, it could be done now. Any Board that liked could get rid of all its pupil-teachers immediately—an even number, at all events. Though it could be legally done now, I do not think a Board would venture to put at the bottom of any school a whole number of assistants at £80 a year, with no promotions for some of them for years. There is promotion in the case of pupil-teachers.

145. *Mr. Hardy.*] In addition to that a Board must make a provision for future teachers, filling up places vacated through women getting married and men going out of the calling ?—The training colleges would supply these. You would have to keep the numbers up either by means of the training college or by pupil-teachers. We are not quite ready yet to make the change. I was hoping that we were working towards it gradually, and, if nothing else had been done, I should myself have advised the Minister.

146. To what do you attribute the scarcity of teachers just now ?—The scarcity of male and female teachers together is not so great this year as it was two years ago.

147. To what do you attribute that ?—In my evidence before the Commission I said there would be a shortage of teachers for two or three years after the passing of the Act.

148. You think that difficulty might fairly be overcome now ?—No, it will be gradually overcome.

149. It is being gradually overcome ?—Yes.

150. There will not be the same shortage later on that there has been since the Act came into operation ?—It will gradually diminish, in fact it is diminishing quite fast enough. We do not want to go to the other extreme. It takes about one hundred and sixty teachers a year to supply the deficiency in the colony.

151. *The Chairman.*] Coming to the allowances to be made to students at the training college: Clause 2 says that the following allowances shall be paid: "For the first year—To those under clause 1"—that is, the pupil-teachers who enter the training college—"the salary and allowances of a fourth-year pupil-teacher, together with university college fees." How much does that come to approximately for each pupil-teacher? What are the salary and allowances of a fourth-year pupil-teacher?—For about three-fourths of the teachers the allowances would be £50, and fees about £6 or £8—together, about £56 a year for the majority of the pupil-teachers, and £5 a year more for those who are away from home.

152. How much would those in the town get?—Fifty-six pounds, and the others £61.

153. I suppose that is suggested because you do not want to put them on a worse footing while training at a college than they were on as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

154. Do you not think, especially with regard to the town ones, that the payments might be less, and that they would still be induced to come, the inducement being advancement in after-life?—That is a sort of thing which is rather difficult to tell without having experience, but I think it is quite possible.

155. You know what the Boards have said about it?—Yes.

156. How many students would be likely to come into the training colleges to keep up the supply of teachers?—Of course I drew this document up in order to bring in the number required. I think 160 all over the colony.

157. One hundred and sixty would keep up the supply?—Yes. Some people think that number is too high and some think it too low. The number I have set down is the mean of the different estimates.

158. How many of those would come in under clause 1 as pupil-teachers?—I think about 120.

159. And they would cost, say, from £56 to £61 a year each?—Yes.

160. Forty would come in under clause 2?—Yes, costing about £16 a year. Some of those would be second-year students. Those who did the second year would naturally satisfy clause 2. I reckoned that the cost would be £8,400 altogether for allowances to students.

161. That is for the first year. How can you modify those payments in the first year to provide something more for the second?—Of course you cannot at first give them all two years, or you will have another shortage. If you at once took all the ex-pupil-teachers and kept them out of the schools for two years you would have a shortage in the next two years, because you would cut short the supply for the ensuing years. In 1905, presumably, there would be 160 fresh teachers required in the colony; but there would be only, we will say, sixty or seventy that had been going to the training colleges, so that there would be ninety going straight from the schools. If you took those ninety and put them in the training college for two years you would cut short your supply for one year. Then if you kept them for two years you would take not only a year but the succeeding year, and it would be some time before you could recover the shortage. You would have to fill vacancies from the uncertificated teachers and semi-efficients. On this account the difficulty would have to be overcome gradually. You would hardly prevent a teacher going out who had spent only one year at the college if the Boards could not get teachers otherwise.

162. With regard to the salary for the first year, how would you modify this suggestion of yours to set free some money for the second year, more especially with reference to those living in towns?—There is a precedent that appears to work, and that is in connection with the University junior scholarships and the senior National Scholarships. The amount is £20 to a student not obliged to live away from home, and £50 to one who is. I think that is too low—£20 and £50.

163. What do you suggest for those living in the towns? What sum do you suggest between £20 and £56?—I think it should be not less than £30 and university fees.

164. And for those from the country?—I think logically you ought to add £30.

165. That would be £60 and fees?—Yes.

166. Would that take more money, or would it set some free?—It would set some free.

167. Do you think that £30 and university fees for a boy or girl in the town who had been a pupil-teacher for four years would be sufficient, together with the prospect of advancement in after-life, to induce them to come?—I am doubtful about it. I look at it in this way: Dunedin and Christchurch have offered just as good an inducement as that for some years and they have not got the young people. In North Canterbury it is £30 and £37 10s., and in Dunedin practically the same.

168. The amount suggested is sufficient for the country boy?—Yes.

169. What amount do you think would induce the town boy to offer?—If I had thought any less sum would induce him I should have put down a lower amount. It is rather difficult to get the elements to judge what would induce boys to come. It depends upon so many circumstances—on employment in other ways. I should not like to try the experiment myself with less than £40.

170. Very well, then, will you work it out on the £40 and £60 basis and let us know what it will be?—Yes.

171. And will you give us your estimate of what it would be under the proposals of your letter?—My estimate is £8,400. I can give that now.

172. What we want to get is the estimate of what this will work out at, at £40 and £60?—Yes.

173. "To those under clause 2, nil." That is, you propose to give nothing at all to those who have matriculated and who enter direct from the University or from a secondary school. Do you not think you should give some inducement to those lads to come in?—I think you should, but I did not see where the money was to come from. I had only a certain amount to go upon and I had to provide for all the pupil-teachers first. I reached the total without coming to those under clause 2. I suggest, at all events, university fees for them.

174. Is that sufficient to induce them to come ?—I do not think it is.

175. How much more do you think would be required to induce them ?—I think we should have to give them what we now propose to give in the second year.

176. That is £10 and university fees ?—Yes.

177. Will you work that out too ?—Yes.

178. "For the second year —To every student, whether under clause 1 or 2, who keeps terms at the university college during the second year, a bursary of £10 . . . together with university fees." In my opinion that is not sufficient to induce them to stay two years.

178A. What do you think would induce them to stay the second year ?—I think it should be not less than for the first year.

179. That is £40 and £60 ?—Yes.

180. Will you work that out too ?—Yes. If you offered that—but first of all you ought not to offer it to every one.

181. What do you mean by that ?—Some will show that they are practically not worth any more training at the end of one year.

182. You suggest there should be a selection after the first year ?—Yes.

183. How would you make that selection ? By examination, or how ?—It would be by examination and teaching-ability. I think the best way would be for the director—and his certificates would have much weight—the Inspector-General, and the inspectors to do it.

184. The Inspector-General, the local Inspector, and the head of the college should act together ?—Yes.

185. Should it be an oral examination, or written, or what ?—I think the literary examination in that particular case is not the most important part. I think the question is more one of training-experience, and so on. Consider one who had been a pupil-teacher for, say, four years, and had shown a certain amount of ability for, say, infant-school work, but was limited to that—and there are such people—if she had given most of her time in the training college to special work under the kindergarten mistress—which I suppose the training college to have—you would not want her to go and take a degree. It would not be advisable that she should waste her time and tire herself mentally by trying to do anything of the kind. There is a certain number to whom a second year's training would not be profitable, and it ought to be determined as to whether they should go on. The tribunal with whom the recommendation rested should be one capable of judging as far as possible ; it must be an expert one.

186. *Mr. Hardy.*] Would that be for the purpose of determining whether they should take up infant-school work ?—I took that as a special instance. There are other cases, but it is very pronounced in some cases like that. I do not think there would be very many. Then there would be some with whom nothing would be gained by going on for another year, and then there would be others that would not be willing to go on for another year.

187. Then this committee that had the power of deciding would be able to say that certain persons should be allotted work which would keep them in junior positions in the future, or really of sending them out as junior mistresses ?—I do not see how you could do that. The power of appointment rests with the local authorities, and I do not think it is desirable it should rest with anybody else. I think that whatever changes take place in New Zealand the appointment of teachers ought to remain with the local authorities. I do not see how you could continue that and allow any body of experts to earmark teachers for certain work. Let them say how the teacher is qualified, and let the Board decide.

188. Is it within your knowledge that some of the Boards expect their teachers to attain a certain state of proficiency before they appoint them to the better positions ?—Yes ; they are not very definite in the way they do it, but I believe that practically the action of the Board has that effect. They expect the teachers to show evidence of their fitness.

189. Is it your experience that the Boards do this or not—your experience of appointments generally ?—My immediate experience of the North Canterbury Board is that the appointments are on the whole very good.

190. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the second year at the training college, you said you thought it might be advisable to pay £40 to the town teacher in training and £60 to the country one. Do you wish me to infer that you suggest that that should be paid in the second year to the boys or girls who had entered under clauses 1 and 2, or would you make a distinction between those entering under clause 1 and clause 2 in the second year, one having been a pupil-teacher and the other not ?—I do not think I would increase it under clause 2 in the second year. The North Canterbury Board years ago had great difficulty with the teachers leaving after being trained.

191. You would leave it ?—Yes.

192. You suggest that for those who come under clause 2 in the first year it should be £10 and the University fees, and in the second year the same ?—Yes.

193. *Mr. Hardy.*] In order to get over the difficulty that you referred to, would you not take a bond ?—The North Canterbury Board used to have a bond.

194. It might work if a bond were entered into that a student who did not continue would refund the expense of his training, and in addition pay something for the inconvenience which the Department would have to suffer through his going out ?—It would not even get back what you gave, because to train each teacher would cost a good deal more than he would refund ; there is the whole maintenance of the staff. Each college would cost £2,500 besides the allowances to students.

195. *The Chairman.*] You will prepare us a table, Mr. Hogben, showing the cost of carrying out these suggestions, so that we may get at the cost under the new proposals and under your proposals contained in this letter ?—I will. I may say that the bond did not succeed before—in fact, the pressure of public opinion was such that you could not enforce a bond.

196. *The Chairman.*] Subsection 2 provides for two years' training. You suggest that a committee might be set up to examine at the end of the first year and advise as to those who should go on to the second year's course ?—Yes.

197. What have you got to say about a three-years course?—I do not think you should make provision for that just now.

198. Did not the Committee suggest that secondary-school teachers should be trained at the college also?—Yes.

199. Would not a secondary-school teacher want a three-years course?—He would want a shorter course than the others.

200. It is not suggested that he should go in with a university degree, is it?—No, but he will not have a chance of securing an appointment in a secondary school if he has not a university degree.

201. What course of training do you suggest for him?—I should suggest generally for the secondary-school teacher, if he were marked out as such—which I do not think desirable—one year. That is all they suggest in England, or in the New South Wales report.

202. One year—when?—After the university course.

203. *Mr. Foulds.*] It would not matter whether it was after or before?—No.

204. *The Chairman.*] You suggest one year in the training college?—If a young person were marked out for a secondary school-teacher and had already practically made up his mind, one year would be quite sufficient. He would not go through all the work that the others would. He would go through lectures on education; he would have to take practice, and he would spend a good deal of time in the district-high-school classes of the normal school.

205. If those coming in under subsection 2 enter as you suggest here, I presume two years would be sufficient for them in the training college?—Yes.

206. Supposing we were to reduce the qualification to the simple matriculation, would the two years in the training college be sufficient?—Yes, I think so. I do not think that, as far as the training college is concerned, they should get more than two years.

207. You think we would get efficient teachers if they went from the matriculation to the training colleges for two years?—Yes. If you considered doing away with the pupil-teacher's course the question would have to be considered whether a pupil-teacher should be taken away from his secondary school a little earlier and given three years at a training college, or whether he should be kept on a little longer and given two years. That depends on these continuation scholarships at the secondary schools. At first the winners of them get two years' free education, and then they get two or three years after that up to the age of nineteen. It would depend on how that worked out.

208. Then you think that meanwhile this is more or less experimental?—Necessarily.

209. Within a few years all this should be revised?—Yes, I think so, when we see what the supply is.

210. The next thing that we come to is the curriculum: We understand that you suggest that it should include the several branches of the subject of education, a special course of kindergarten work, and science for public schools, and so on. Do you include nature-study in that?—Yes.

211. There is no need for us to put in nature-study specially?—No.

212. "Science" will include nature-study?—Yes.

213. You have nothing further to suggest about the curriculum?—No. I do not see any harm in putting nature-study in.

214. I think it is advisable to put it in in order to satisfy some people who are interested in agricultural training?—I would go further than that and say "nature-study and elementary agriculture." It would then read "Science, including nature-study and elementary agriculture."

215. Now, with regard to the staff: We would like to get in detail what the staff is that you suggest, and what the cost of it would be?—Mr. Hardy will remember that that was one of the things that were discussed at Christchurch, and it was discussed on the same basis at Dunedin. I myself would prefer a school of 250, but I recognise that local circumstances may make it desirable to have a larger one, so I have drawn up a table of the staffing and salaries for a school of 420. Christchurch now wants to increase it beyond that.

216. What do you suggest?—This table that I have prepared is for a school of 420, including forty district-high-school pupils—forty secondary pupils. One of the conditions was "In order to allow training colleges to prepare teachers for district-high-school and other secondary work, clause 35 of the Standard Regulations should be amended as to the second paragraph by inserting after the words 'district high school' the words 'and in schools attached to training colleges.'" That was so as to allow district high schools to be established. That allows two things, that those going to be teachers in district high schools may be trained in secondary work, and that secondary teachers may be trained too.

217. *Mr. Hardy.*]—How would that work? It would open two district high schools in Christchurch, for instance—I am just taking that as a case?—My opinion is that that would be a mistake. It would be overlapping. Moreover, district high schools are not suitable for large towns.

218. *Mr. Hardy.*] You are providing a staff for a training college with a district high school in it of forty?—Yes.

219. And is there a model school as well?—Yes.

220. Of how many?—Forty.

221. A model school of forty, a district high school of forty, and a total number of 420?—A total of 460. There are two schools. There is the district high school of 420, there being forty secondary pupils in it. The district high school is the whole thing, including the primary and the secondary pupils. Then there is a model school of forty, which is the largest model school with a sole teacher you can have under the Public-school Teachers' Salaries Act.

222. *Mr. Hardy.*] Why call it a "district high school"? Would it not be better to call it a "training college"—of 420 having a model school, and, if necessary, a district high school, attached?—I had to bring it under the Public-school Teachers' Salaries Act, and so I have framed this in order to bring it under the Act and the allowances that are already made under it.

223. *The Chairman.*] It is a school of 460 practically. What are they ?—Three hundred and eighty are primary scholars in the main part of the school. Then there are forty secondary pupils.

224. That is the district high school ?—Those two together make it “a district high school.”

225. And there is the model school of forty ?—Yes. Really under the Act there are two schools, the district high school of 420 and the model primary school of forty.

226. *Mr. Hardy.*] A district high school of 420 ?—Yes.

227. And yet that is doing primary work ?—Yes, every district high school does primary work. A district high school under the Act is a primary school that has other classes for secondary work, but the primary work must be carried on intact as well as the secondary work.

228. But the district high schools are not carried on separately from the primary schools ?—No.

229. *The Chairman.*] We know what is meant. It does not matter to us what the name is ?—In complying with the Act it was not open to me to take any other terms than those which are recognised.

230. The Act could be altered if necessary ?—I do not think there would be much gained by altering the Act in that particular. There would be only a difference in names. Well, in drawing up this table I have arranged the allowances under five columns. The first one shows the salaries that are payable under the Public-school Teachers' Salaries Act, and the second one other allowances. Underneath that in the second column I have placed other grants that would be available, so as to get in the first column the total grants that would be available as salaries or allowances.

231. That is under the existing law ?—Yes.

232. It is all available now ?—Yes. The director under the Act would get a salary of £300. He is put down as the headmaster of that school. I give him an allowance of £160 because it is a normal school.

233. Is that £160 under the law too ?—No, not under statute ; that is out of the £600 granted by Parliament last year. The grant was made up of £600 for each college. The figures were before the Committee last year. There was the special grant of £600 for each college and another grant of £100 for the lecturer, and allowances for students. Then I have set down for him £100 as a lecturer on education and £40 house allowance under the Act, giving him a total income in salary and allowances of £600.

234. How much of that is additional to what the law already provides ?—£260.

235. But the £100 is already provided by law ?—It is provided by a vote of the House, and so is this £160.

236. There is no addition to what is already provided by vote of the House or by law ?—That is so—in fact, the whole of this is within that.

237. There are no additions then ?—Well, last year of course only a portion was taken. This is a scheme for spending what the House has voted. I should like to increase some of the items. The second master would be really the acting-headmaster in a place like this as far as the children were concerned. The director would never have anything to do with the children.

238. Which would be the method master ?—The second master, and he would be the one who would have to deal with the parents of the children. You would probably call him the “method master” or give him some name that would not cause him to be confused with the director. You might even call him “headmaster.” Two hundred and five pounds is the salary under the Act. Because it is a normal school, I put down £75 additional. Then he would be the lecturer on methods (assisting the principal), and you would give him £50 for that, making a total of £330.

239. That is rather low, is it not ?—I think so, but it is more than he is being paid now. The mistress would get £135 under the Act. On account of its being a normal school there would be £40 more, and as lecturer or instructor—she would have to give some special course in kindergarten work—I have set down £25, making a total of £200. I should like to see her get £240, or something like that. For the assistant master there would be £110 ; because of its being a normal school, £65 ; as lecturer on elementary science—for he would have to take them through the course suitable for public schools that was not taken at the university college—£25, making a total of £200.

240. *Mr. Hardy.*] I should think that would be hardly enough ?—I quite agree with you. The man next in standing would be the secondary-school master, because he would have to be the special tutor, but he is not the secondary-school master : he will really be the fourth in position—the third after the director. The next three are juniors, because you must make up the staffing of the school—you have no pupil-teachers—so that they can do without students altogether if the latter go to lectures. Instead of giving the three juniors £100, £80, and £80, I have increased the amounts by £20 each, so as to give them £120, £100, and £100. Some of the students you would want to manage the classes, and a good many would be glad to stay on for another year—for instance, if they were attending the university college.

241. *The Chairman.*] That is the lot for a school of 420 ?—That entirely satisfies the Teachers' Salaries Act in regard to staffing, in fact it is stronger, because of their being all adults. The assistant master for the secondary pupils would get £270 under the regulations under the Act and £30 as lecturer, or a special tutor, making £300. The model-school master would get £155, £40 extra because of its being a normal school, £25 for elementary agriculture, and £20 house allowance, making £240. He takes the agricultural instruction. He would have to show how he would work in connection with the small schools. The other allowances besides those under the Act are—district-high-school allowances and grant £270 ; for manual and technical instruction £150—this is already mentioned in the circular ; the capitation under the Manual and Technical Education Act would amount to about £125 ; lecturer on education £100—that is out of the grant of £600 already provided for each training college ; and drill, £25, under the regulations, making a total of £2,580.

242. That is already allowed?—Yes. Besides the moneys allowed I would allow £25 for special instruction in woodwork, £25 for cooking, £50 for drawing, and £50 for singing. That makes an expenditure of £2,520, but I find I have £60 to spare. I did not notice that the house allowances were not included in the allowances under the Teachers' Salaries Act.

243. We understand that for that school all the money is now provided either by vote or by law?—Yes.

244. With respect to the smaller schools, there would be some modification of that, would there not? You suggest they should be smaller?—It would still absorb the whole of the grant. The only difference would be that under the Public-school Teachers' Salaries Act.

245. The cost of the training colleges would be four times the amount you have mentioned?—You cannot say that it would be four times that, because more than half of that is provided to teach those teachers under the Public-school Teachers' Salaries Act—a good deal more than half of it. The only extra cost that you would have to provide would be the £700, and I have not included students' allowances.

246. *Mr. Hardy.* The proposal is to go on as we are doing in Christchurch and Dunedin for a time, and then to establish training colleges at Auckland and Wellington. Would you have the existing colleges brought down to 250?—I would let the arrangements stand as they are. I proposed to the Minister that they should stand for three years. In three years the matter would have to be revised in any case.

247. *The Chairman.* As to the two new ones, we made a recommendation that they should consist of 250. You still adhere to that opinion, I suppose?—Yes, I think 250 is a good number.

248. *Mr. Hardy.* My impression is, as we are able to do this work, and do it well, in a school of 400, that there would be no harm to have a school of 420 at Auckland and Wellington, and by that means economize the teaching?—I will tell you what the objection is to making the school larger. You must not forget your duties to the children in the school, and if you have a school of 420 the man who is the acting-headmaster—who is also the method master—will have to devote more of his attention to the individual children.

249. *The Chairman.* Would it not be well for us to experiment with a smaller school in the new districts and test the one against the other?—A good many experiments have been made all over the world.

250. And the tendency has been to have smaller schools?—Yes.

251. *Mr. Fowlds.* How would the salaries work out with the smaller school, because of course you would not have the same fundamental salaries?—The figures are the same for a 250 school, but you would not require such a big staff for the smaller number of children.

252. *The Chairman.* Would you put the director down at the same amount?—Yes.

*The Chairman:* Will you submit us a return showing the staffing and salaries for a school of 250 and for one of 420?

*Mr. Hardy:* Will you also show on the return the cost per head of the children at the school in each case?

253. *Mr. Fowlds.* Mr. Hardy wants to make out that it will cost more per head of the children attending a school of 250 than it will per head of the children attending a school of 420?—It would, a fraction.

254. *Mr. Hardy.* I want to see that fraction?—The difference is not much when you pass 200 in attendance. I will let you have the return.

255. *The Chairman.* Have you anything further to enlighten us upon, Mr. Hogben, or do you think you have given us what you can about this matter?—Of course I am prepared to give any other facts that I can, but I do not know that I wish to say anything more.

256. Are there any other facts really pertinent to the question that you think we have not got a grip of?—I think I have made clear the connection between the pupil-teacher regulations and the training colleges.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,675 copies), £10 14s.

*Price 9d.]*

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1904.

