

95. How much further would you go?—I would leave to the education authorities the question as to whom free education should be given.

96. Have they not fixed the standard of free education when giving a bursary?—It would be fixed, I suppose, on the recommendation of the professors.

97. *The Chairman.*] You said you were prepared to admit that there were more free students than you thought at the present time. We admit all those who come up to a pass with credit in the Junior Scholarship examination: do you want a lower standard than that?—No.

98. Even if two thousand come up to that standard they get free education. Are you satisfied that existing conditions go far enough now that you understand what they mean?—I am very nearly satisfied, but fancy my knowledge of existing conditions is still behindhand.

99. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you not think £60 and fees for scholarships is adequate?—Yes. I had £45, and had to pay fees and my board out of that.

100. Some one asked you if you thought one Royal Commission would be sufficient, or whether you required a Commission for primary, secondary, and university education. You gave evidence about co-ordination and overlapping, and said you did not believe in overlapping. Do you look upon education from the primary school to the university as practically one system?—That is how I look at it. I wish all to be co-ordinated.

101. You think they all rely upon each other?—Yes.

102. Then, would not one Commission be able to meet that?—I think I weakened somewhat when being questioned on that point.

103. You as a university man would not argue that we could build up a university without a foundation leading up from the primary school?—Certainly not.

104. So that the whole is one system?—Yes.

105. I think you said education was costly: were you referring to the cost to the State or to the student?—To the State, in university equipment, libraries, &c.

106. You said you did not believe in fees being paid to professors: what influenced you in saying that?—There have been some statements made—I do not know on what authority—about professors in the Senate regulating examinations, and so forth, so as to bring a number of students to their classes for the sake of the fees.

107. Do you think that might happen?—I think it might.

108. Have you any other reason to give?—I think the main reason is that the professors' salaries should not vary. I think they should be put on the same footing—whether the class is popular or not, the professor should not suffer in salary.

109. Does the payment of fees create a distinction in salaries?—Yes. I think the salaries should be regulated by the governing bodies.

110. You were speaking about technical education, and you are a scientifically trained man yourself. Have you much knowledge of the technical education provided in New Zealand and the general organization of it?—No, not as organized under the Education Department. My knowledge was gained chiefly in the School of Mines. I taught in the Thames and Waihi Schools of Mines for nine years.

111. What is your idea of the training there?—In some of the subjects it is good and in other cases inefficient. That is partly caused by the external examinations. The teachers cannot teach the subject as they would like, but teach to a syllabus and to the needs imposed by the examinations.

112. With regard to scientific mining you were advocating specialization: do you think there is room in New Zealand for two University Schools of Mines?—Decidedly not.

113. You think it is a waste of money to have two?—Yes; there are not the students for them. There are not really sufficient students for one under present conditions. I speak of the University Schools of Mines.

114. Do you think we are getting good value out of the Schools of Mines on the goldfields?—Yes; I believe in having them in the mining centres.

115. This is your remark in your statement: "If the external examination is to be retained, then the class examination ought to be abolished"?—Yes, that is what I said.

116. If the class examination is to be abolished, will that not make the position different from the point of view of what is advocated in the pamphlet by the Reform Association?—What I mean is that there should be no class examination immediately before the degree examination.

117. If you abolish the class examination what check will you have on the student from the point of view of the teacher with regard to his degree or scholarship?—There would be practically none. The responsibility would be thrown on the external examiner.

118. Would not that make things worse?—It might.

119. Is it not argued now that the local college examination is one means by which the teacher himself has some influence upon the degree or the scholarship that the student may get?—A professor can prevent a student from sitting for his examination if he likes, but he cannot possibly give him his degree.

120. But he has some influence on the degree?—He has a negative influence.

121. Would you abolish that negative influence?—Yes, if I were a professor I would not like to have that influence only. I would pass every student I possibly could—from kindness of heart perhaps.

122. Do you think that is done?—I think so. I know a case of a student who failed in Latin, but he was given a pass on the condition that he did not sit for Latin in his degree examination. He sat for Latin, however, and passed.

123. Then you do not look with much faith upon this class of examination?—No. It is mainly owing to the strain on the student caused by these two examinations coming close together that I object to it.