

68. Would you judge, then, that most of the students simply take it up with the idea of making it a profession?—I think the majority of the degree students will take it up with the idea of becoming teachers in this country.

69. What percentage would you say take any of the classes simply with the idea of improving their own homes?—Taking them as a whole I should think the majority would. That is the case in America.

70. Have you any idea as to whether these classes have greatly affected the life of the people in America?—People there consider that they have. From my own personal experience I am not in a position to say. I was just passing through.

71. Did you hear any comments as to whether the social and domestic life of the people had improved as the result of these classes?—All I can say is that I never heard the existence of these classes or courses criticized. I never heard any one objecting to them, and I know that the feeling in favour of them has been steadily growing.

72. You could not, I suppose, give us any idea as to how many students afterwards marry?—No, I am afraid I could not.

73. Was it your own impression that most of those who took the degree course, at any rate, remained single?—No, I do not think they did. I know several cases where they did marry.

74. It seems to me that this whole question is one that is worth our following up, and naturally we want to have details from men who have seen the thing in operation for years. To whom could we apply for this detailed information?—I do not think you could do better than apply to Professor Robertson.*

75. What is his address?—His address was the McDonald College at Montreal, but he has left there. He was the head of that for some time until he had put it on a good working basis. I should think that "Professor Robertson, Ottawa," would find him, or "Care of the Agricultural Department." He is such a very well-known man in Canada that a letter sent to any of the Departments would get to him.

FRIDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1913.

Professor PICKEN examined. (No. 2.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Do you wish to give evidence in connection with the petition you have presented from the College?—Yes.

2. I should like to say that all the members of the Committee have before them the minutes of evidence taken two years ago, in which Professors Hunter, Von Zedlitz, Laby, Kirk, and Easterfield gave evidence on this subject, and I should like you to avoid if possible traversing the ground covered. Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes. Our main object this morning is to put the case as forcibly as we can for the setting-up of a strong Royal Commission to investigate into university education in New Zealand, and provide the Legislature with a scheme for reforming it upon the most modern lines possible under the conditions of this country. It is impossible for us to enter into the question of the Inspector-General's report to-day; our evidence in that connection is in course of preparation, but it cannot be put before you until next week. My colleague, Professor Hunter, will speak on the development of the university reform movement since evidence was last put before this Committee, and Professor Von Zedlitz will put before you some principles drawn from the most recent Royal Commission report on university education—viz., the report of the Haldane Commission on the University of London. It is our object, so far as may be possible, to avoid in any way repeating evidence put before the Education Committee in 1911. I shall take it that copies of that evidence, and copies of the pamphlet "University Reform in New Zealand," are available for the information of members of this Committee. I trust also that steps will be taken to provide members of the Committee with copies of the publications of the Haldane Commission on University Education in London. The contention to which I wish to confine my statement is that a Royal Commission is the only possible way of dealing with this question, and that a Royal Commission will only be effective if it includes one eminent man who has had experience on some of the Royal Commissions that have in recent years inquired into British university education. There can be no doubt that if the New Zealand Government approached the matter through the Imperial Government the right man would be found to preside over such an inquiry. The problems that have to be solved are of such a kind as can only be solved by a special tribunal, absolutely impartial and specially qualified for the work, concentrating entirely for a certain period on the task. Each of the colleges has been allowed to grow up as local circumstances might direct, quite independently of the others, and only checked by extremely straitened finances and by the influence of the University examinations—both checks of such a kind as to nullify all the undoubted advantages of independence. Lack of funds has induced governing bodies at times to make inferior provision for the teaching of important subjects, a practice which is encouraged by the fact that the only recognized test of the work done is the degree examination of the University. The colleges have been tempted rather to provide that for which there is always strong demand—viz., coaching for external examinations—than to give a much-needed lead to the public in intellectual matters. Their solvency—indeed, their very existence—has been involved in the relation of their students to an examination which might be (or, rather, necessarily is) highly inimical to the best class of university work being done by them. If it appears at any

* The best authorities on home-science teaching to apply to for information in the United States of America would be Mr. Richards, School of Technology, Boston, or Dr. Russell, Head of the Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York. In England I would recommend Professor Smithells, Leeds University, or Professor Cyril Jackson, London University.—JOHN STUDDHOLME.