

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.