the educational affairs of the Dominion. The districts might well be the present University districts. We think that the election should be on a popular basis, instead of by School Committees. We think that these Boards might control primary, secondary, and technical education within their district, and that the qualified teachers may be moved from one kind of school to another if considered necessary—that is, from the primary to the secondary schools, or from the primary to the technical, and *vice versa*. The advantage of having the secondary schools as well as the primary under the control of one Board would be that it would give some unity to the scheme of education. At present it is more or less disjointed. It would also give the teachers a broader outlook. If a man passed through a primary school to a secondary, or from a secondary to a primary school, he would naturally have a wider outlook on educational problems. The abolition of the small districts, with their office staffs, and so on, would save money, and the formation of larger districts would give teachers some equality of opportunity for promotion—an equality that does not exist at the present time. We did not consider clause 6 of the order of reference in regard to overlapping and duplication. As to clause 7 of the order of reference, we would suggest a liberal subsidy to local voluntary contributions towards primary education such as now is given in the case of technical schools and district high schools. I might quote a case in point. In my district we collected £110 for the improvement of the schoolgrounds recently, and the Education Board were good enough to give us a grant of £1 for £1 up to £100, but they thought that they were treating us in a rather excessively liberal way. I think that if the Department encouraged local effort of that kind, it would result in a saving to the Department in the long-run, and it would also arouse local interest in the welfare of the school. As to clause 9 in regard to the syllabus, I have a good deal to say. First of all, we think that no subject has any right to a place in the syllabus unless it is of value both educationally and practically. I should like to make clear that by "practical" I do not mean "technical." We do not want to produce tradesmen in the primary school. By practical I mean the subject should have an intimate relation to the life of the child, and his future career, as well. I should like to add at this point to what Mr. Campbell said: that we in Auckland are strong believers in this syllabus. The faults with which it has been blamed are nearly always the faults of interpretation, but like every other human product it is capable of improvement. There are a few suggestions here. I quote now from the report of the New Zealand Educational Institute, 1910. This is a report of a committee of the Institute of which I happen to be the convener, dealing with matters connected with this syllabus. Under the heading of "English" there is a suggestion that in the subject of writing encouragement should be given to the acquirement of facility in conjunction with legibility. There is a feeling that much school writing at the present time is more drawing or engraving than writing. It is done so painfully slowly. We are not anxious to see poorer writing, but we wish quicker writing, and we think there should not be much difference between a child's writing test and the writing he does in his composition exercise, for instance. It would be better to have less perfect writing fixed and a more perfect specimen of penmanship in his ordinary written work.

8. Can you supply a few concrete illustrations of the work done under the syllabus in your school to show what is actually done?—Yes; as a matter of fact, I aim at this in my own school. In Standard VI, which I have just been examining lately, I can think of one child who wrote seven pages of paper of foolscap size in an hour and a quarter in a composition exercise, and it was all good, clear writing—not, of course, as good as the writing test, but as near to it as you could expect. That, of course, was the best in the class. I do not say the whole class could do that, or anything like it. We aim at getting speed as well as beauty of form. There has been a good deal of talk about the question of technical terms in connection with grammar. This is the finding of the committee I speak of: "That in examination tests there is no objection to the employment of the technical grammatical terms used in the present syllabus, provided that formal definitions of these be not required." Under the old system the examination in grammar consisted very largely in requiring definitions to be learned in the period, and that was often done without any real understanding of what was being done. We feel that when a child has an idea, for instance, of an adjective clause, it is a proper thing that the child should have a word to express that idea, but we do not think the child should be required to give a clear logical scientific definition of every word he uses. Now, the work in arithmetic we are all agreed requires readjustment. We have a fairly long report on this particular subject. It is very much on the lines of Mr. Hogben's own suggestions: "(*a.*) That the syllabus in arithmetic should be reduced, and also recast, so that the burden of work may be more equally distributed among the standards. In this connection attention is directed to the great amount of arithmetic demanded by the New Zealand syllabus as compared with the requirements of the English Board of Education, and is of opinion that education in the Dominion would gain considerably if a syllabus approximating to scheme B (England) were adopted. (*b.*) That the heavy arithmetic syllabus frequently interferes with the general progress of the pupils, as the work in other subjects is often retarded by the undue amount of attention given to arithmetic. (*c.*) That since it is not advisable to attempt to teach the whole subject in primary schools, technical schools, or individual effort outside of school. (*d.*) That since education should aim at adjusting individuals to their environment, arithmetical exercises should be drawn from the actual surroundings of the children, should be in the form used in daily life, should be taught practically, and should be suited to the age of the pupils. (*e.*) That the foundation of success in this subject is unremitting practice in mechanical operations connected with commercial and everyday life, especially mental work. (*f.*) That accuracy, speed, and neatness in mechanical work must be aimed at in all classes. (*g.*) That up to and including Standard VI, the greater part—say, 60 per cent.—of the examination should be mechancial, and should include concrete examples. Tables should be carefully and practically taught. (*h.*) That in Standards I and II only one principle should be introduced