

204. But the moment she gets married you dismiss her?—I do not say so.

205. As you propose to differentiate salaries for man and woman, why not do so in the case of pupil-teachers?—Because in that case the allowance is below a living-wage.

206. Do you think it would be better to give a larger salary and employ better teachers in smaller schools, by requiring them to teach up to, say, 40 pupils?—I hold very strongly that we should keep down the number that we give to the unassisted teacher. Keep the number down as low as we can, and by doing so we benefit a large number of schools. You could not reduce the number of classes to less than five classes if you had children from five to fifteen years, and it is a great strain on the teacher; and not only that, but I think we should give the best teaching to these children in schools of from 20 to 35, where there are 12,948 children.

207. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many schools?—483.

208. *Mr. Hill.*] Supposing women were to be employed in schools below 35, what saving would there be on the two scales?—I do not know exactly, though, speaking roughly, the saving would be about £3,840—that is, by employing women in all schools between 20 and 35.

209. *Mr. Stewart.*] That amount would be a saving between the two modes of staffing the schools?—Yes.

210. *Mr. Hill.*] You propose to add an assistant in the case of every school where the average attendance exceeds 35?—Yes.

211. Would it be possible, do you think, to work such a school with two female teachers—a principal teacher and a lady assistant—instead of a male principal teacher with an assistant?—Well, it depends on what is expected of the teacher. The teacher now is expected to teach drill, and it is evident that the drill of the boys would not be so efficient under the average female teacher as in the case of the male teacher.

212. You want males to teach calisthenics?—To teach drill; and then there is the teaching of woodwork, which you could not expect of the average female teacher. Manual instruction should be co-ordinated with the other subjects of the syllabus; and, taking these things into consideration, I think perhaps it is better to lay down the general rule that there should be a male assistant if possible—that is, where there is a female head-teacher.

213. Do you think it possible to adopt any other plan in order to produce efficiency in these schools—say, raising the school-age to six or seven years, and increasing the capitation allowance in the same proportion?—I should not be prepared to recommend raising the school-age. I did think so at one time, but experience has shown me that it would not do. It would mean practically reducing the numbers and reducing the school-life of a child. There would have to be an increased capitation.

214. If you have £100,000 capitation, assuming that you took out 10,000 children, that takes away £40,000, and you simply say that the remaining children would have to produce that money: would it not strengthen the schools?—If you have a scheme founded on any capitation you are met by the fact that you cannot get an efficient teacher below a certain minimum. If you reduce the number of children per school you are at the same time increasing the expense per head.

215. In your tabulation, except between 250 and 300, you increase the staff as follows: For each increase of 30 in average attendance, one pupil-teacher; for each increase of 60, one assistant. Is this proposal better than is now found in any of the education districts?—The education districts are not quite uniform. Some districts are much more liberal than others. In schools under 300 the numbers proposed would be 50 and 25.

216. Below 300 you give an assistant for every 50?—Yes.

217. Then, is your proposal better?—It is more liberal on the whole.

[*Mr. Hill's* further examination of *Mr. Hogben* was deferred until the reassembling of the Commission in Wellington.]

THURSDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1901.

*Mr. HOGBEN's* examination continued.

[*Mr. Hogben* handed in a return—Exhibit 10.]

218. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] *Mr. Hogben*, I think you expressed the opinion, on more occasions than one, that you considered the teachers were required to do at the present time rather too much work: do you consider that 35 to 36 pupils are enough for a sole teacher—you have not considered that a large majority of the teachers will be willing to do more work than what your proposed scale sets out, in order to get higher pay?—I should like to say, in regard to the first part of the question, it is not so much that the teachers are doing more work than they should do, it is because of the large number each teacher has that the work assumes too much of a mechanical form. I do not think they are doing more work than we should expect them to do, or more than they expect to do. Generally speaking, teachers belong to an industrious profession; I think they are doing a very reasonable amount of work. The character of the teaching becomes more mechanical on account of the larger number of pupils; it is not the effect alone on the teacher, but the effect on the pupils.

219. How do you account for the fact of there being so few male teachers in the service at the present time? Is it not on account of the cheapness of female teachers, the inclination of Boards to appoint female teachers, and the fact that very few avenues are open to girls?—There are several causes; the last cause you indicated is perhaps the greatest of all. The phenomenon itself is by no means peculiar to New Zealand or the United Kingdom; it is not peculiar to English-speaking people, but it is a general movement all the world over that the proportion of female teachers is tending to increase. I would quote the remark made by the Hon. E. Lyttelton, president of the Headmasters' Association (?), in January last. He said it was the privilege of a