

45. Would you favour local rating for the purpose of providing to some extent for the building and upkeep of the schools?—It prevails in other countries—in England and Germany. There is a threefold source of revenue—the pupils pay fees, the Municipality exacts a school-rate, and the State makes a grant.

46. Do you think it would tend to increase the efficiency of the system if local rating were brought into operation?—It depends entirely upon the amount of the rating.

47. Would it not increase the interest taken in secondary education by the people themselves if they had to provide for it directly?—It does in other countries, and it should here.

48. And are you in favour of subsidizing the amounts raised locally?—I think that ultimately it must come to that in New Zealand. That is my personal opinion, but I have not gone into the matter from the statistical point of view.

49. *The Chairman.*] Have you done so from the economic point of view?—I cannot say I have. I know that the general feeling is against local rating.

50. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think that is because it is not thoroughly understood?—I think it would have to be made clear, if there is to be local rating, that the ratepayers will have a *quid pro quo* in the reduction of general taxation. I think they will have to understand that.

51. Do you favour the co-ordination of the primary and secondary systems—that is to say, placing them under one local body?—Provided that the secondary teachers would have a much wider outlook than they have now—that they would be eligible for inspectorships, for headmaster-ships of primary schools, positions in the training colleges, and higher positions generally.

52. Do you not think that that result would follow?—It should follow. The system should be one organic whole, if possible.

53. Would not that also lead to the primary and secondary teachers being brought more into touch with one another?—Yes. I think that one of the unfortunate drawbacks at present is the want of that touch.

54. At present the Superannuation Act provides annuities for both primary and secondary school teachers?—Yes.

55. Is it not probable that the primary and secondary teachers of New Zealand would form one association, such as the New Zealand Educational Institute, if the co-ordination were brought about?—That would be the natural result, I think.

56. *Mr. Hogben.*] In speaking of the cost of secondary education in England and Germany, did you not take Dr. Garnett's figures?—Yes.

57. Do they not include interest on the money borrowed for buildings?—I could not say. The figures are given in the appendix to the report I have quoted from.

58. Is that included in your £15?—There is another heading, "Cost of Maintenance." It is not clear from the report.

59. Did you take the New Zealand figures from Table K, in Parliamentary Paper E.—6, 1911, net income from endowments and cost per head, page 17?—The figures I gave were the amounts spent in 1910.

60. Do those figures include the cost of buildings?—I do not know that that is clear from the report.

61. What is the heading of the table?—I understand that the figures I gave were the expenditure on salaries and maintenance.

62. *The Chairman.*] Would you dispute Mr. Hogben's suggestion that they do not include buildings?—The figures I gave provide merely for the payment of teachers and office expenditure.

63. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you know the definition of "net annual endowment"?—I do not. I find it very difficult to get a clear idea from the returns, owing to the extent to which technicalities are used.

64. Do you know that in Prussia the figures include building, and the interest on the loans for buildings?—No.

65. When you give Professor Sadler's opinion as to the average salary you quote from his Essex report, I believe. You say that the salary should be £300?—His statement is that the minimum salary of a secondary-school teacher in his prime should be £300.

66. Do you remember what he says is the actual salary?—I know it is very much less.

67. Is it as good as that in New Zealand?—Taking the actual money payment, I do not think there is very much difference. Taking the cost of living, I think there has been an improvement in recent years.

68. Have you any figures to show what the salaries are?—No.

69. You say that in Germany there is an average of from twenty to twenty-five pupils per teacher?—Yes.

70. What secondary schools have you taken?—I will give you several secondary schools.

71. Are you counting every teacher as teaching the whole time?—I am taking full-time teachers only.

72. Is there one teacher to twenty pupils?—Yes.

73. Dividing the number of pupils by the number of full-time teachers?—Yes.

74. Is that a fair way? Would it not be fairer to take the number of teachers available at one time, and divide by them?—I do not think so. Here is the case of the Realgymnasium at Weimar.

75. Is not the average time of that school thirty-two hours per week?—Yes.

76. What is the average time for which the teachers teach?—One teacher, the director, eleven to twelve hours a week; the teachers of classics, twenty hours per week; class teachers, twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-two, twenty-three, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three, twenty-three, twenty-one; the drawing teacher, twenty-four; the gymnastics teacher, twenty-four.

77. If you take most of those teachers it would be fair to say that they teach twenty-one hours out of thirty-two a week, or about two-thirds of the school time?—Yes.