

a headmaster who is a highly paid official should be paid in respect of the infants in his school, because all that he does, as far as infants are concerned, one man could do for ten schools. There is a great deal of waste of power in that direction.

46. You favour placing Inspectors in charge of districts. Having established your Inspector in the outfield, and kept him there for two years, would you not draw him nearer to the centre?—Two years would not be enough.

47. Then, would you gradually allow him to come nearer until he should become eligible for appointment to a suburban area, and ultimately to a metropolitan area?—I would not suggest that the man sent to an outfield area should have had no experience in the metropolitan area. He should have a wide experience. I only indicate in the scheme the general principle upon which I would organize an inspectorate. The key-note to the question is that each Inspector should be responsible for his district, which he is not at present.

48. Do you favour grading them and gradually promoting the man from the out-district until he becomes qualified for the inspection of the metropolitan area, or even the Chief Inspectorship?—I should not like to see the system made quite rigid, but it should be based on some such idea as that.

49. Would it not tend to make the individual the centre of educational activity in his district?—Yes. That is what I should like to see.

50. Especially if he could be relieved of the work of examining the schools that did not require it?—Yes.

51. Would not the adoption of such a scheme add to the present cost of the inspectorate in this district?—It would.

52. Largely?—Not so largely as to compare with the advantages of the system. I would like to say that I feel very keen indeed on this question of the reorganizing of our schools so that the attainments and capabilities of the child shall be the determining factor as to where he is taught, and so that by aggregation within a certain area our work could be concentrated. I really believe that that would work the greatest reform in our primary system that would be possible. I hope that the Commission as it proceeds through the Dominion will elicit the opinions of experienced teachers on this point.

53. Do you consider that the system of freedom of classification has been a success?—A great success.

54. Are you prepared, as a teacher and past Inspector, to say that teachers should be allowed to accredit a pupil forward?—Only in certain cases. They would have to be special cases to be approved by the Inspector, and they should be rare for a beginning. On the certificate of certain of the schools in Auckland it would be absolutely unnecessary for the Inspector to accredit, because the teacher could do it as efficiently.

HERBERT GLANVILLE COUSINS examined on oath. (No. 14.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am headmaster of the Auckland Normal School, and an ex-President of the Headmasters' Association; past-President of the District Educational Institute, and contributors' representative on the Superannuation Board.

2. What are your educational qualifications?—I am a Master of Arts of the New Zealand University, and hold an A1 certificate as teacher. At the request of the Auckland Educational Institute I come before you to make a statement on matters within your order of reference. In requesting me to do so my committee have honoured me by the assurance that in speaking quite freely from the standpoint of my own experience I shall, in a broad sense, give a true expression of their opinions. I come, then, not as a delegate but as a representative teacher voicing his personal experience and a few of the conclusions based on it. This experience dates back to 1877, when the Education Act was passed. For ten years I was a pupil of various primary schools; later, a pupil-teacher for six years. Next I had about seven years' experience in charge of country schools—half-time, sole-teacher, two-teacher, and three-teacher schools. During the past twelve years I have been in the city—half that time first assistant master at Beresford Street School, the remaining time in my present position, headmaster of the Normal School, which includes main school, high school, model school, junior model school (or lower part of a two-teacher school), and kindergarten. My work also includes services for the Training College in training the students in methods and practice of teaching. About two years ago I spent four months as Acting-Inspector of Schools, visiting about eighty schools, almost all of which were in remote parts of the district. It affords me much pleasure to be able to bear testimony to the marked progress which has taken place within my memory in education in New Zealand, particularly in our primary schools in recent years. This manifests itself—(1) In the love of school as shown by the great majority of our pupils in contrast to the marked tendency to truancy in the last generation; (2) in the improved discipline of our schools as evidenced by the marked decrease in corporal punishment; (3) in the more natural relations between pupil and teacher, which is an important factor in that most desirable product—good tone; (4) in the more all-round development of our pupils, fitting them for their future work. This improvement is due to several causes: (1.) The wonderful advance in biology, embryology, psychology, and kindred sciences has led to an intensive study of the child and his life—his relation to the past and to the future. This has begun to reflect itself upon us in New Zealand, with the result that we have become self-critical as teachers, and are beginning to be dissatisfied with mere empiricism. (2.) The amendments made in the examination requirements for teachers' certificates in recent years have led to a rejuvenation in the profession. (3.) The improved status of teachers due to the establishment of a Court of appeal, colonial scale of salaries, and the establishment of a Superannuation Fund has added to the dignity