

be put on the same footing?—I said before that I would take every type of position and grade the applicants for these positions irrespective of sex, and then I would appoint the topmost. I believe the great majority of women are claiming for open competition, and the men are not afraid of open competition. The door has been closed, and the effect is that the more competent women in the profession who have a right to expect something higher have no hope of promotion.

56. Do you think it is possible with the present staff we have to have that grading brought up to date on the principle you say?—I think so.

57. Do you not know that some teachers are only seen by one Inspector probably in five years?—I never heard of that; I do not think it is so in our province.

58. Under a proper grading system more than one Inspector would surely have to see a teacher?—It would be desirable, but not essential.

59. Then, do you think you would approve of the grading of teachers by any single Inspector?—Where more could not possibly see a teacher I should take the opinion of an Inspector as better than nobody's.

60. Then you think that the promotion of a teacher should properly rest in the hands of somebody who is better than nobody?—That is so. I think it should rest on expert opinion, and that the more experts you can have to confirm that opinion the better; but that where it is not practicable to have many experts to see the teacher I think you can safely rely on the grading of that teacher on the opinion of one Inspector.

61. In many parts of this district only one Inspector would see a teacher?—Only in the case of young teachers. No one can work very high in the profession without knowing a number of Inspectors.

62. But is it not the people in the lower positions who want safeguarding, and not the ones in the higher positions?—They all want safeguarding.

63. You believe in cutting up the graded list into sections?—Certainly.

64. What about the suggestion I made to supplement the training college by having certain small schools in different parts of the district conducted by special teachers, to which schools inexperienced teachers could have been brought for instruction?—I think it is admirable, provided you make these an essential part of the training college so that the methods will be in keeping with proper principles.

65. And specially level up the salaries of the head teachers who had charge of these schools?—Necessarily so.

66. Have you had any experience in the use of single desks in school?—My Standard I has been using single desks for four years. I think they are very fine indeed. I recognize the difficulty that more floor-space is required, and that they are expensive too, but I think the single desk is desirable, especially as the children get bigger.

67. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the science for the D Examination: under the revised regulations, would you give the fall D certificate in any case without knowledge of scientific method?—I think I would even dare to do that, provided I gave a handicap to make up for it, on the principle of the University in regard to Latin.

68. You really think you could give a full certificate to a teacher with no knowledge of scientific method?—I admit it would be a very great pity to have to do so, but I would rather do that than debar the teacher from getting on.

69. But would it debar the teacher from getting on if we gave him a license?—If 5 per cent. is taken off his salary I think that is wrong.

70. If the 5-per-cent. disability is taken away, you believe a license would meet the case?—Unless the license prejudices him in the eyes of the Board. If the Board gave a preference to teachers with a certificate, then I think it would not be satisfactory.

71. Supposing you gave a full certificate without science, and left science to be indorsed, do you think that most of the teachers would ever take science at all?—I would make it compulsory unless the conditions were such that they could not take it.

72. Do you not think the proper course would be, even if it did cost a considerable sum of money, to give them the opportunity to go through the science course?—That is the better course, I admit. If you close the schools and give them a practical course, I am with you.

73. Could they not do it in the Christmas holidays?—I do not agree with that.

74. Are you aware it is done in America?—I know a good deal of continuation work is done in America.

75. Do you think it is too much to ask a teacher once in his life to make that sacrifice?—I think it is too big a thing you ask, and I do not think it will add to the inducements to go to the backblocks.

76. You think it might be overcome if we were to bring them within reach of the science teaching?—I think that is the best solution.

77. Do you mean by a "vocational course" a technical course?—Not a full technical course, but such a course as would lead towards the vocation, while giving a fairly good general education.

78. *The Chairman.*] You are a firm believer in the value of kindergarten training?—Yes.

79. Do you see any objection to grafting kindergarten education on to the public-school course in the large centres?—None at all, except that of expense.

80. Apart from the question of expense, is it not recognized elsewhere that the children proceeding from the kindergarten to the primary school have an advantage over the ordinary pupil?—I think so; that is my experience.

81. *Mr. Pirani.*] You said that some Inspector found fault with the infants' work in your school: was that Inspector a departmental or Board Inspector?—The local Inspector; the departmental Inspector called the work good.

82. Then, if that Inspector was the sole judge of the efficiency of the infant teacher, according to your idea that Inspector would not be able to judge?—I would not agree with his judgment.

83. And so he might make a mistake in the classification?—Certainly. We are all liable to make mistakes. I do not say the present system is ideal, but it is far ahead of anything we have had.