

7. Could that work be curtailed?—I think it might be left to the Board to give the amount of salary paid in bulk, simply stating the total amount of salary paid at each school.

8. Do you know of any reason why more than that should be required by the Department?—No.

9. Do you find that as the result of so much detail being required there are many mistakes or misreadings made by the Board and discovered by the Department?—In the first quarter there may be half a dozen instances of readjustment. After that there are very few.

10. Could these readjustments be made without this detail return? Suppose you simply gave the total for each school, would it not be possible for the Department to make the readjustment from that?—I do not think the Department could deal with individual cases.

11. Then you think it is necessary that in the annual return the individual name should be given?—I do not think very much hardship would result. The teachers are alive to their own interests, and they have the Educational Institute behind them. If they think they are aggrieved in the matter of salary they soon let us know. Any grievances generally arise from the interpretation of the regulation.

12. Do you think the return is required to safeguard the revenue?—I do not think so. I think the Boards sufficiently safeguard the revenue. We are not inclined to pay teachers what they do not earn.

13. Could not a great deal of the safeguarding that is done by the Department be just as well done by the Audit officers when they are examining the accounts in the Board's office?—I think so.

14. Would not post-audit sufficiently safeguard the Dominion finance?—Yes, if the regulations with regard to salaries and schools were clearer and the auditor were thoroughly conversant with them. I think your contention with regard to post-audit is quite right, but I do not think that even the auditor could always find out a mistake.

15. *The Chairman.*] Leaving out the question of interpretation of the regulations, could the auditors do the work thoroughly in the form suggested by Mr. Pirani?—I do not think so.

16. *Mr. Pirani.*] Can you suggest any alteration in the system that would be satisfactory?—I cannot.

17. With regard to new schools: do you think that the information required by the Department is harassing?—In many cases it is impossible to furnish that information. The Department has to be content without having all the information required in 30 and 30A duly verified. It would take a week to get the full information in some districts.

18. If the requirements of the Department were carried out, would it put undue expense upon the Boards—such, for instance, as getting the Inspector to certify to the correctness of the information by a personal visit to the district?—The Inspector always visits the district with regard to new schools.

19. Is there any improvement you could recommend to simplify the application for new schools?—No, excepting that the Department might look upon the Inspector's report as final in the matter. Instead of that you know that in some cases the Rabbit Inspector, or the Sheep Inspector, or the Mining Warden, or the Crown Lands Ranger, or some other officer is asked to give information with regard to the details already supplied to the Department.

20. *The Chairman.*] Are they really asked to report upon the Inspector?—Well, to corroborate or otherwise the Inspector's report.

21. *Mr. Pirani.*] Do you know of any instance where, as the result of the Department's inquiry outside the Board, a grant has been made?—I cannot say there has been any instance.

22. So that, taking all the work done by the officers of other Departments, you do not think they have had any effect?—It has had practically no result except in a few cases with regard to the sites of schools. In those cases the result has been to put the school on the wrong site.

23. Then it has really been detrimental?—Yes. I may mention one instance in which I recommended a site for a school at Waikino—a beautiful site on a flat across the river. The matter was referred to the Mining Warden. His objection was that the children in going to a school erected on the site recommended by me would pass through the reducing-works and eat cyanide and be poisoned. But there is nothing to prevent the Waihi Company from prohibiting the children from going through their works. In fact, it would not be convenient for them to go through the works. However, as the result of the Warden's report the school was built on the top of a hill 350 ft. high, where it gets the noise of the battery, and extra cost is entailed in making and maintaining paths up the hill.

24. Have you considered the question of placing all the primary, secondary, and technical schools in the district under one central authority?—I have considered the question, and so has the Board. The Board is very strongly in favour of placing technical education under the control of an associated Board—that is to say, technical education pure and simple. The technical instruction given at the primary school would still be under the control of the Education Board.

25. And what about secondary education? Does not that concern you, seeing that so many free-place pupils go from the Education Board schools?—I have not considered the question. We have quite enough to do in looking after the primary schools in this district.

26. What is your experience of the present regulations as to the capitation for conveying children to school?—I think that in nearly every case the capitation allowance is insufficient.

27. Would it tend towards the establishment of larger schools if the distances, instead of being three or four miles, were the same as the distances in regard to compulsory attendance—two miles and three miles? Would not that reduction be an advantage?—No doubt it would be an advantage to the children, but it would have no effect upon the establishment of larger schools, because children living within two miles have to attend school whether payment is made for their carriage or not.