

177. Supposing there was such a conference, and a scale of marks were drawn up, would it still be necessary to keep the scale that we have now, which depends on the marking for teachers' certificates by the Inspectors at present?—I do not think it would.

178. You think one would be enough?—Yes.

179. Do you think that the one that is carried out now is really a sufficient index of the standing of the teachers?—I do not.

180. Would you state on what grounds you think it is insufficient?—On account of the different standards men in different districts set up. If you take a small district: the Inspector is asked to classify his teachers and to assign efficiency marks, and he has no standard to guide him. He may not have any really strong efficient school in his district. Besides that, different people take different views of the qualifications of teachers. I am aware that the Department does not lower the classification of any teacher.

AUCKLAND, 5TH JUNE, 1912.

EDWARD KER MULGAN further examined.

181. *The Chairman.*] I understand that you wish to enlarge your answer to the question of yesterday in regard to the use of the grant for the training of teachers?—Our position is this: We are getting up classes for the instruction of uncertificated teachers. All the teachers who are receiving this instruction live at a distance. It would require at least £5 per head to provide instruction for those teachers between now and the end of the year. That means that we could provide with the grant for about forty-five teachers—to be on the safe side, say, forty. I have had applications with respect to these classes from 120 teachers. If we provided for all those we should spend £600 out of the £900 on tuition fees alone. The grant would not bring the teachers to the centre, pay for their instruction, and provide for their board. Besides, is it quite fair to say that the Board has at its disposal £900 for the training of uncertificated teachers? The £900 is made up of a special grant of £225 and that the balance is £650. That £650 is used for giving instruction in cookery, woodwork, dressmaking, and other subjects of that kind. It seems to me that it would be unfair to deprive teachers of instruction in those subjects. So it is hardly fair to say that the Board has that amount at its disposal for the training of uncertificated teachers.

182. *Mr. Hogben.*] Is not science included among the subjects of instruction for which you can use the £600?—Yes.

183. And having used this so long for training teachers in woodwork and cookery, would it not be fair for a year or two to use a rather larger proportion for training in science?—We might use some for that, but I do not think it would be right to use a great proportion, because there are so many young teachers to come in.

184. You must get them in the training college, which is separately provided for?—Yes. Notwithstanding that, there are a great number of teachers who require this training to-day.

185. But are the whole 120 ready to get their certificates except as regards science? Could you not devote it, say, to forty who are ready to take science to complete their certificates?—I do not think that is quite the question. We could do that, but it is a question whether we should deprive the other eighty pupils of the opportunity of receiving benefit from the grant.

186. But they will get it in their turn, of course. Is it not true that you have been training teachers in woodwork and cookery for a long time, and that many of the teachers you have been training are not actually teaching cookery and woodwork?—A great number of them are not.

187. Then, would it not be fair to divert a good portion of the grant for the teaching of the present uncertificated teachers, or some of them, in science which they will use in their teaching?—I think it would be fair to devote some of it to that purpose, but not an appreciable portion, because we have young teachers continually coming on who require this training.

188. Suppose you took £400 of it, and estimate the cost of training teachers at something like £10 each. Thus you would train forty teachers who have completed their certificates except as regards science?—We will have to give them training in other things. I think it would not be right to the service to take any large portion, because this district differs from others in that it is a very large district, and we have a great number of teachers coming on who require to be trained, and there are other subjects in which we give training—dressmaking, drawing, brushwork, and so on—in which it is necessary that the young teacher should have training.

189. You said that one of the reasons why you do not get so many candidates for teacher-ships is the length of training they have to undergo before they can earn a fair income. How would you hold out inducements to them? Would you pay higher rates where they are training—college students than they get now?—No. I think the prospective benefit is always a greater attraction than the immediate benefit. They consider that the prospect of earning a good income at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six is more satisfactory than a moderately good income while they are being trained.

190. Then if you give them enough to keep them while they are being trained the inducement would be sufficient if the ultimate salary were higher?—Yes. It is the length of training taken in connection with what it leads to.

191. You think that the length of training would be rather a good thing for the teacher if he is to get a good salary afterwards?—Yes.

192. As long as you could maintain the teacher, so that any boy or girl with ability from any section of the community could come in, you would not cut down the secondary course to two years?—Certainly not.