

1914.
NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

(REPORT OF THE) ON THE EDUCATION BILL.

(MR. G. M. THOMSON, CHAIRMAN.)

*Report brought up on the 30th day of September, 1914, and, together with the Minutes of Evidence,
ordered to be printed.*

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

Extracts from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF JULY, 1914.

Ordered, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to consider all matters relating to school-teachers, education, and public instruction generally, public-school training of teachers, higher education, technical education, manual instruction, and such other matters affecting education as may be referred to it; to have power to call for persons and papers; three to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Hanan, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Poland, Mr. Sidey, Mr. Statham, Mr. J. C. Thomson, Mr. G. M. Thomson, and the mover."—(Hon. Mr. ALLEN.)

FRIDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF JULY, 1914.

Ordered, "That the Education Bill be referred to the Education Committee."—(Hon. Mr. ALLEN.)

REPORT.

THE Education Committee, to which was referred the Education Bill, has the honour to report that it has fully considered the Bill, taken evidence thereon, and recommends that the Bill be allowed to proceed as amended in the copy attached hereto. A copy of the minutes of evidence is attached hereto.

G. M. THOMSON, Chairman.

30th September, 1914.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

WEDNESDAY, 29TH JULY, 1914.

MR. G. HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, put in a tabular statement showing the proposed and present staffs and salaries of public schools.

EDWARD KER MCGILGAN examined. (No. 1.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Chief Inspector of Schools in the Auckland Education District.

2. Are you representing the Inspectors or the Board?—Both Mr. Purdie and myself are representing the Auckland Education Board. I am speaking for the Education Board, and I desire to bring before the Committee certain matters connected with the Education Bill. We say, first, that on the Council of Education the Inspectors are not sufficiently represented, that at least one member of the Council should be an agricultural expert, and at least one member should be an expert in technical education. Why we say that the Inspectors are not sufficiently represented is that possibly the Assistant Director of Education will find a place on that Council, and also another officer of the Department, and we do not know whether that officer will be an Inspector of Schools or not. It is quite conceivable that the attitude of an Inspector of Schools who is working amongst the teachers from day to day, with regard to the interpretation of a regulation, may be somewhat different from that of a departmental officer whose attention is confined to a large extent to administration or framing regulations. An Inspector goes from school to school, converses with teachers and learns their difficulties, whereas the departmental officer does not do so and would not be brought constantly in touch with them. If it is contemplated that one other representative of the Department is to be an Inspector actually at work in the schools, then our objection to that proposal in the Bill would be largely withdrawn. The same remarks would apply to one member of the Council being an agricultural expert, and also to one member being an expert in technical education. The masters of the secondary and technical schools have the privilege of electing a member, but the number of teachers in secondary schools considerably outnumbers those in technical schools, so that there is no guarantee that the member elected would be an expert in technical education. The next matter I wish to deal with is the resolution which was passed by the Auckland Education Board. It was as follows: "That, as recommended by the Royal Commission on Education in 1912, the total number of Education Boards in the Dominion should not exceed five, and that the proposal to divide the Auckland Education District into a district of North Auckland and a district of Waikato calls for emphatic protest and strong opposition." I should like to give a few reasons why the division should not take place. First of all, it does not appear to me personally or to the Board that any reason has been given why the Auckland Education District should be divided. If it could be urged that the administration of education was inefficient we should possibly have very little to say. If it could be urged that the standard of efficiency reached by the pupils in the schools did not compare favourably with that reached in other districts our opposition to the proposal would to a very large extent be withdrawn, or, at any rate, very much weakened. We have not learnt that either the standard of efficiency, or the standard of education reached, or the training given to pupils in our primary and other schools compares unfavourably with that obtaining in other districts. Surely a large district is more economically managed than two small ones where it would be necessary to have separate staffs. The whole of the advanced educational thought in New Zealand has been against small watertight compartments in which there has been great difficulty in promoting free trade between teachers. In Auckland free trade has been established amongst 25 per cent. of the teachers of the Dominion. The important matter in determining the boundaries of any district is that the district should be sufficiently large to enable every teacher to have a reasonable chance of promotion within its area. If you are going to do that there must be a sufficient number of large schools within the area of the district. If you cut the Auckland District into two, as proposed, all the schools in Grade VII will be in one of those districts. There will not be one school in Grade VII in the other district. It is hoped that we shall have a Dominion scheme of grading in the future. That has not come yet, but it may come as the years pass. In the meantime local feeling to a large extent will control promotions, or help to do so, and does not that mean that the teacher in the smaller of those two districts may find a good deal of difficulty in getting to the other—i.e., in getting into the larger schools? He will be at a disadvantage as compared with those who have grown up in the other district. The whole of the teachers of the Auckland Education District are opposed to the proposed division of the district. The breaking-up of the Auckland District may have a serious effect upon the grading scheme. We have ten Inspectors in Auckland, and the grading scheme has been in operation for a number of years. Last year we invited all who were dissatisfied with the grading to send in protests, and we received only sixteen protests—i.e., barely 2 per cent. of our teachers were dissatisfied. Moreover, none of the protests were upheld. The reason of this small percentage is that we have a large Board of Inspectors, and I feel that the great confidence that exists in regard to the grading is owing to that fact. A considerable number of teachers in our district are known to all the Inspectors, and the grading of these teachers sets up a standard with which other teachers can be compared, and so we get at a

uniform and fair system of grading which satisfies practically all the teachers in the district. If we had a smaller grading Board we would not have the confidence of teachers which obtains to-day. If we are to get a satisfactory Dominion scheme of grading and promotion it will be through having large districts and large bodies of Inspectors who know the teachers as well as it is possible for them to do. There is another point I desire to bring forward, and that is that our Inspectors constitute in a small way an Education Council among themselves. We meet and discuss matters, but if the district were cut in two it would not be so easy to meet and exchange ideas. If a centre is established, say at Hamilton, the Inspectors will be withdrawn from contact with leading educational thought. They will be withdrawn from what they could learn from observing, inspecting, and examining such schools as technical schools, training colleges, and the like. They will be withdrawn from the influences of those institutions, and I cannot help feeling that their efficiency may be to some extent impaired. Another point is that the Auckland Board some years ago passed a resolution to the effect that no teacher was to be eligible for promotion until he had gone into the country and served for a certain length of time in a country school. Many of our teachers have therefore been induced to leave Auckland and go into the Waikato in the hope of qualifying themselves for town appointments. If the district is cut in two, and the teachers are prevented from going back to the area with the larger schools, I feel that we would not be treating them as fairly as they deserve. These are some of the reasons why we think it would be an unwise course to divide the Auckland Education District. We do not presume to criticize or make any remarks so far as other districts are concerned. The next matter I wish to draw attention to is on page 14 of the Bill. We think that provision should be made for the appointment of at least one Inspector of Schools by each Education Board. We are somewhat in the dark as to what the intentions of the Department are so far as the proposed duties of its Inspectors are concerned. We think there should be some one under the control of the Board who would act as intermediary between the Department and the Board. If the Senior Inspector is to be the officer we are not quite satisfied that the plan will work out at all well seeing that the Chief Inspector would not be an officer of the Board but an officer of the Department. Clause 67 provides that when any school rises a grade the Board shall review the staffing conditions obtaining therein, and may, if necessary, transfer the teacher or teachers thereof. This refers generally to the appointment of teachers. A teacher is appointed to a school, say, in Grade III, and then perhaps that school rises to Grade V or VI. He may be able to do really good work in a third- or possibly a fourth-grade school, but he may not be able to do the work we expect of him in a fifth- or sixth-grade school. He is not absolutely inefficient, but relatively so, and the Act gives us no power at all to remove that teacher. It is quite true that if he is inefficient we can remove him, but he may be relatively inefficient. We feel that if such a man were out of the school concerned we could get a very much better man for the position. We would like the regulation to be modified in such a way that each time a school rises in grade the whole staffing of that school may be reviewed by the Education Board and transfers made accordingly. We consider that a very important matter. We have a grading-list, and there are several cases of schools of Grades VI and VII where the head teachers at work are eligible only for schools of Grade IV; indeed, if they had to compete now for schools of Grade IV I do not think they would get them. I cannot say they are doing absolutely inefficient work, but I can say they are doing relatively inefficient work, and if those teachers were removed from those schools we would get others to take their places who would do very much better work. As to subclause (4) of clause 67, we do not consider, in view of our experience, that the proposal to advertise all vacancies in schools is practicable. We have been obliged to give up advertising in some cases. For instance, we have coming out of the training college each year something like fifty or sixty students. The students who came out two years ago we hoped to place in the usual way by advertising vacancies. The effect of this was that numbers of the students applied for the desirable positions and left out the undesirable, the result being that quite a number of students were unemployed and the vacancies were rapidly filling up. When they come out of the training college we reserve certain positions for them and place them in those positions. I do not think the proposal in the Bill should be given effect to. In regard to the question of manual instruction in public schools and technical instruction in continuation classes, in a small country district the school in which manual instruction is carried on may be used as a place for continuation classes and possibly technical classes. The instructor who takes the manual work may be an instructor, say, in woodwork and under the control of the Education Board; he may also give instruction at the continuation classes and be under the control of the School Committee; and we think there may be some difficulty owing to this divided authority.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I do not see the difficulty, because the school is under the one authority?—Yes, but the instructor is under two authorities.

4. But if the school is lent to the instructor for certain purposes I do not see the difficulty?—It lies in the dual control over the building, the apparatus, and the work that the instructor does. From whom is he to take his instructions? There has been, I believe, some difficulty so far as the Hamilton School is concerned. We intended to suggest to the Committee that the capitation provided for was not sufficiently liberal, but I have just had a conversation with the Department's officer and understand the position better, and I am satisfied that more is being done to provide a more liberal capitation. Another matter I feel strongly on is that provision should be made for compulsory attendance at daylight continuation classes. Some years ago the Board of Governors of the Christchurch Technical College had a meeting with employers in order to interest them in the matter. The result was that some employers allowed their employees to get away in the daytime to attend the classes. I feel strongly that the time will come—and the sooner the better—when employers will recognize the very great advantages to be derived from technical training, and may be induced to send the apprentices in the daytime. If it could be done voluntarily so much the better. Another important matter is that which deals with compulsory attendance at primary schools. We feel that provision should be made for the compulsory

registration of private schools. The machinery is in the Act for compelling all children of a certain age to attend school, but there has been a good deal of trouble in this matter. I have in my mind a school in Dominion Road, Auckland, that had existed for quite a long time before we knew anything about it. As soon as we found out about it we sent the Truant Officer to inquire why the school had not applied for exemption. The Inspector, on visiting the school, was dissatisfied and ordered the children of school age to attend a primary school. Such schools should be compelled to come out into the open and register.

Might I refer to a matter I overlooked, the question of representation on the controlling body of technical classes, outlined in clause 108? Subclause 3 (a) deals with the representation of Education Boards, and the powers of Managers controlling technical schools. If I interpret the clause correctly the Board of Education has the right to appoint three members, and then it would be entitled to one-half the number of members beyond nine. Supposing we had a Council consisting of twenty-five members: taking nine from twenty-five will leave sixteen. Well, the Education Board will be entitled to eight members, plus three, or eleven out of twenty-five. We think that rather large—in fact, that the representation of the Board on the management is excessive.

5. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You want that reduced?—I think so.

6. With regard to the division of the district: do I understand that your arguments in the main are for the purpose of inducing the Committee to still further reduce the Education Board districts from nine to five?—I did not go into that matter, but personally I think it should be done.

7. Do you recollect what the recommendation of the Education Committee was last year in regard to the size of the Education Board districts?—Yes.

8. It does not come, then, as a surprise to your Board that eight or nine should be suggested?—I cannot say that I have heard any surprise expressed.

9. Mr. Purdie is surprised, and so he says is your Board?—Mr. Purdie may know, but I do not. He was surprised at any thought of dividing the Auckland District.

10. Assuming that this Committee sticks to its conclusions of last year to reduce the number of Boards from thirteen to eight or nine, does the Auckland Board still maintain that it ought to be left alone and undivided?—Yes.

11. I wish to ask the Auckland Board whether they are by doing that sympathizing with those other Boards in New Zealand whose districts are so small that their teachers cannot get a career?—It is hardly for me to answer for the Board, but I should think they are. I am thinking of a district like Westland.

12. We will talk about the North Island. If the Committee determines to reduce the Boards from thirteen to nine with the object of giving a career to teachers in other districts would not the Auckland Board be prepared to make some little sacrifice to assist their brother Boards?—Oh, yes; the Auckland Board would not object if some of the schools, or a portion of the district at the southern end, were taken away. That portion which lies towards the Taranaki District, and which could be administered from Taranaki—we expect to lose that portion in time as soon as railway connection links the two districts up.

13. Then probably you do not object to a part of the Auckland District being cut off, as it is a matter of boundary?—The boundary is a very important matter.

14. Do you suggest that the present boundary would not offer a satisfactory career to certain teachers in the Auckland District, and who would be put in the proposed new Waikato District because there are not sufficiently big schools there?—That is one of the objections.

15. Do you suggest that one of the representatives on the Council should be there in the interests of agriculture?—Yes.

16. It is already provided for in clause 8. With regard to the representation of Inspectors on the Council, are you not aware that it is proposed under the Bill that the Inspectors shall be taken over by the Department?—Yes.

17. Do you not think that under subclause (c) of clause 8 there is every probability that an Inspector would be appointed on the Council?—Yes, but we have no assurance to that effect, and their presence on the Council is so important that we think it necessary to emphasize the point.

18. Do you not think that the Minister would also think it important, and that if he had the power to make the appointment that he would probably do so?—I think he would; but we thought it as well to bring this matter under the notice of the Committee. If it is contemplated to appoint, under the subclause quoted, Inspectors actually at work in the schools, we have nothing further to say.

19. I will not pledge myself to do it, but the power is there for the Minister to use, and no doubt he would consider it. About the representation of those interested in technical schools: do you think it would be quite fair to put on the Board a representative of the technical-school teachers alone?—That is another very important matter. Technical education is making a good deal of progress here, and there should not be the possibility of a practical representative of technical education being left off that Council.

20. Under subclause (f) of clause 8 there is power to elect one member to the Council by the male teachers of secondary and technical schools: do you not think that is a sufficiently wide-enough electorate to appoint one member of the Council?—I think I pointed out that the number of electors, as far as the secondary schools were concerned, was very much more than the number of electors connected with the technical schools, and therefore there would be no certainty that technical education would be represented on the Council; but the certainty is rather in the direction of the secondary people having a representative.

21. You have got to remember the great distinction between the two branches of education?—Yes and no; there is undoubtedly a difference; but they are rightly recognized as being on the same plane, and are included in the term "secondary." The interests are somewhat different, and each should be represented.

22. Subclause (j) provides that three members shall be appointed by the Minister—two to represent industrial interests (one of whom shall represent agriculture), and one (a woman) to represent the interests of the education of girls. Do you think that clause gives sufficient power?—There is plenty of power for the Minister there, but we have no guarantee that he would exercise it in the direction indicated.

23. But are not industrial interests technical interests?—They are very much interwoven. But I can quite understand a person being appointed to the Council who has a good knowledge of industry and industrial interests, but who may not know very much about the details or aims of technical education.

24. In respect to clause 30 you raised an objection. You thought the Board ought to have power to appoint somebody who would be the intermediary between it and the Inspectors or the Department. Do you not think there is sufficient power in that clause for that to be done? They can appoint a secretary and other officers, and could not they appoint the one you suggest?—We are not quite sure about that power being there. But if it is so, of course, what I said may be withdrawn.

25. Would not the term “other officers” include “Inspector”?—Does it give the Board power to appoint an Inspector?

26. Do you think it will become necessary for the Board to appoint an Inspector?—I do not know what the duties or powers of the Senior Inspector will be, or what control the Board will have over him. I understand that the custom obtains in the Old Country for the Board of Education to appoint Inspectors to act between the two parties. We believe that there would be required in the future some one who would interpret reports for the Board. Of course, we do not know how much control the Board of Education will have over the Senior Inspector. He might be quite independent of the Board.

27. As to clause 67, and with respect to the rise in grade of a school and the teacher remaining on, and the Board coming to a conclusion, or its Inspectors, that a change ought to be made, you think there is not sufficient provision made for that matter there? Subclause (3) of that clause says that the transfer of a teacher may be made “in any case where the efficient conduct of any school appears in the opinion of the Board to require such transfer.” That does not refer to the individual, but to the conduct of the school?—I do not know that there is sufficient power. We have in our district, and it is a common experience of all districts, schools and teachers that have outgrown their usefulness, but the Board cannot remove the teacher. I am not sure that that clause would enable the Board to remove the teacher if he were relatively inefficient yet not absolutely inefficient. The teacher would be able to take advantage of the Appeal Act. We have always understood that so long as the teacher was doing moderately satisfactory work we could not remove him.

28. I am advised that subclause (b) above quoted is sufficient to give power to the Board to make these transfers?—If we can be assured that it does cover the matter I refer to we will be quite satisfied.

29. It seems to me to be very wide, and does not refer to the teacher, but to the whole school: is that not so?—I am referring more to the head teacher.

30. I think that case would come within the clause?—Supposing we had such a case, and I as Chief Inspector were called on to give evidence in Court. If I were asked, “Do you consider this school inefficient?” I could not say absolutely that it was. I might qualify the word “inefficient,” and say that it was “relatively inefficient.” I might be required to give a plain “Yes or No—is it or is it not inefficient?” I might not be able to say that it is absolutely inefficient.

31. I would point out that the clause provides that the Board shall be the judges of the question of the efficient conduct of a school. Is not that conclusive?—But supposing that the matter is taken to an Appeal Court. The teacher can appeal against the Board.

32. The clause is intended to deal with such cases. What do you suggest?—We suggest that the Board should be empowered to consider the whole matter of the staff of the school, and to reorganize it if necessary: that is to say, the Board should have the power each time the school rises in grade—say from IV to V—to deal with the school and say, “We do not consider Mr. Brown a sufficiently good teacher to be allowed to remain in charge of this school, so we will transfer him to another grade.”

33. I will get further advice from the Inspector-General and the Law Draftsman as to whether this clause is sufficient?—Thank you.

34. As to clause 67, and the matter of advertising for teachers, I think you suggested that under this clause it would be necessary to advertise in all cases, but that is not what the clause says. It does not read that there should be advertisements in the case of transfers?—In all cases excepting transfers.

35. Do you think it would be right for us to put into the Bill a provision that there should not be advertisements in every case excepting transfers?—No, I think something of this kind would do—that in all cases where possible; so that the Department would not be bound to advertise in every case.

36. Might it not be rather dangerous for us to give an unlimited power to the Board in respect to this matter of advertising? I think there might be acts of injustice committed by some Boards if we did not make provision for advertisements?—Could not a very strong clause be worded to the effect that, unless under very special circumstances, when the Board might be asked to explain to the Department—something of that kind. As to the advertising, I personally am most anxious for it, and so is my Board. They passed a resolution at my suggestion two or three years ago binding ourselves down to advertise, but had to relax it. If such difficulty arose in one district how much greater would the difficulty become if the matter applied all over New Zealand.

37. About the compulsory attendance at the daylight continuation classes, what is your idea? Do you suggest that the employers should be asked to better meet the convenience of the boys, or do you want it put into legislation that these compulsory continuation classes must be established?—I do not know whether it is well to speak about these matters at the present juncture, but I do feel that this question will have to be dealt with. I would like it not to be lost sight of by those who undertake the responsibility of framing regulations and Education Bills. I think the employers should be required to give their apprentices or employees a certain amount of time off to enable them to attend the classes, but when is the time to do it is a different matter.

38. Do you think it opportune just now to put into legislation anything compulsory in this way?—I do not know that it is; but I think we might in some way or another indicate in the Bill that such a change is likely to take place before long.

39. Can you tell us whether the Auckland Education Board are or are not in favour of the proposals in regard to the inspectorate?—No, I cannot. It is not that I do not want to, but I really do not know.

40. Speaking as an Inspector who has had much experience of that branch of the work, are you in favour of those proposals?—I am strongly in favour of them, and always have been in favour of the centralizing of the Inspectors.

41. I ask you as a member of the Board, or as an Inspector, whichever you like, whether you have any serious grievance to find in the schedule as regards the grading of salaries of the teachers?—I do not know that I have any serious grievance to find against the salaries. I realize that it is a very difficult matter to provide sufficient money to satisfy everybody, but I feel that we have not gone far enough yet in respect of salaries. In Auckland we have a great deal of difficulty in finding efficient teachers to man the out-of-the-way backblock schools. The staffs in the larger schools also are not sufficient. If we increase the staffing of our larger schools in the towns that will deplete the country districts of the more efficient teachers, and we can hardly hope to obtain a sufficient number of really efficient teachers for both large and small schools. We require to make the service more attractive to get the teachers, and the most effective way to do that is to improve the scale of salaries. I am glad to see that the salaries attached to schools where teachers are likely to spend their lives have been increased—that is, Grades IV and V.

42. *Mr. McCallum.* Are you aware of any appeal from a Board's transfer of a teacher?—I know of absolutely none in our district. The transfers have always been very carefully made, and where in some case we think the teacher might possibly object to a transfer we ask him the question. Practically there has been no case in Auckland, since that clause came into operation, of a teacher having appealed against a transfer. We have refrained in certain cases from transferring teachers, realizing that there would be an appeal if we did transfer them.

43. Have you had any appeals in the Auckland District?—I might modify my previous answer by saying that there has not been one since 1904.

44. Do you not think that the power in regard to appeal has a bad effect on education?—I would not answer that Yes or No. To some extent it has had a bad effect, but I should be very sorry to see the power taken away.

45. The local authority under the clause is the Magistrate. Should not a Judge of the Supreme Court at least be substituted for the Magistrate?—I have not considered the matter.

46. Do you not consider that the members of the Auckland Board, administering the education system in respect to one-fourth of the children of the Dominion, are higher educational authorities than any Magistrate?—I do not know that I can answer that question. You want a man of the world in a sense, one who has a judicial mind, to deal with these appeals. I do not think it requires necessarily a man who understands the details and practice of teaching. There would be such a man, no doubt, on the Board or in the Court, but not having considered the matter my opinion is not very decided.

47. As to the compulsory attendance at the continuation classes, up to what age would you suggest?—Say up to seventeen or eighteen.

48. Regarding the new scale of salaries, do you think it is fair that a country school-teacher with over forty or fifty children in grades running over five standards should draw the same salary as the third assistant in the school of five hundred pupils?—As a general rule I think it is not.

EDMUND CAMPBELL PURDIE examined. (No. 2.)

1. *The Chairman.* What are you?—A member of the Auckland Board of Education.

2. Will you make a statement to the Committee?—I desire to say that I have taught in every type of primary school, in the secondary school, and I have been an Inspector of Schools. In the first place I should like to say, on behalf of the Auckland Education Board, that the Board is heartily in accord with the spirit of the Bill. We have not been sent down here in any complaining spirit at all, but merely to point out one or two matters which we think might be remedied when the Bill is in Committee. The Auckland Education Board was the first Board in New Zealand to pass a self-denying ordinance in respect to the teacher. It withdrew by its grading scheme its power to appoint the teacher, and it recognizes that this Bill withdraws from it the power of appointing Inspectors. Though the Board does not approve of that, still the members acquiesce in it. They also recognize that this Bill withdraws to a great extent the power of the Boards of Education in the matter of the establishment of new schools, and the Auckland Board acquiesces in that. Mr. Mulgan was sent down here to represent the Board because it was recognized that within another twelve months he will practically be an officer of the Department, and that that adds weight to his evidence inasmuch as he is not directly responsible to the Board for any evidence he may give, although he has given evidence on lines indicated to him by the Board. I should like to

confirm everything he has said in regard to the Council of Education. Our opinion was that it would have been composed purely of expert advisers, that in its essentials it should have been selective rather than elective, and that the preponderating power on that Board would be the inspectorial power. We feel that strongly. In respect to the division of the district, we feel that a very grave injustice will be done to the teachers of the Waikato if the idea is carried out of subdividing the Auckland District into two. The trend of public opinion, as indicated by the recommendation of the Royal Commission, was strongly in the direction that the Boards should be widened and not limited—that the number should be five and not nine. We are in thorough agreement with the idea of making the Boards larger, but we see no necessity whatever why the Auckland District should be cut in two. Although we are aware that the Inspectors in conference gave a lead on this question, we do feel that the man most competent to speak on the matter, and who we are assured demurred at the Conference, is Mr. Mulgan. We feel, with his wide experience, his word should have carried very great weight in regard to the question of the number of Education Boards being nine. This Bill disturbs the already existing condition of affairs. We were not prepared for that disturbance, and instead of throwing upon those who disturb an already existing condition of affairs the onus of proving why it should be altered the Bill has thrown upon us the onus of showing why it should not be disturbed. A statement has been handed in to the Committee giving the reasons which actuated the Board in coming to the conclusion that the Board of Education of the Auckland District ought not to be divided into two parts. Another point we desire to bring forward is that we consider the Chairman of an Education Board should be paid an honorarium of not less than £200 per annum. That deals with the clause in the Bill which provides for a reasonable travelling-allowance being made to members of a Board. As to clause 29, dealing with the refund of members' travelling-expenses, the members of the Auckland Education Board feel that as their Chairman has to give up at least three days a week to his duties he should be allowed an honorarium not exceeding £200 per annum. The members of the Board are quite satisfied with reasonable travelling-expenses while on the Board's business, as at present, but the Bill provides that the allowance shall be on a defined scale, and that will be more satisfactory. The next point I wish to refer to is in connection with the voting-power of householders at School Committee elections; see clause 40. Our Board is strongly of opinion that extended powers should be given to the parents of children actually attending school by allowing the father and the mother double the voting-power of each householder. In regard to clause 54, we consider that the proviso in subclause (6) should be made mandatory. The Board is strongly convinced that the old drill system, which has been superseded of late by the system of physical instruction, was such a splendid preparation for the military training now in vogue and that the boys are to get afterwards, that they wish to see that clause made mandatory, and that military drill should be taught in the schools. Going back to clause 14, the Board is of opinion that it should be impossible for the number of urban members to exceed the number of rural members. Under the present Bill there would be six rural members on the Auckland Board, and four urban members representing the towns: that is to say, when the number reaches 61,000 you would then have four urban members. That number has already been reached in Auckland. When the population reaches 121,000—and that number has very nearly been reached by Greater Auckland—you would at once have six urban members, which means that the urban members will possibly at times outvote the rural members. I am a rural member at present. The reason why they will probably outvote the rural members is that it is possible that the six urban members can more easily attend the meetings of the Board than the six rural members. When Auckland, however, reaches 181,000 of population, under the Bill it will have eight urban members as against six rural members. What is required is a distribution into counties by Act, and the rural areas should be safeguarded to that extent. In point of fact, the Board would suggest that the number of rural members should at times slightly outweigh the number of urban members. In connection with clause 75, subclause (2), we suggest that after the words "a teacher" should be inserted the words "or Inspector."

Hon. Mr. Allen: In clause 127 we have made that alteration.

Witness: Thank you. As to clause 127, I would contend that the salaries of Inspectors are not sufficiently high, and the Board considers that the work of the Inspectors is of such great importance as to warrant the payment of every Inspector of Schools on a higher basis than that of the most highly paid teacher in the service.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen:* To every Inspector?—Of every Inspector of Schools having full inspectorial power. I am contemplating the Inspectors as we understand them in the Auckland Province at present. It may be that you are going to establish special Inspectors, allotting them special duties.

4. What is the salary of the lowest paid Inspector in Auckland?—They range from £400 to £450. We regard the education of the young as a matter of the highest importance in the interests of the State, and therefore that the highest officer in the Education Department should be paid on exactly the same basis as the heads of other Departments. As to clause 155, we think that the proviso limiting the subsidies payable under paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) should be deleted, because limitation in subsidy may lead to limitation of bequests. I see no reason why if money is given in the shape of a voluntary subscription the subsidy should be limited to £250 and £500 respectively in the case of the gifts of land and of bequests. The last point I wish to call attention to is the schedule on page 66—Schedule VI, Part II, section (c). We suggest that Boards have power to establish separate infant schools with a minimum attendance of fifty-one. The minimum is fixed at 161 in the schedule. That is a question affecting the Board's policy, and we have established in Auckland in recent years a very large number of schools on the basis indicated in clause (a) of the Sixth Schedule. We feel that had we had the power, instead of establishing schools of that type we would have established separate infant schools. We believe it

would have made for economy, and also for efficiency of teaching. In a large city like Auckland we have these mixed schools dotted all over the place, and we believe that if we had had schools in a variety of places taking possibly only children from Standards IV, V, and VI, it would make for efficiency of teaching in those schools, and for economy as far as the Consolidated Fund is concerned. If we have power only to establish a separate infant school when the number reaches 161 we would then be faced with this condition of affairs: that within that area are a very large number of children, probably many hundreds, who would under ordinary circumstances attend Standards IV, V, and VI of a fully mixed school. If, on the other hand, we had power to establish, when the number reached fifty, an infant school, we would have established it within that area; and by the time it reaches 161 custom would have sanctioned its use and would have enabled us to continue on in that way. We feel that if this power is granted a very large number of educational problems will be solved. In the first place we are satisfied that if you can get in Standard VI eighty or one hundred children, in Standard V from eighty to one hundred and twenty, and in Standard IV from ninety to one hundred and thirty, these children would be very much more efficiently taught than at present. We think the present system of schools is acting very injuriously indeed on the really able children of the community; and we feel that in the large centres it ought to be possible to group these children together in such a way as to enable the classes to be subdivided with some reference to the attainments and capacity of the pupils. In a city like Auckland there would be five or six schools teaching only Standards IV, V, and VI, and there would also be a large number of infant schools, staffed by capable women teachers, on a separate scale of staffing and salaries entirely. Some years ago I brought this matter up at the Inspectors' Conference, and the underlying principle was carried by a large majority. So I hope our Board will be given the power to establish a separate infant school when the minimum average attendance reaches fifty-one. I am distinctly of opinion that the proposal will be in the true interests of education. Finally, I would say that the Auckland Education Board is thoroughly in accord with the underlying principle of this Bill, but it wishes to strongly protest against the clause which subdivided the district.

5. I will ask Mr. Purdie one question—whether the Auckland Education Board favours the centralization of the inspectorate?—I think that the Auckland Board would acquiesce in the proposal. They raised no objection. But had the question been put to them plainly they would have said, No, they would rather not centralize.

6. *Mr. Sidey.*] I understood you to state that the Auckland Board has given up the power of appointing teachers?—Practically. Nominally, we do appoint teachers. We have a grading scheme, and the teachers are shifted almost automatically from the graded list, which is formulated by the Inspectors and not by the members of the Board. The position is generally advertised, and the teacher highest on the graded list gets offer. The decision is then sent on to the Committee, and unless they see serious objection that person is appointed.

7. Do you submit one name to the Committee?—Just one.

8. Do you advertise every vacancy?—As a rule.

9. And select from those who apply?—Yes.

10. You have seen the proposals with regard to the appointment of teachers?—Yes.

11. Are you satisfied with them?—Yes, generally. They further curtail the powers of the Board. At the present time we voluntarily give up the power of appointment, but under the Bill we have to do so compulsorily; and I may say from a wide experience of education I think it is a very wise provision. It is distinctly better that an expert body of men should appoint the teachers rather than that men elected on Committees who really know very little about these matters should make the appointment.

12. Do you consider that the provisions of the Bill will prevent your doing what you are doing at present?—Practically, the matter will be in exactly the same position; only it makes it incumbent on us to do what we are now doing voluntarily.

13. You are aware that there is a little discretion allowed in the case of Inspectors who have to consider the case of teachers with equal qualifications?—We have never come across a case in which they have absolutely equal qualifications.

14. You think that that provision is likely to remain a dead-letter in practice?—I think it ought to, as we hardly want to make it applicable on all occasions.

15. With regard to the election of Boards, is your Board satisfied with the alteration proposed?—Yes.

16. Does your Board see any objection in the fact that one portion of the Board is elected on one method, and another portion is elected on an entirely different basis?—I do not know. Very likely they have considered this particular matter. I gathered as much from the expressions of the opinions of the members, and that they considered it a very grave danger if you based the election on the municipal franchise, because some person might get on the Board who would otherwise be undesirable, and under other conditions would not be elected.

17. Is your Board in a position to express an opinion as to whether this is an improvement on the old system under which one portion of the district is one constituency and another portion another constituency?—I see your point; but the question is that if you have an urban-school area the number of School Committees within that area would be so small that there would be almost no electors, or very few, and there might be only one member to elect. So it seems to me desirable that the franchise should be on a wider basis. That being the case, the only solution is to bring in the municipal franchise.

18. Do you think that these urban-school areas are likely to be very small?—I think they would have jurisdiction over a large number of schools.

19. At any rate, there is no objection raised to the proposal by your Board?—None: I think the Board would be generally favourable.

20. *The Chairman.*] Is there anything you wish to add?—Will you permit me to add, with respect to the question of the districts, that the line would be drawn under the proposed schedule just a little south of Auckland. The community of interest existing certainly down as far as Taumarunui is so great that it is highly undesirable to break the Auckland District up in the manner suggested. Not only would the large schools all come within the North Auckland area, and offer better prizes; but the Dominion scale of grading is not yet in force. I think that Dominion grading scheme can be brought about much more easily by the meeting of the representatives of five bodies for the purpose than by a larger number. You asked Mr. Mulgan a question I should like also to answer. You asked him if the Auckland Board did not realize that it would by refusing to acquiesce in the division of the Auckland District into two parts be sacrificing the teachers of the present smaller districts. The Auckland Board is strongly of opinion that the number of Boards should be curtailed, and it realizes the difficulty of effecting this curtailment. We suggest that the Auckland Board should remain as at present to a large extent, with this exception, that instead of having the nine districts you will have eight, and then gradually breaking up the smaller areas until a reasonable approximation is reached as regards size and community of interest. We think that community of interest should play some considerable part in the matter of the arrangement of school districts.

21. *Mr. Poland.*] As a member of the Board, and lately an Inspector of some years' standing, and also a teacher, are you strongly in favour of large Board districts?—Yes, unquestionably.

22. Do you believe that the five districts recommended by the Commission of 1912 are too many for this Dominion?—I think that if you are going to have Boards at all then five is the proper number.

23. You do not think that the present size of the Auckland District has done any harm, but rather that it has conduced to efficiency and economy?—I am quite satisfied that it has done no harm. There has been no complaint on the ground of administration or efficiency. As an Inspector I can say that the Auckland schools can hold their own with any in the Dominion.

24. Do you think that the teachers in the proposed North Auckland District will be at a disadvantage as compared with their present position if this change takes place?—No; I think that the whole of the North Auckland teachers will benefit, because there will be a large number of big schools for them to work on. If you took the consensus of opinion of the teachers within the proposed Waikato area I feel satisfied you would find that ninety-nine out of a hundred would be against the proposed subdivision.

25. In speaking about the proposal for the election of Boards you stated that under the Bill Auckland at present is electing four members, but that Greater Auckland would be able to elect six; that those six would really have the preponderating influence: do you adhere to that opinion?—I think it would be very likely that they would have the majority on the Board.

26. *Mr. Statham.*] In respect to military drill in public schools, it is permissive under sub-clause (6) of clause 54. Did I understand you to say that you think that provision should be made compulsory?—That is so.

27. In addition to the physical drill?—Yes.

28. Can you say anything more about that point?—The members of the Auckland Board are so thoroughly satisfied with the old Cadet system as a preparation for the present Territorial system that I think they would be in favour of the old military drill as against even the physical drill, because the old military drill did include a very large amount of physical culture.

29. You do not mean to suggest interfering with the physical-culture system?—No, I would not suggest that; but the physical-culture system has come in since my time, and I have not had the opportunity of personally observing the full effect of it as against the other system, so I would not like to offer an opinion.

30. *Mr. McCallum.*] The Auckland Board is not unanimous in regard to the division of the district?—It is practically unanimous with the exception of one member, Mr. E. C. Banks.

31. He belongs to the south?—Yes, to Matamata. We understood he would petition. Other than Mr. Banks the Board is unanimous. We think you may have a large amount of evidence, say, from the local bodies, from the Waikato area in support of this division, but on the other hand you will get evidence by the teachers against the division. We think it only natural that if you hold out to the Waikato people an inducement such as a Board of Education within their own area, the local bodies would all be in favour of it; but we really believe that in the interests of Waikato it ought not to be severed from the Auckland District, having regard to the quality of the teachers who will apply for positions. Under the present conditions I have not the slightest doubt that the Auckland Board will be inundated with a crop of applications by people within the Waikato area who desire to get into the North Auckland area in order to be on the side of the larger promotions it will offer.

32. You are aware of the underlying principle in regard to the Boards?—Yes; you are working up towards an abolition of the Boards ultimately. I want to say this not on behalf of the Board, but my own personal opinion is that one of the best things that could happen to New Zealand would be the entire abolition of the Boards of Education. I am a member of a Board and have opportunities of seeing evidence day by day why the Board should be abolished, but I am only offering that as a personal opinion. I am satisfied that the method of selection of members of Boards has failed completely.

33. Have you gone into the question of the Court of Appeal?—No, not deeply. I have always been under the impression, and have advised teachers in this direction, that they are too much protected by the Court of Appeal. The Board of Education has had very little trouble in respect of appeals, though I may say it has lost every appeal made against it. In one case I am quite satisfied it was wholly against the public interest that they should have lost the appeal. I have advised the teachers that they are too much protected by the Court of Appeal, and I have

suggested to them many times that they should ask that the Boards be given greater powers in the matter of transfers and dismissal of teachers. If that is not done, some day or other the people of New Zealand will rise up and say they will not have the present condition of affairs at all, and ask that the Court of Appeal be swept away altogether. I think it is in the interests of the teachers that the Court of Appeal Bill should be very carefully revised. We have refrained from taking action in the interests of the district, because we realize that if a teacher took a case before the Court of Appeal we should be beaten. I think it is a very serious matter indeed. I do not think there is any other body of incompetent people protected as the incompetent teachers of New Zealand are by that Court.

34. What have you to say to my suggestion of substituting a Judge or Magistrate?—I do not think it would affect the proposition in the slightest. I still think the power is there in the Act. In one celebrated case we had in Auckland I do not see how the Judge or assessors could have given a decision different from that which they gave, and yet at the same time I am satisfied that the decision was wholly against the interests of the people of the district in which that man was teaching. I think this Court of Appeal Bill wants careful consideration. Personally, I think the most important matter I have brought before your notice this morning is that of the establishment of separate infant schools. I believe that is very largely going to affect the policy of New Zealand and all other educational districts right throughout the world. When I brought the underlying principle before the Inspectors' Conference some years ago I was asked by the Inspectors to waive the question because it was so big, and it was voted against in order that it might be given more mature consideration. When I brought the matter up three years subsequently it was carried at the Inspectors' Conference by an overwhelming majority, and I think the Committee should seriously consider the establishing of that practice in New Zealand.

35. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] With regard to the decision of the Conference, may I ask whether that decision was upheld at subsequent Conference?—I could not say. I did not subsequently attend the Conference, and I am not sure whether it was or not.

36. I have some idea that a Conference reversed its decision subsequently?—Not on any occasion. I am sure of that.

37. I am informed that the Conference did reverse its decision subsequently. If we do allow these separate schools for a smaller number than 161 down to fifty-one, does it not mean separate headmistresses at infant schools with consequent increase in salaries?—Just as there is a differentiation between the payment of primary-school teachers and secondary-school teachers, so there would be a differentiation in salaries paid to true primary-school teachers and the grade between approved and secondary.

38. Is there not a difference in the salaries between headmasters and assistants?—Yes.

39. In a separate infant school would not the headmistress have a separate salary?—Yes. I think in respect of schools it is only applicable to large ones. You might have a separate scale and staffs and salaries.

40. Would not the provision we have in the Bill satisfy you about the side schools?—No. We do not want to establish side schools, because by doing so we withdraw the services of the headmaster from the main work of the school, and, in point of fact, every headmaster knows and will say clearly and distinctly that so far as the primary department is concerned the infant-mistress is really the one who supervises, controls, and does the whole of the work of that primary department, and we think she should be paid for it.

41. If she is appointed as headmistress will it not increase the cost?—I think not, sir. I think you find that in that way you will aggregate your upper children, and by decreasing the cost of the teaching of the upper classes by a system of aggregating you will decrease the cost of the whole system. I worked it out in detail some years ago, and I should be very glad to send to the Committee a memorandum of the cost which I drew out on that occasion.

THURSDAY, 30TH JULY, 1914.

NELLIE COAD examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—The Women Teachers' Association, Wellington Branch.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee in reference to the Bill now before us?—Yes. While recognizing that many reforms have been embodied in the new Education Bill, and while admitting that increases in salary have been granted to most head teachers and upper assistants, still we wish to point out that it provides no increase for a large number of experienced and deserving teachers in Grades I and II. Take, for instance, three types of schools—one in Grade VIIc, one in Grade IVc, and one in Grade 3B—and apply the proposed scale of salaries to the staffs of each. First of all, Grade VIIc, taking for our type a certain school in Wellington City (South Wellington), in which there is a staff of sixteen assistant teachers. This is what we find: (a.) Among upper assistants—Head teachers get an increase of £40; first assistant an increase of £10; second assistant an increase of £10; third assistant an increase of £40; fourth assistant an increase of £40; fifth assistant an increase of £15; sixth assistant an increase of £15. (b.) Among lower assistants—Seventh assistant gets no increase; eighth assistant gets no increase; ninth assistant gets an increase of £15 up to £140 (maximum); tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth assistants get no increase. Omitting the last two (twelfth and thirteenth) assistants, who are recently appointed and therefore are not so experienced as the tenth and eleventh assistants, four deserving teachers on such a staff do not benefit. Two of these have been teaching from

sixteen to twenty years, and are capable and certificated. They have had town and country experience. The ninth assistant, who reaches a maximum of £140 in two years time, has been teaching for about thirteen years, and shorthand-writers and typistes in Government Departments gets £160 in eight years. There are about thirty-seven schools in this grade. This means that, approximately, 148 teachers in this particular type of school alone do not benefit. Type 2, Grade IVc, upper assistants: Karori—The head teacher gains nothing on his maximum; the first assistant gains £10; the second assistant gains £15. Lower assistants: Third and fourth assistants gain nothing by new Bill. In this school, therefore, two teachers do not benefit, one of whom is a teacher of over sixteen years standing, with town and country experience. There are about thirty-four such schools, making a total of sixty-eight who do not benefit in this type of school. Type 3, Grade IIIB, mostly found in the country: One teacher in the lower grade does not benefit. There are 127 such schools, and therefore 127 such teachers who do not benefit. So in these three types of schools alone 343 teachers receive no benefit. Similar results will be obtained when the proposed scale is applied to schools in the other grades. As a rule it will be found that the lower assistants will benefit little or not at all. In some cases they lose—for example, sixth assistant in Grade VIB drops from £150 to £140 16s. As a remedy for this state of affairs I would suggest that the maximum of Grade II be made £180 instead of £120, thus eliminating Grade III, and that teachers of ten years' experience and over be put at the maximum in Grade II (£180). Resolutions to this effect have already been passed at the Wellington District Institute, and the New Zealand Educational Institute has affirmed the principle. Such a course will spell greater efficiency and content in the service, and will attract a greater number into the profession. At present, as Principals of training colleges tell us, the supply of teachers does not equal the demand.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] You have referred to several classes of assistants, those at £100 to £120?—Yes, in some cases.

4. Are you aware that the number now at that stage is 1,295, taking all the teachers in all classes, and that the number at £100 to £120 is only 257 under the Bill, so that all the others must get promoted to other places: are you aware of that?—No. Might I say that I have taken some trouble to ascertain these figures, and I have found that about 78 per cent. of the women teachers are in those Grades I and II, of £140 and less.

JANET A. FINLAYSON examined. (No. 4.)

1. *The Chairmna.*] Whom do you represent?—The Women Teachers' Association, Wellington Branch.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee in reference to the Bill we are now considering?—Yes. In giving evidence before the Education Committee I wish to deal with a few of the anomalies that occur in the Education Bill now before the Committee. The points to which I would draw attention are—(1) The difference between the cost of educating boys when compared with that of educating girls, as shown in the schedule dealing with the salaries paid to teachers in separate boys', girls', and infant schools. (Schedule VI, Part II, (i) and (ii)); (2) the difference in the grades of salaries of assistants in relation to their relative positions on the staffs of schools; (3) the anomaly which allows a teacher transferred from one position to another to suffer loss of salary through such transfer. Taking these points in order—(1) The difference between the cost of the education of boys as compared with that of girls and of infants: Comparing a Grade VIB boys' school with a Grade VIB girls' or infants' school (Sixth Schedule, Part II, (i) and (ii), and taking in each case the minimum salaries of the teachers in these respective schools, we find that (a) the salary of the head teacher in the separate boys' school is £110 more than the salary of the head teacher in the separate girls' or infants' schools of equal grades; (b) the total amount of the salaries paid in the boys' school is £340 above that of the salaries paid in the girls' or infants' school of equal grade. The education of girls and infants, one would infer from the above facts, is of less importance for the welfare of the nation than the education of boys, and in consequence can be paid for at a cheaper rate. (2) The difference in the grades of salaries of assistants in relation to their relative positions on the staffs of schools: In Grade VB, VIA, B, VIIA, B schools the second assistant drops two grades below the first assistant in salary. For some inexplicable reason this does not happen in schools of Grades Vc and Vd. In these two grades of schools the second assistant drops one grade only. It seems an anomaly that whereas the third assistant in all schools of Grades V, VI, and VII receives the same salary as the second assistant, on the other hand the second assistant is, in all but Vc and Vd schools, placed two grades below the first assistant. The first and second assistants in our larger schools both occupy very responsible positions—positions which involve many duties besides actual class-teaching—yet while the third assistant is paid a salary equal to that of second assistant, the second, with extra responsibilities and duties, receives a salary two grades below that of first assistant. (3.) The anomaly which allows a teacher transferred from one position to another to suffer loss of salary through such transfer: In the Education Bill, Part VI, section 67, we read, "The transfer of a teacher may be made in any one of the three cases following: (b.) In any case where the efficient conduct of any school appears in the opinion of the Board to require such transfer." The efficient conduct of a school may, I take it, mean, among other things, a due balance of male and female teachers, and not merely the efficiency of any particular teacher likely to be transferred. A school grade VA rises to Grade VB. The first assistant's salary in such school rises from Grade IV to Grade V, but the second assistant's salary remains Grade 3. According to clause (b) quoted above a transfer is effected. The first assistant of Grade VA

school with a Grade 4 (£190-£220) salary now becomes second assistant with a Grade 3 (£150-£180) salary in the Grade Vb school. According to the Education Bill of 1914 there is no provision against such teacher dropping at once from perhaps the maximum of the Grade 4 (£220) to the maximum of Grade 3 (£180). Such a case, if not cases, occurred under the provisions of the Education Act of 1908, and such cases will occur again under the Education Bill of 1914 unless the anomaly is removed, for on this point the Bill of 1914 reads exactly as did the Act of 1908, as may be seen by comparing them. Section 56 (5) of the Act reads, "Notwithstanding the provisions of the last preceding subsection, if a teacher in a public school is transferred from one position to another position (whether those two positions are in the same school or in different schools, or under the same Board or under different Boards), his salary in his new position shall be determined in the manner following: (a.) If the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position is less than the minimum salary of the grade or subgrade of salary attached to his new position, he shall receive as his initial salary in his new position the amount of such minimum salary, and thereafter shall receive an annual increment in the manner provided in the last preceding subsection. (b.) If the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position is greater than the maximum salary of the grade or subgrade of salary attached to his new position, he shall receive as his salary in his new position the amount of such maximum salary. (c.) In any other case he shall receive as his initial salary in his new position the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position, and shall receive his first increment of salary on the same date as if he had continued in the position from which he was so transferred." I think that section 75, subsection (4) (b), of the Bill reads exactly the same as the Act of 1908.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Do you suggest it is possible for a teacher's salary to be reduced under section 75 even if transferred?—A case occurred in our district. The teacher is now suffering a loss of £30 in salary.

4. But could any teacher's salary be reduced by transfer under section 75 of this Bill?—Yes.

5. Any existing teacher?—Yes. I have an example here. For example, in Grade Va, according to the provisions of the Bill, in a school with an average attendance of 241 to 280, the first assistant's salary is £190 to £220. The school rises, say, to Grade Vb, then the first assistant's salary is £230 to £250. If the transfer is effected of the first assistant to the position of second assistant, the second assistant in that case gets £150 to £180. According to the regulation—section 75 (4) (b)—the assistant must receive the maximum £180, but that maximum of the second assistant may be £10, £20, £30, or £40 below what the teacher was receiving as first assistant.

6. But do you suggest that a first assistant in Grade Va school, if that school rose to Grade Vb, might under any circumstances, except the one I will allude to presently, be put into that school as second assistant?—It happened in our district this year, and can happen again under that same provision.

7. Are there not some certain circumstances under which it would be just for it to happen? Supposing a teacher proved inefficient, ought there not to be some power in this Bill in the case of a transfer to put that teacher in a lower grade?—If the teacher were proved inefficient.

8. Has that teacher not the right to go to the Court of Appeal?—I think the teacher should have that right.

9. Has she not got the right?—I suppose she has.

10. Well, if there was any injustice in reducing her, and she was not reduced because of inefficiency, she has the right of appeal?—Yes, and the right of appeal should be exercised.

11. So that she would have justice?—If she knew the Bill, as she should.

12. The object of the clause is to give the Board power to put a teacher into a lower position on transfer because of inefficiency?—Yes.

13. We must keep that right, otherwise where should we be?—I see, yes.

14. The teacher is protected by the Court of Appeal?—Yes.

15. *Mr. Hogben.*] The transfers are left to the discretion of the Board. It is quite conceivable that a Board might transfer a teacher from Grade IV to Grade III, but if the Board did so without sound reason there would be the right of appeal.

16. *Mr. Poland.*] I understand the case you referred to occurred last year simply because that particular school rose from Grade Va to Grade Vb?—Yes. The woman was first assistant in the school, and it was deemed necessary that a man should be appointed as first assistant. There was no question of inefficiency. The woman put her case in the hands of the New Zealand Educational Institute.

17. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] And what did the New Zealand Educational Institute do?—That is what she wants to know.

18. *Mr. Poland.*] If that school had not risen from Grade Va to Grade Vb that teacher would not have had her salary reduced?—No, not if the school had not risen from the one grade to the other. If it had not been for the raising of the grade of the school the teacher would this year have been receiving a salary of £30 more than she is at present receiving.

19. That teacher would be first assistant till another forty pupils came into the school, but the Board considered that a male teacher was required, and they reduced her salary and her status?—That is so.

Mr. Hogben: Miss Finlayson is quite right in regard to what did happen. The case did occur, and I do not know what was in the minds of the members of the Board. I cannot say that the Board did wrongly, but taking such cases generally, if there is no question as to the efficiency of the teacher but merely the efficient conduct of the school, I think a wise Board would, and they do, wait for an appropriate opportunity for transfer. The Board probably overlooked the effect of its action.

JOSEPH GRIMMOND examined. (No. 5.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of the Westland Education Board?—Yes.

2. And you have a specific matter to bring before the Committee in regard to the Bill we are considering?—Before I left Hokitika we had a special meeting of the Board to consider this Bill, and the Board came to a conclusion and passed the following resolution: "That this Board recognizes the advantages offered by the Education Bill with reference to grading and payment of teachers, status and remuneration of Inspectors of Schools, and in other important directions, but can see no advantage to the Westland District by the proposed amalgamation with another district, for the following reasons: (1.) In Westland the local conditions are special, and will not be taken into consideration so fully by a Board meeting in a distant centre as by one intimate with the requirements of the district. (2.) In remote districts, where there is a large proportion of schools under sole teachers, the majority of whom are previous to appointment without training or certificates, close attention and frequent direction by a capable Inspector is a necessary requirement. This has been secured in the Westland District, but will not be so possible if it is part of a larger one. (3.) The cost of inspection of a district such as Westland, with small schools scattered over a large area, in which travelling is difficult and the teachers are in many cases untrained, will be large in proportion to the roll number, whether it is part of a more extensive district or not. The cost of administration must similarly be larger. (4.) The opportunities for promotion available to qualified teachers are not altogether absent. This is proved by the fact that four Inspectors of Schools in the service of other Boards or of the Education Department, also the headmaster of one of the largest schools of Christchurch, have been teachers in Westland. A considerable number of other certificated teachers from this district are now employed in other districts. The great difficulty experienced by the Board is to retain qualified teachers." Those are the principal objections. I might say that, having some little experience in educational matters as a member of the Board, Westland is peculiar in this respect: that we had one Board controlling almost the whole of the West Coast, and we had something like double the number of children attending the schools, but through a change of the position of the Board from one town to another some objection was raised, and the Government then divided Westland into two education districts, which, in my opinion, was quite unnecessary. At all events, that involved the same schools, the same teachers, two Inspectors, two Boards, and two staffs. I happened to be a member of both those Boards from the time they started, and I cannot see that it has increased the efficiency much by doubling the staffs. I think we got on just as well when we had the whole education district of Westland working under the one staff. I know that the conditions are improved now for travelling, and I believe that, so far as the Board is concerned which I have the honour to represent, they would rather that they were part of a large district like Canterbury than joined together, as some people on the Coast desire, in a separate district.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You prefer being put into Canterbury?—That is the opinion of the Board as it appeared to me. They did not come to any decision, but I understand an effort is being made to try and get a separate education district. They feel that if you are going to kill them you might as well kill as many as you possibly can. I recognize that local things are run wild in our part. As a member of the County Council I go into the Education Office, and I find I have a good many of the same members there with me, and the same applies to the High School Board, the Charitable Aid Board, and the Harbour Board—the same men on the different bodies. We recognize that the Government is doing some good in reducing the number. At the same time Westland is in a peculiar position. There are about three hundred miles of rivers in certain portions which are unbridged, and the number of small schools we have appear to be perhaps more than required. If two or three families are living on one side of the river and other families on the other side, they are practically just as much separated as if they were four or five miles apart so far as the school is concerned.

4. Do you favour the reduction of the number of Boards from thirteen to some lower number?—Yes, I do.

5. And you approve of Westland going into Canterbury?—Well, rather than put up with other Boards on the West Coast.

6. *Mr. Sidey.*] Do I understand that you want your district to remain as it is at present?—The majority of the Board thought that if it would remain as it is we could give greater attention to those small schools in the southern district by having one Inspector, who is not only an Inspector but a dry-nurse to the teachers employed in those schools, because they had no one to train them, and we have to do the best we can with them.

7. Am I right in saying that the majority of the members of the Board want the district to remain as it is?—I think that is their opinion. They would rather have it as it is than chance a change; but if there is to be an alteration, and a reduction will add to the improvement of the teaching staff and Inspectors and officers, and perhaps better the standard amongst the schools, they are prepared to have a big district rather than have them mixed up.

8. If there is to be an alteration, then you want it altered differently from what the Minister proposes?—Yes, that is so. That is their opinion.

9. Will you state exactly how you want it altered?—We are prepared to keep it as it is, because we get on very well; but if you are going to alter it, I say we would be far better if put into a big district than being joined together on the Coast. In that way you would give the teacher a better chance and be able to bring the education standard of the West Coast up to the highest standard in New Zealand. We want if possible to remain as we are, but if you are going to alter the position put us in with Canterbury rather than with any one else.

10. Then you are quite satisfied if the alteration is made similar to that proposed?—Yes.

11. *Mr. McCallum.*] You are not satisfied to be linked up with Greymouth?—We do not think there is anything in that. It might lessen the expense, although I do not myself think so. I think there would be dissatisfaction, and you would not improve the status of the schools as you might by joining us with Canterbury.

12. Now, do you think the management from Christchurch will give you the same satisfaction for representation that you have got at the present time?—That I do not know. We do not know what representation we are going to have.

13. When you are linked up with Christchurch you will have a quarter of the members?—That is what I say. It will give us a closer intimacy with the various schools as we are, but we would prefer joining with Christchurch for the advantages we would get in the way of better education for the teachers than they would get by remaining with some other Boards.

14. How many pupils have you attending the schools in Westland to-day?—I think about twelve hundred. I believe we are the smallest Board in New Zealand.

15. And in Canterbury there are about twenty-eight thousand pupils under two Boards. and you desire to be linked up with a district with that number of children?—Yes, if any alteration is made.

16. Do you not think you will require some intermediate body between your Committees and the Board in Christchurch?—I do not know. We say we are doing very well if you will leave us alone.

17. You are not going to be left alone—that is hopeless. It is the same with Marlborough. Do you not think you should have some intermediate body—some School Board or office in Hokitika?—And another in Greymouth. You perpetuate the same thing. I do not fear that joining in with a big body will hurt us. I think they will give us justice.

FRIDAY, 31ST JULY, 1914.

WILLIAM MILNE HAMILTON examined. (No. 6.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am a member of the South Canterbury Board and an ex-Chairman. I might say I have been a member of the South Canterbury Education Board for about ten years, and I was Chairman for about three years.

2. Will you state your case to the Committee?—I do not know whether it has come under your notice that we passed a resolution at the last meeting of the Board in Timaru with reference to this matter, and if not I will read it. It reads, "That the proposal to do away with the South Canterbury Education District is calculated to be seriously detrimental to the best interests of education in South Canterbury without any corresponding benefit to the general interests of education; that it will not promote economy in administration; that owing to the wide areas over which the proposed new districts will extend it will be impossible to get representatives on the new Boards with any sufficient local knowledge of the numerous and widely scattered rural school districts and the important schools in Timaru and other towns in the district for enabling them to effect a just and equitable distribution of the benefits of our education system to which all the various localities and schools are justly entitled; that teachers and others in South Canterbury will be put to serious inconvenience, delay, and expense through having to transact education business with Board officials in distant centres, their only means of doing so being by making journeys to these centres or by the manifestly unsatisfactory means of written correspondence; that in regard to all matters frequently arising, the conditions and circumstances whereof can only be adequately presented by deputations, all parts of South Canterbury will be placed at a great disadvantage, as it will be impracticable to send deputations to either Dunedin or Christchurch; that in regard to the County of Waimate in particular, as it is situated in the Canterbury Provincial District, of which Christchurch is the capital, it would be an anomaly and an incongruity to have its educational administration centred in Dunedin; that, moreover, the principle of centering administration in the larger cities is detrimental to the welfare and progress of rural districts, and therefore to the general progress of the Dominion; that this Board claims to have achieved a large measure of success in promoting the general good of its district in educational matters, especially as to efficiency in methods and economy in expenditure, and claims that in no respect will the new proposals as to districts conduce to give any better results." That resolution outlines the grounds on which the Board thinks it would not be wise to interfere with the present system. I think it would be a sound principle for the Government to act upon, that unless a case is clearly made out where some improvement would be gained it would be very unwise to tamper with the existing position of matters. I may point out that the Board I represent has been in existence for a great number of years, and it has adapted itself, and the people have adapted themselves, to the administration which this Board carries out. Throughout the whole time I do not think that any dissatisfaction has been expressed. Everybody in the district seems to have become well accustomed to the methods of the Board, and great satisfaction exists throughout the district with the work of the Board. I might point out that the Board can justly substantiate its claim to have done the very best with the means at its disposal on the question of economy.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I do not question that they have been economical?—Well, in that case it seems difficult to understand why the change should be made, unless there is likely to be some gain. The proposal would cause much disorganization by introducing new boundaries, because one part of the district will be cut off and given to Canterbury and another part given to Dunedin. In regard to the proposal to put the County of Waimate into the Otago Education

District, I do not think anybody conversant with local affairs in Canterbury would for a moment have dreamt of making such a proposal. There is no community of interest between the County of Waimate and Dunedin, which is the centre of the Otago Education District. Unless there is community of interest it would be very unwise to put it in with another Board. The people in the south part of Otago would have no interest whatever in Canterbury. It has been one of the main features of the policy of the Government to encourage settlement in rural districts, and the result of this proposal to make the districts so wide will be that the rural districts will be very much more out of touch in regard to control of education. It is a very serious matter, and will not tend to encourage settlement in the country. The people of the country value the institution of their schools very highly indeed, and take a very great local interest in them. That is very largely due to the fact that they are in close touch with the local controlling Board. The farther away you take that local controlling interest from them the less interest the people in the country will have in their schools, and it will not be for the benefit of education to do anything which will diminish local interest in the schools in the country. It will make the country less attractive to live in, because people value the institution of the schools because of the close relationship between the school and social life. Our experience in South Canterbury is that the people are always willing to come to our assistance in providing funds for the establishment and carrying-on of the schools, and that is due to the fact that we are in close touch with them.

4. Are you talking of the Boards or the Committees?—The Board. The Board is in close touch with the whole district now because it is of reasonable size, but that interest which they now take would be seriously diminished if the district was largely increased, because they would see little or nothing of the members of the Board. One of our features has been for the Board to go round and see the schools for themselves, and there is not a school in the district that the members of the Board have no personal knowledge of. I would point out that under the present proposal the districts seem to be very unevenly divided. I take it that the object of the Bill is to have educational matters administered with a fair degree of uniformity throughout the country by having the districts divided with a fair regard to having them even in regard to size. I think that idea should be carried out. I desire to say that under the present proposal in the Bill there would be only four Boards in the South Island—Nelson, with approximately 220 schools and 8,650 children; Canterbury, with 345 schools and 30,000 children; Otago, with 235 schools and 20,000 children; and Southland, with 225 schools and 12,000 children. You will see there are two Boards there the sizes of which are very disproportionate to the other two, and it would not seem likely that a Board having 30,000 children under it would be able to administer the work as well as a Board having a smaller number. The North Canterbury Board has passed a resolution to the effect that it considered the proposal to make its district so wide was not desirable. We have a scheme by which we think the division could be arranged better in the interests of education generally. Why should there not be five Boards in the South Island? It cannot be any essential part of the scheme that there should be any definite number of Boards. Under a scheme of five Boards the Grey might be taken from Canterbury and given to Nelson. We would also suggest that the boundaries of South Canterbury be enlarged and take in the Ashburton district, and that part of the Waitaki County north of Kakanui River could easily be worked from Timaru.

5. *The Chairman.*] You do not consider that the Otago people would have the same feeling you have now?—It would be lightening their work, but would not make any difference to their Board. Perhaps they would be satisfied and prefer it. I submit that would be a very fair division of the South Island for the purpose of administering educational matters. I might point out that this is not the case of a Board being a decadent Board or a Board that has not shown that it can satisfactorily manage its affairs. Further, the district is growing rapidly. In the course of time the country will be much more thickly settled, and that is all the more reason for having a separate education district there. Timaru is steadily rising in importance as a centre, being the chief port for the district extending from Ashburton to Oamaru. It is not a case in which we are asking to be made a district, but simply asking to be allowed to remain as we are.

6. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] With regard to what you said about the rural district being out of touch—out of touch with whom, with the Board?—Rural School Committees would be more out of touch with the Board in large areas than in small ones.

7. Have you had experience of a large district to be able to say that?—It stands to reason.

8. If the representatives from a large district have given evidence to the contrary, what have you to say?—The evidence has to be taken for what it is worth.

9. Would not the Inspector be more in touch in a large district than in a small one?—The Inspector would visit the schools.

10. Is there any reason why the Inspector should not be so much in touch with a larger district as with a smaller one?—No.

11. Does not the Inspector advise the Board?—On certain points; but a Board cannot get anything like the same knowledge from an Inspector as the members of the Board get themselves.

12. Do you say the members of the Boards are acquainted with all the schools?—I think so, in some districts.

13. In regard to the local controlling influence, where does it exercise itself?—It exercises itself in the administration of the affairs, in looking after the school buildings, and in looking after the relationship between the teachers and the different schools.

14. Controlling the buildings: is not that the business of the School Committees?—No. The School Committees have certain powers in regard to buildings, but the Board as a whole says what shall be done in regard to repairs.

15. Does the Board act on the advice of the Inspectors with regard to repairs?—Not altogether, no.

16. There is no question of the local controlling influence of the School Committee in the appointment of a teacher or residence in a particular local district?—If the Board sends a number of names the local Committee has the choice.

17. Are you aware of any influence in any of your small districts which are detrimental to the teacher in the case of appointment?—No.

18. There is no favouritism shown anywhere?—I challenge any one to show that favouritism has been shown.

19. By any School Committee in your district?—Not as far as I know. I think we have been singularly free from that.

20. You spoke of local funds being raised for the schools in your district: does the Board raise them?—The School Committees and inhabitants round about who are interested.

21. But the School Committee is the moving spirit, I presume?—Yes. If they receive encouragement from the Board they do more.

22. What encouragement does the Board give them?—The Board can show its sympathy in various ways. It can grant reasonable requests in regard to the proper upkeep of their districts.

23. I want to know how the Board can show their practical sympathy in the raising of local funds?—It is rather difficult to say. It is a thing that cannot be very well defined. If a School Committee knows the members of the Board personally, and knows the members are sympathetic towards the Committee, they will certainly do more than they otherwise would do.

24. Is it not the Committee that is the moving spirit in raising local funds?—The Committee represent the people interested in the school, but a good deal depends on the sympathy between the Board and the fact that they know the Board is situated in their own district. It is largely a matter of sentiment.

25. I understand you to say you favour small Education Board districts?—Not necessarily. What I say is that where a district is of fair size and not too small it is not desirable to have it done away with, and when it has shown that it has worked absolutely satisfactorily.

26. Would you favour the cutting-up of the Auckland District, which is a very large district?—Speaking generally, I should think it probably would be desirable. If I had to pass an opinion upon it I would think it would be desirable to have it cut up.

27. Are you speaking simply from the point of view of the Education Board or are you speaking in the interests of the teachers generally of the country?—I am speaking as a member of the Board and in the interests of the public and the teachers.

28. *Mr. Sidey.*] Have you considered the question from the point of view of the teachers?—I have, yes, and I do not see that the teachers can be prejudiced by our district being left as it is. They are quite satisfied so far as I know. The teachers in our district have never expressed dissatisfaction.

29. Do you not think there would be a wider avenue of promotion open to the teachers if the district is large?—No, I do not see anything in that point. I think that could be well met if the Inspectors are put under the Government with a system of grading.

30. Do I understand from your remark that you favour the proposal in the Bill to centralize the Inspectors?—I am not opposed to that.

31. Is it necessary for the teachers to attend personally upon the Board?—Not at all: there is no necessity for it. They have to attend at the Board office on their business. It is a great convenience for them to have an office within a reasonable distance. They have occasion to attend frequently on various matters.

32. For what purpose do they attend?—The Secretary of the Board can tell you better than I can. They are constantly attending at the Board office.

33. Do you not think that the local interest is almost entirely due to the School Committee?—No, I do not think so. I think the local interest can be fostered very largely by the Board having men who are in touch themselves with the localities.

34. *Mr. McCallum.*] Have you a School Committees' Association?—No.

35. Are your School Committees strongly opposed to the amalgamation?—Oh, yes. As far as I understand, they are entirely opposed to it. Several have passed resolutions already, and there is to be a representative meeting.

36. You say your teachers are indifferent?—I think the teachers are strongly against the amalgamation also. I believe they will be dealing with that at the Institute meeting.

37. Of the nine members on your Board, do they all take an active interest in educational affairs?—Yes, every one.

38. They understand the Education Act and the regulations?—Yes.

39. You would say they are educationists?—Yes. Some have a better grasp of matters than others, but all have a very intelligent knowledge of the Act. There is not often occasion when there is not a full Board, and all take an active part in the work of administration.

40. Could not all the work you do be done just as well in Christchurch?—I do not think so.

41. Not with two or three delegates from the South Canterbury District?—No, I do not think so. Those delegates would be the only ones who would be in touch with any parts of the district.

42. I suggest that two delegates from your Board being up in Christchurch would be much better in touch by meeting other delegates in Canterbury?—I can see that there is something in regard to what you say. It might enlarge their horizon by coming in contact with others, but I do not think the benefits would outweigh the disadvantages.

43. Would you not be satisfied with a Board office at Timaru with a Clerk under the central Board from Christchurch administering the affairs as at present, and transferring all your Board functions to Christchurch?—I cannot see that anything would be gained by that.

44. Is it not a parochial feeling only?—No, I do not think so. I do not approach it from that point of view. I approach it from the point of view of the interests of education generally.

45. Do you say you would not be just as well served by an office in Timaru, a Clerk there, and your two or three delegates representing the nine members going up to Christchurch once a month?—I have already given my opinion on that matter.

46. *The Chairman.*] Which are your counties?—Geraldine, Levels, Mackenzie, and Waimate.

CHARLES SMITH HOWARD examined (No. 7.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I have been a member of the Timaru Education Board for the last nine years.

2. Will you please make your statement to the Committee?—I feel that there is very little for me to say. Mr. Hamilton has covered very effectively practically the whole of the points we desired to bring forward. On behalf of the Board, and I think I might say on behalf of the whole of the district.—at all events, the larger Committees, and I believe the majority of the smaller Committees—I desire to express our satisfaction with the Bill which has been introduced. As you are aware, I have been a teacher for thirty-five years, and for nine years I have been a member of the Board. I know something about the different Acts that have been passed, and I consider the present Bill is a very fine one indeed. Our hope is that, with the exception of one or two things, it may become law. We desire that the proposal in the Bill with regard to dividing the Boards or districts will not be carried out. I might say that there seems to be general satisfaction with regard to the betterment of the secondary school-teachers. One disappointment in connection with the Bill is that you still continue to pay salaries according to the average attendance, and it is hoped that you may see your way to alter that. One matter that Mr. Hamilton omitted to mention was the fact that we have endeavoured to do a great deal of work as a Board for the schools. We have a staff of workmen, we have shops and machinery, and we make all our own desks, forms, and cupboards. We build our own houses and schools, and we do the painting and repairs to the schools generally throughout the whole district. During the last three years every school and schoolhouse in the district has been thoroughly overhauled and put in good repair. We do not claim that it is particularly a money-saving business, although it does not cost any more, but the character of the work done is undoubtedly very much superior to that which we have been accustomed to get under the old system of tendering. If we joined with North Canterbury, we do not know what will happen to this part of our work, and it is altogether too important to be done away with. It should be remembered that originally South Canterbury was a part of North Canterbury, and it was found very difficult to work South Canterbury from North Canterbury. There was a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed, and the result was that there was a subdivision of the district.

3. *Mr. McCallum.*] How long ago was that?—Something over thirty years ago. It seems to those in the Timaru District and the South Canterbury District that if this proposal is tried for a while it will eventually have to be altered again. I was a little surprised to hear the Minister of Education say that economy was not to enter into the business. We understood the larger Boards were supposed to be able to exercise considerable economy in addition to the fact that it would give the teachers a larger area over which to look for promotions. Out of the ten posts we have under our Board, six have been filled by outsiders, which shows that the local teachers have not always been appointed, but the best men that we could get. As an old teacher I cannot see where it is going to be such a great advantage to the teachers in the way of promotions. It seems to me and to the members of the Board that that is a difficulty that might be overcome in some other direction. There is one other respect in which we do stand alone, and that is in the matter referred to by Mr. Hamilton—that we know each school personally. I might say that in June last the members of the Board travelled many miles and visited thirteen schools in the district.

4. *Mr. Malcolm.*] At whose expense?—At the expense of the Board, and the auditor approved of the payment. Everywhere we went we were met by the Committees, who expressed the greatest satisfaction that we had made it our business to come and see the schools and see what was required.

5. *Mr. McCallum.*] I suppose they all wanted money expended at their schools?—Yes, but they did not all get what they wanted after we saw what was required to be done. We had no hesitation in saying in some cases that they did not require it.

6. *The Chairman.*] Supposing you were under Canterbury, would it not be possible to keep your working staff together and work it from Timaru under the Canterbury Board?—I do not think it would be possible. I do not see that it would be worked cheaper or more efficiently.

7. But to keep it there and work it?—It would be very necessary to keep it there, but I cannot see that it would be possible to work it as well from Canterbury.

8. Was not the difficulty of communication in the old days the reason of the separation of the district—you not only had no railways but no bridges whatever?—No. There was a railway through to Invercargill about thirty-five years ago.

JAMES GIBSON GOW examined. (No. 8.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am Chief Inspector for the South Canterbury Education Board.

2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Yes. The evidence I had proposed to give to the Committee has been pretty well covered by the previous witnesses, but I desire to

bring forward one or two points. The Bill proposes for the South Island four education districts. An examination of the departmental reports for 1912—the latest available—reveals these facts regarding the proposed districts:—

District.	Schools (approximate).	Roll (approximate).
Nelson	220	8,650
Canterbury	345	30,000
Otago	235	21,000
Southland	225	12,350
	<hr/> 1,025	<hr/> 72,000

Hence it is clear that the Minister regards a district whose school population is about 9,000 as permissible. It is also evident that, compared with the others, two of the districts are disproportionately large. Why should there not be five Boards for the South Island as for the North? Grant that, and it can easily be shown that South Canterbury should be retained as one of the education districts. Further, if it is retained, both North Canterbury and Otago would be less cumbersome and overweighted. If Grey be taken from Canterbury and given to Nelson the latter will then have approximately 260 schools and 11,000 pupils. Further, Ashburton County, with, roughly speaking, twenty-five schools and 1,300 pupils, and that part of Waitaki County north of the Kakanui River, with, say, twenty schools and 1,700 pupils, could be added to the present South Canterbury District, and the proposed boundaries of Otago and Southland could be readjusted. The table would then take this form:—

District.	Schools.	Pupils.
Nelson	260	11,000
North Canterbury	230	22,000
South Canterbury	130	9,000
Otago	205	18,000
Southland	200	12,000
	<hr/> 1,025	<hr/> 72,000

All these figures are only approximately correct. Surely by such an arrangement there would be greater economy in administration without any sacrifice of the needs of the schools of any district. So far as is evident the chief reasons for the establishment of fewer education districts are (1) economy, (2) greater facilities for promotion amongst teachers. As regards economy, I have to say that while administration may cost a little less in the larger districts it may be economy only in name. Over and over again I have been told by teachers and visitors from other districts that South Canterbury schools are better cared for, and their needs are more readily supplied, than in other districts. If a larger district is more economically administered, and yet owing to the lack of knowledge of the district by its members as a whole is unable to attend promptly and effectively to the needs of its schools, that is not economy at all. Further, I would direct attention to Table F12, page 41, of return E.-2. In that comparison South Canterbury, though a smaller district, stands fifth on the list of economically administered Boards. The South Canterbury Education Board has always been noted for its strict attention to economy and for its efficient administration of the funds entrusted to its care. Its scale of incidental allowances to Committees is very liberal, and it renders material help to Committees in carrying out necessary permanent improvements to grounds and buildings. In order to make the most of its building and maintenance funds the Board six years ago entered upon the policy of employing its own workmen to carry out repairs to schools, to erect new buildings and additions, and to make all necessary furniture and fittings. To aid in this work the Board has erected a large workshop, 140 ft. by 22 ft., in which is installed up-to-date machinery costing with the shop £1,000 and driven by electrical power. Here are made all the desks and school furniture needed in the district, and most of the joinery needed in connection with new buildings and additions. This has proved to be a much more satisfactory method than the contract system was. The Board finds that now its repairs are more thoroughly carried out and that far better value is obtained for the money spent. To show the nature of the Board's operations I would state that the staff of workmen at present consists of three carpenters, two apprentices, and three painters, who are supervised by the Board's foreman or clerk of works, who also acts as the Board's architect. For 1913 the Board paid out in wages to its workmen the sum of £1,300, and for timber, &c., used in the factory the sum of £1,320. Besides these sums the foreman's salary of £250 per annum has to be taken into account. But Timaru ought to be the centre of an education district because of its position. It is the outlet for the productions of a very wide district from Oamaru to Ashburton, and owing to the productiveness of this region its importance must grow. This Bill is providing not for the present so much as the future, and if South Canterbury is retained it will in the course of twenty-five or thirty years be as Christchurch is now—the centre of a school area in which within a radius of twelve miles are found 12,000 pupils. Conduct of business in the smaller Board: Under the system adopted the South Canterbury Board meetings are held twice a month. Each meeting lasts from two to four hours, and no member sacrifices much time in attending meetings, and can easily leave his home and return to it the same day. Thus it is made possible for all classes to be represented on the Board. If the meetings necessitated a two or three or even four days' absence from home it is probable that only the leisured or the moneyed class of public men could act on the Board, and that would be a retrograde step in the management of educational affairs. Further, in the

smaller districts it is possible for every member to become acquainted with most of the schools in the district, and that is a great advantage when matters affecting schools are dealt with. In a very large district it would be quite possible for every Board member to be ignorant of the position and needs of many different schools. Now, as regards cost of meetings, it is worth while making a calculation. One meeting of the South Canterbury Education Board costs £4 14s. but a Board meeting in Christchurch might cost as follows:—Four Christchurch members at 5s., £1; two Timaru members at £1 5s. plus 10s. for three days, £5 10s.; two South Canterbury members at the same, £5 10s.; two North Canterbury members at 15s. each, £1 10s.; two Westland members at £2 10s. plus 10s. for three days, £8; total, £21 10s. Thus even for twelve meetings per annum the cost would be at least £258 and might easily be £300. To this must be added the cost of many special trips, necessary if members are really to know the district. Further, the travelling-expenses of the Board's employees—its foreman, clerk of works, architect, &c.—would be greatly increased. Now, as regards the cry from our teachers that in the smaller districts there are not enough opportunities for promotion: is this the fault of the size of the district or of the methods of appointment? And if it be not the result of area, why seek to remove the evil by enlarging district areas? Surely this is only widening the barriers. If every district had followed South Canterbury's policy no such cry would have been heard from our teachers. Of our thirteen largest schools only four headmasters were trained in South Canterbury—the other nine came from other districts. The only real remedy for this complaint from teachers is a Dominion scheme of promotion; and the Bill paves the way for this by its proposals to centralize the inspectorate and so provide for a central grading scheme.

3. *Mr. McCallum.*] You favour centralizing the appointment of Inspectors?—I have always voted against that.

4. Then you do not believe in it?—I do not say I do not believe in it, but I think the Inspectors might be still under the Education Boards with a scheme of salaries as proposed for the teachers.

5. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Do you mean that those who pay should not employ?—I do not know. I am speaking from the point of the efficiency of the work.

THOMAS REED FLEMING examined (No. 9.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am Chief Inspector for the Wellington Education District.

2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—First of all, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire to thank you for your readiness in receiving our deputation. I wish to speak on behalf of almost all the Inspectors—in fact, I think I can say on behalf of all the Inspectors in the Dominion. Auckland is the only district which is not represented by this deputation, because they have approached you separately. The first point we desire to make is that there should be at least one Inspector for every fifty primary schools. Mr. Hill, our senior Chief Inspector, has signed his name to our list of suggestions, but he asks me to state that he does not approve of this proposal coming in here. That does not mean that he does not approve of it as a matter of principle. It is a matter dealing with the administration, but we thought it advisable to point out what we thought the extent of an Inspector's duty should be. Our second suggestion is that in the event of the control of Inspectors being placed in the hands of the Department, no Inspector at present in the employ of any Education Board in the Dominion should suffer loss in rank or in salary, and that the present inspectorial staff should have precedence for promotion.

Mr. Hogben. That is already provided for. It is the intention of the Minister to reserve the question of the salaries of Inspectors.

Witness. I am glad to know that. We think the Inspectors should be given that consideration when the question arises. The third proposal we bring forward is that, in general, the headquarters of the Inspectors appointed to each education district should be the chief town of that district. Our idea is that we have found from experience that the fortnightly or monthly meetings of the inspectorial staffs are advantageous, and we are strongly against the idea of an area Inspector. Our fourth suggestion is that the salaries allotted to Inspectors should range from £500 with annual increments to £650, exclusive of travelling-expenses. These amounts were recommended by the Conference of Inspectors in 1913, and of Chief Inspectors in 1914, and the minimum of £500 has also been recommended by the Otago and other educational institutes. The Auckland suggestion is for a higher amount than that, and if the Committee could agree we should like to see the Auckland proposal substituted.

3. *The Chairman.*] I understand there will be no reduction in salary where a Board has already appointed an Inspector at a certain salary?—In our fourth suggestion we are simply laying down a general principle more than anything else. The fifth suggestion we made, which should really be taken with the fourth, reads—that this request with regard to salaries is in accord with the general principle that no Inspector should receive lower remuneration than that of a headmaster of the highest-grade primary school; and is also in accord with the sound business principle that a supervising and reporting officer should receive higher remuneration than those whose work he has to supervise and report upon. This is our strong point. Under the Act the highest salary is £520—namely, £440 salary, £30 for district high school allowance, and £50 house allowance, making about £520. We consider that no Inspector should be placed in the position of going into a school at a lower salary than the officer he is reporting upon. We consider that a sound business principle, and the principle upon which the salaries of Inspectors should be allotted. Then our sixth suggestion is that in drawing up a scale of salaries for

Inspectors it should be remembered that by being placed under the Department, Inspectors would incur the following among other disabilities: (a) Financial loss owing to withdrawal of the privilege now enjoyed of receiving fees for departmental examination-work, supervision at examination centres, and fees for special examinations. This means, roughly, an individual loss of about £40 a year. We are unable to say exactly what it is. We do not take any special fees in our district, but at the same time there are certain fees and perquisites which are allowed to go by the regulations to the Inspectors. As far as we can make out, taking the average amongst the Inspectors, we think we are not under the mark when we say £40 a year. Then (b) curtailment to three weeks of the annual leave of Inspectors, which at present varies from a month to six weeks in different districts. Some of us do not even get the three weeks, but we are in the position that we have to get the work done for our Boards, but we are supposed to be allowed to take six weeks, but under the Public Service Regulations we only get three weeks. At present we can arrange with our own Boards, but speaking for myself I hardly ever get more than that, and I know there are other Inspectors who hardly ever get any at all. The seventh suggestion is that the Minister may grant leave of absence to any Inspector to enable him to visit schools or other educational institutions in New Zealand or elsewhere. Such leave of absence shall be on full pay and on the following conditions: three months for five complete years of education service, six months for ten years, nine months for fifteen years, and twelve months for twenty years and upwards. There is a provision in the Bill for such leave for teachers, but none for Inspectors.

4. *Mr. Hogben.*] It does not require it—it is in the Public Service Act. All service would count?—That is a matter we did not know about, and we wish it to be cleared up. Then, No. 8 is that a clause should be inserted in the Bill making it clear that the previous education service of an Inspector in the Dominion should be counted as full service for all the benefits conferred by the Public Service Act. That refers to what Mr. Hogben was saying, and we are very pleased to know that it is so. It has not been clear to us hitherto. Our ninth suggestion is that, in accordance with the principle that no Inspector should receive lower remuneration than that of the highest grade of head teacher, the position of Assistant Inspector as set out in the Twelfth Schedule should not be retained. Reference has been made to that by Mr. Hogben and Mr. Sidey. I should like to impress upon the Committee this point: that the salaries allotted to Inspectors should range from £500 with annual increments to £650, exclusive of travelling-expenses. This is a consolidating Act, and I think members will agree with me that Parliament is not ready to touch an Education Act again in a hurry. When you have a consolidating Act it should be consolidated on the proper principles. It means that an Assistant Inspector may come in at a small salary and then possibly have means of rising up to another, and that also prevents many young men in the service from taking a small salary to begin with. As this is a consolidating Act we think it should contain principles that should be laid down for Inspectors, and if there is any reason because of the transition from the present stage to the stage proposed in this Bill, that could be put in as a saving-clause. Neither the Minister nor the Director of Education will be in office at the time to explain the reason for this in the Act, and this stands as putting the Inspectors in this grade at present, and may stand for a long time. We have no objection whatever to any reason for the thing coming in as a temporary arrangement, but we think anything that may be a temporary arrangement should be put in as a saving clause so that those who have to deal with the Act afterwards will know what the true position of the Inspectors is.

5. *Mr. Hogben (for the Minister).*] I suppose the suggestions you have made represent the opinions of the Inspectors?—We set up a committee at the Conference in 1913 and again in 1914, and with the exception of the Auckland men the suggestions I have made represent the opinions of the Inspectors.

6. Would the Inspectors think that an Inspector who is now receiving £325 should be raised to £500?—We are rather laying down general principles, and we are not here to recommend anything necessarily with regard to adjustment. I take it that a man who is considered to be an Inspector at £325 is probably fitted to receive a higher salary. As a matter of fact, what has happened just lately in one district is that one Inspector has accepted an appointment with the idea of getting a higher salary. He is losing money in his present position.

7. Is it not possible that if a position had been open at £500, instead of £325 or £300, that other men of high qualifications would have applied?—That is the very reason for asking for the Assistant Inspector to be deleted.

8. Are you not doing an injustice when you give him £500 and do not give those other people a few months later the chance of getting the higher position?—The question of injustice in one individual case is very small compared with the general principle we are laying down. Individual cases like that should not in any way interfere with the general principle.

9. You must remember that some clauses of the Bill are framed with the view of transition?—We recognise that.

10. One of the chief uses of the Assistant Inspector might be to effect a transition?—Yes.

11. Supposing you appointed an Inspectress in needlework, would you give her £500 a year?—We are not considering special cases. That is a special case like an Inspector of woodwork or anything else.

12. There is no such thing as an Inspector of woodwork, but there are in almost all parts of the world Inspectors of needlework. You would not include them in this general scale?—No, not Inspectors of needlework.

13. You would regard this as applicable to some Inspectors, if necessary—for instance, to the Chief Medical Inspector?—Yes, I think the Chief Medical Inspector of Schools should get

more than that. We are merely dealing with the inspectorate as an inspectorate. Personally, I think those cases ought to come into that list and ought to get at least that salary.

14. *Mr. Sidey.*] I suppose you agree that the principle of the Bill is the centralization of Inspectors?—We are not here on matters of policy, but I distinctly disagree with the proposal, and have always voted against it at the Conferences of Inspectors. Of course, I am speaking personally when I say that.

15. You do not know to what extent your opinion is shared by the other Inspectors in New Zealand?—I think you should ask the other Inspectors. The motion at the Conference was not carried; it was shelved last time.

16. Do you not think it would conduce to uniformity of standard?—It depends upon what you mean by "uniformity of standard." I do not think it would any more than at present.

17. *Mr. Poland.*] You know the Bill provides for a limited number of Inspectors, not less than two nor more than five?—Yes.

18. Also a number of Senior Inspectors?—Yes.

19. That means that only a limited number will be able to receive that salary of £500 to £625?—That is only in the Bill and not the Act. That can be altered, of course.

20. Do you think that that limited number of Inspectors is anything like a fair number to receive the salaries provided in the Bill for the whole of New Zealand?—No, I do not think so. Our contention here will bear that out.

21. Do you not think, seeing that only possibly two and certainly not more than five Chief Inspectors are to be appointed, that your proposal of £650 as a maximum is a very modest one?—Yes. You will find that the Auckland Inspectors have asked for a higher amount. We certainly think it is a very modest proposal. We have taken as a guide the resolutions passed at the Conference and also the salaries provided in the B (Professional) Division of the Public Service Act, which begins at £500.

22. Are you not of opinion that the services of a Chief Inspector in New Zealand, with a status such as under this Bill, that his duties are worth more than that of an architect to a Board?—Yes, unquestionably. Some architects get £700.

23. Can you give the Committee an opinion as to whether the Inspectors approve of the proposals under this Bill for the payment of salaries to be based on the average attendance?—I am not prepared to give anything but a personal opinion. We have not considered that at the Conference. I cannot say I have examined the clause sufficiently.

24. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to clause 127, this is what the Minister has promised: "No such Inspector shall receive a salary less than the salary he was receiving at the commencement of this Act"; and if we put in the words "and allowances" it would cover the case of No. 6?—We are bringing these cases forward so that the Committee will know the position.

25. *Mr. Malcolm.*] In regard to clauses 5 and 9, do you take it for granted that the Inspectors must be drawn from the ranks of headmasters?—I cannot give you a definite answer as far as the Conference is concerned. I think we are pretty well unanimous in saying that we think they should be.

26. Do you consider a man who has been headmaster at a school for a number of years is as well acquainted with small schools in country districts as a man who has had actual experience?—I think when you deal with such applications you always look at the man's whole experience. It is a question of organization. As Inspector he would have to supervise.

27. I am speaking of a man who has been a long time in a large school. I suppose you know that such men sometimes forget how to draft a time-table for a small school?—Yes, but each case would be considered on its merits.

28. If you have a young man who has plenty of merit, and of good standing and degrees, it may be advisable to accept him although he has not a headmaster's experience in a large school?—Yes, decidedly, but he should be appointed at £525. I do not object to that for one moment, but he should get the salary for the position. It necessarily places him in the position to supervise the work of the headmaster.

29. You say "necessarily places him in the position of supervising the work of the headmaster." Must he necessarily be called upon?—When I used the term "necessarily" I think you will find that circumstances will arise where that will be.

30. You admit that it would be possible to so organize affairs that he would not necessarily be called upon?—No, I do not admit that. Our experience of the districts is against that.

31. In order to keep poorly paid Inspectors in the service—men whom one would imagine were not highly qualified and therefore not very highly paid—in order to keep them in the service would it not be possible to arrange that they should have the inspection of schools in the outlying districts?—That would be detrimental. When I answered you "necessarily" I meant as things are at present. My main contention is that we wish that to be laid down as a general principle. You know Parliament will not be ready to take up another consolidating Bill in a hurry. We are not objecting to adjustment, but what we are asking for is that in the schedule setting out the position of Inspectors the principles we are laying down here should be included. If there is any saving clause such as you suggest it should go in as a saving clause and meet our adjustments. We do not wish that to be lost sight of. An Inspector should get £500 to begin with. We contend that this Assistant Inspector, put into this schedule at present for the reasons you are stating now, which are quite reasonable, will remain in perhaps as a general principle. That is the point.

32. *Mr. McCallum.*] The position of Inspector is one of the plums of the teaching profession?—Yes.

33. We might have a lot of very deserving men grading at country schools who would be fit to come in at £500 and work up and get to the Inspector of small schools, but there are country schools to which you could send an Assistant Inspector?—We cannot agree with you on that point at all. When a man is fit to be an Inspector he should get the minimum salary of £500.

HENRY HILL, Chief Inspector of Schools, Hawke's Bay, examined. (No. 10.)

Witness: I should like to express my views as to the inspectorate, though I would prefer that you should ask me questions on the subject. Personally, I have always been in favour of the centralization of the inspectorate. I perhaps have had the longest experience among the Inspectors, as I started my work following the passing of the Education Act in 1877. I have attended every Conference since that time, and at each Conference I believe I have proposed the centralization of the inspectorate. Personally I congratulate Mr. Hogben—I believe it has been his idea, although I have never spoken to him on the subject—I congratulate Mr. Hogben and the Minister of Education upon inserting this provision in the Bill that is before the Committee to-day.

1. *Mr. J. C. Thomson.*] What are your reasons for favouring the centralization of the inspectorate?—Because I believe it will add to the efficiency of education very materially. I am against uniformity; I oppose uniformity entirely—the greater the differentiation in our school-work the better our schools will be, in my opinion; but the centralization of the inspectorate will enable us to bring matters into a better form of government in the way of getting a general system of classification of our teachers. I myself look upon it as a stepping-stone to the generalized classification of the teachers throughout the Dominion, and it is one of those things that personally I have spent a good deal of time in studying. I may say that I quite agree with all that Mr. Fleming has said; it was only on the question of the inspectorate that I wished to speak, especially when Mr. Fleming and Mr. Gow said so pointedly that they were against the centralization of the inspectorate. I myself am entirely in favour of it, and hope it will be carried out. I think the Inspectors, as has been well said, have been too modest in their requests, because the position which they occupy is such as to warrant, to my mind, the very best salary it is possible to give to the profession.

2. *Mr. Sidey.*] You speak for yourself, of course?—Only myself.

3. You said you were opposed to uniformity?—Yes.

4. But you are not opposed, are you, to uniformity of standard passes—I mean, for the purposes of obtaining, say, a certificate of competency or a certificate of proficiency?—Yes. I think a certificate of proficiency in country schools could be more adapted to the needs of a country school. Every child, under the requirements, has to pass through and get the same departmental standard, taking the same subjects.

5. You are aware that there are certain positions, say in the Railway Department, that are offered to applicants who have passed, say, the Fifth or the Sixth Standard?—Yes.

6. Is it not desirable that there should be the same standard required right throughout New Zealand?—In the case of those who desire to enter the Railway Department they would prepare those subjects in the same way as a lawyer will prepare the subjects that are required for a lawyer.

7. No, there are no special subjects at all; they simply take the school certificate?—But you could have the same standard of equality. It is not necessary to have the same subjects.

8. I do not think you quite understand what I mean. Supposing a pupil applies from Canterbury and another one from Otago to get into the Railway service; they both produce a certificate showing that they have passed the Fifth Standard. Is it not desirable that the qualifications of these two boys should be the same?—It is possible for them to be the same and yet for the boys to have passed different examinations. In this way: if the Department say the following subjects are required—

9. They do not make any stipulation whatever as to subjects?—Then I say it is just as likely, with the essential subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic, for a boy to be as well qualified in the country without taking other subjects as a boy in the town. I want to make it clear that the country need not have the same subjects as the town, and yet have the same standard of efficiency.

10. *Mr. Hogben.*] In a word, you want full liberty of programme for the children, but you want at the same time, as far as you can show it by certificate, equality of mental capacity?—That is exactly the position.

ALEXANDER L. WYLLIE, Chief Inspector of Schools, Southland, examined. (No. 11.)

Witness: The case of an Inspector who has accepted a position at £325 has been mentioned. I do not know whether Southland is referred to or not, but it has occurred in Southland at any rate, and I simply want to state the circumstances. I am in a position to know that neither the one appointed at £325 nor the one appointed at £375 would have applied for the positions unless they had known that a Bill of the sort that is now before the Committee was going to be introduced this session, and they applied for those positions, actually losing money on their present salaries—in the one case at least—in the hope and assurance that this Committee would put things right.

1. *Mr. McCallum.*] Were they teachers?—They were teachers. The one appointed at £325 had a salary and allowance equal to £375. He applied for the position at £325.

2. *The Chairman.*] On account of prospective advantages?—That was all, especially in view of this Bill that was being prepared.

3. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Was the Bill published before he was appointed?—No.

4. Your argument, then, as I understand it, is that we should encourage the speculator?—No, sir.

5. I understand you to suggest that in no case previously have men applied for an inspectorship at £300 a year?—I have no knowledge of that.

WEDNESDAY, 5TH AUGUST, 1914.

EUPHEMIA SIMPSON examined. (No. 12.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—The Women's Branch of the Auckland Educational Institute.

2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Yes. The executive of the Women's Branch of the Auckland District Educational Institute have commissioned me to express their deep appreciation of those progressive measures of the Education Bill placing women on the Education Council and on the inspectorate, and also those making it compulsory for one of the first two assistants in schools of Grades IV to VII and three of the first six in Grades VI and VII to be women. The women of Auckland, knowing that these protective clauses are strongly opposed by a certain section of men, feel very keenly the necessity of urging their retention if the girls' side of our schools is to receive anything like justice in comparison with the boys' side. The teaching of girls is every whit as important to the nation as that of boys; yet at the present time in all our large Auckland primary schools there are three comparatively highly paid men, so that the interests of the boys are trebly secured; while, on the other hand, there is not one highly paid woman to exert the same influence among the girls. In most of our schools, indeed, the senior girls are taught by men, just at the age when they should be under the care of sympathetic and competent women. The Bill, progressive as it is in many respects, hardly goes far enough in the direction of securing competent and suitable teachers for the older girls. Is it any wonder that our girls are not domesticated, so that when they leave school they prefer to work outside the home, as boys do, rather than take up domestic duties? The training of senior girls by men is one of the most serious defects in our education system, and its consequences are already becoming apparent in our national life. In Auckland the prominent men who have contended for the justice and desirability of throwing open the higher positions to women are precisely those who know most about the working of our schools, while those who oppose it are chiefly the male assistants, who have not had opportunities of judging the work done by women. If it had not been for the protective clauses in the last Education Act we feel there is not the slightest doubt that certain Boards would have given even the third assistantship in the large schools to men also, for it has been the unvarying policy of our local Board to keep women in the inferior positions even while admitting the importance and value of their work. In 1912 Miss Hawkins, of Auckland, was appointed (on the recommendation of the Inspectors) to a second assistantship in the Mount Eden School, she having much the highest grading of any applicant for the position. The junior male teachers made such an outcry about the appointment that the Board apparently became frightened at its own slight measure of tardy justice and cancelled it, to the deep and lasting indignation of the women of the province. Under the Otago Board the same practice of giving preference to men prevails, while under the North Canterbury and Wellington Boards women hold second-assistantships. It is evident that owing to the varying policy of local Boards the scale of salaries is hardly a Dominion one after all for women. Clause (d) in the Sixth Schedule will probably result in women being second in every education district, and thus tend to equalize matters. The main point that our branch wishes to emphasize is the urgent necessity of retaining clauses (d) and (e) in the Sixth Schedule, so that the more capable women teachers may have a chance of obtaining some of the higher positions in the service in spite of prejudiced and non-progressive local bodies. The branch also desires to express its gratification at the establishment of special schools for afflicted children, this being a reform strenuously advocated for some years past by our association. I should like to point out that, while the Bill gives the second position to women, it practically debars her from holding the fourth position (£190–220), for it is impossible to doubt that in future men would be appointed by certain Boards to that position to the exclusion of women, and a competent woman is very much needed in the upper part of the school as well as in the infant department. If two positions in Grade IV were allotted, one for a man and one for a woman, this difficulty would be overcome; if not, then the great majority of assistant women teachers will never be able to command a salary above £140 (unless the maximum in that grade be raised).

3. There are two positions already in Grade IV?—But I mean in the large schools.

4. *Mr. Hogben.*] Have you noticed that in all schools in Grades V, VI, and VII the second and third positions are of equal grade?—Yes. It was the next positions I was speaking of where the 4 and 3 are. It is 7, 5, 3, and then 4, 3.

5. Is it not a fact that the fourth and fifth in the larger schools are better than they were before?—Yes.

6. *Mr. Poland.*] I understand you have come here with the object of strengthening the clauses (d) and (e) in this Sixth Schedule?—Yes.

7. So that no attempt will be made to alter that?—That is what I came down about.

8. You think that owing to the action of certain Boards it is absolutely necessary those clauses should be there?—Yes.

9. You do not approve of the positions being left entirely open to the discretion of the Boards?—Yes, we would approve of that if we could depend upon the local Boards, but we cannot depend upon them.

10. You think it is absolutely necessary to safeguard those positions for women teachers?—Yes, in the interests of the schools.

11. And not in the interests of the teachers?—For both.

12. *Mr. Hanan.*] Are you satisfied with the assurance you have received in regard to (d) and (e)?—Yes, I am satisfied on that point.

13. What is the other point you stressed?—We want two places in schools of Grades VIIA and VIIB. After the 5, 5, we want 4, 4.

HELEN BIRSS examined. (No. 13.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What party are you representing before the Committee?—I am appearing here on behalf of the Southland District Educational Institute, and I have also been asked to represent the North Canterbury District women's organization. On behalf of the women's organizations of North Canterbury and Southland I have to thank the Minister of Education for allotting seats to women on the proposed Council of Education, and also for making women Inspectors. It was a reform that the majority looked forward to with hope, but with little certainty of accomplishment. If the Minister of Education in bringing in this Bill had also brought in a grading scheme it would, I believe, have been, if not better, at least as well received as the proposed increase in salaries. Perhaps there is no necessity so great at the present time as the necessity for a Dominion grading scheme, and much regret has been expressed that such a scheme is not attached to the proposed Bill, in order that the present illogical and irrational method of promotion might be done away with. That the final decision in the choice of a teacher is still left with Committees is somewhat of a surprise, as any one interested in education must be well aware of the curious and strange ways that Committees too often have of reaching a final decision—as, for example, the members of a country Committee some six weeks ago, with the names and attainments of three candidates before them, two of high classification, one much lower, and not knowing which to choose, put the names in a hat and, as luck would have it, drew the name of the teacher possessing the lowest qualifications. However, they were afterwards induced to decide afresh, as they were shown this new method was illegal. It is far from surprising, in view of the haphazard way in which promotions are made, that teachers are dissatisfied. Therefore, while congratulating the Minister of Education on the undoubted good points in the Bill, may I, on behalf of the Southland Educational Institute and the North Canterbury Women's Association, point out some defects that we hope will be remedied in order that a greater measure of justice may be given to all. First, that Grade IIIB (81–120) might be included in IVA, so that Grade IV would read for salary purposes 81–240, with subdivisions for staffing purposes as at present proposed. The salary allotted to Grade III is £200 to £250, and a large number of teachers, married men with families, remain in this grade for sixteen and twenty years with little hope of promotion. This class of school should be made more attractive than the third-assistantship in large town schools, the salary of which under the proposed scale is £230–£250. The work of the school from 80–120 requires greater skill and powers of organization than is needed for the teaching of a standard, and in many cases only parts of a standard. The Minister of Education, in addressing a deputation of assistants, explained that country schools must be made more attractive than town assistantships: here is certainly room for improvement. Separate schools: It seems somewhat of an anomaly that a separate scale should exist for boys', girls', and infant schools. One would have thought that it was only in semi-civilized countries that girls were undervalued, but here we have the old fallacy cropping up again. Surely there never was a time when so much has been heard of the value of the education of the child and of the girl, and to pay the women teachers allotted to these positions a salary largely inferior when exactly the same work is demanded is to lower the value and self-respect of the teacher. Our New Zealand Educational Institute is in entire agreement with us in asking that there shall be one scale of salaries of boys, girls, and infants, and the Institute last week passed a motion to this effect and carried it unanimously—at last a step in the right direction of equal pay for equal work. In the proposed Education Bill the grading of assistants in Grade VII schools should be consecutive—7, 6, 5, 4, 4, 3—for the first six positions, and in schools of Grade VIA it should run—6, 5, 4, 4. The proposed Bill, while not lowering the status of the first woman assistant, assigns to her the salary of a third assistant. Under the present Education Bill the first woman assistant is classified in the majority of education districts as second assistant, and paid as second assistant. Why, when the majority of Education Boards now rank and pay her as second assistant, why should the framers of the present Education Bill assign to the highest and most responsible woman in these high-grade schools the salary of third assistant? Ninety per cent. of the women who hold second-assistantships to-day are heads of large infant departments controlling from three hundred to four hundred children. They have pupil-teachers and junior assistants to train and overlook, and where there is no training-school this is no light work. They have the sewing of the upper standard girls and the supervision of the sewing of the school. The third assistant is usually a young man of small experience, who takes this position to gain experience in class-teaching. It is the best a woman can ever attain. The proposed Education Act materially improves the salaries of head teachers and first assistants. Why, seeing that from three teachers in high-grade schools extra work is demanded, should only the first two be given salaries commensurate with their responsi-

bilities? The head teacher has important duties, the first assistant has to be ready to take the place of the head in an emergency, and the first female assistant has larger responsibilities and greater duties than any succeeding assistant, and merely because she is a woman she must not receive the salary attached to the position, but that of the rank below. I would point out that under the proposed new scale of salaries no woman receives the salary of second assistant in any high-grade school. Why this is so is somewhat difficult to understand, and I should, on behalf of the women teachers, be delighted to receive an explanation. In view of the fact that infant-room work is at last, in the light of the new knowledge of to-day, beginning to be appreciated, and since from the teacher in the future greater demands, knowledge, and responsibilities will be exacted than ever before, it is somewhat difficult to comprehend why, for the first time in the history of education in this Dominion, the women are now all under this scale to be paid as third assistants and placed on the level of the Auckland and Otago women teachers. We look forward to the time when all teachers, male and female, will be graded alike, receiving the same marks for literary attainments, personality, efficiency, skill, and service. Then teachers will be chosen irrespective of their sex, and there will no longer be this hateful and degrading sex rivalry in education; but till things are placed on a better footing and women are justly treated we must uphold clauses (c), (d), and (e) of the proposed Education Bill. But until that better state of affairs comes to pass the women teachers of the Dominion have learnt by bitter experience that not from Education Boards, Institutes, or the New Zealand Educational Institute have they received justice, and that is their reason for asking to be heard before this Committee, feeling that only from those outside the profession will a fair estimate of their work be given. I should here like to say that at a meeting of the Educational Institute last week one head teacher in a school in Otago rose and proposed a motion that when a grading scheme came in it should be a separate grading scheme for women as compared with men. Every woman in the Dominion is against that. We are perfectly willing that the same literary attainments and services should be asked of us, and there should be only one grading and promotion scheme for women and men.

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] I presume you distinguish between a Dominion scheme of grading and a Dominion system of promotion of teachers?—One follows the other. You cannot have promotion without grading.

3. You must have grading?—Yes, first.

4. You see there is provision in the Bill for the grading of teachers?—What we regretted was that this Bill had not done it. We do not want local differences to come in.

5. There is provision in the regulations governing the grading of teachers which did not exist before—in clauses 156 and 157?—Yes, we recognize that.

6. It says the Director shall publish a list—that is, a Dominion system of grading?—We were not quite sure what this proposal meant. What we say is that the Bill should have fixed marks for service, classification, personality, and everything else, because each district in New Zealand has its own method of grading, and we want an end put to all these local differences and have assigned certain marks for each.

7. But those details are not generally put in a Bill, because from time to time it may be expedient to vary them?—Yes, that is so.

8. And there is full power given to the Governor in Council to alter the regulations in regard to grading?—Yes. As long as we are sure of that we will be satisfied.

9. In regard to Dominion promotion, who is to do that?—The Education Committee will decide.

10. Is it to be one body or by each separate body?—All one body.

11. What will become of the Boards?—They would supply information to this central body.

12. You say the Committees have the last say in the matter of appointment: that is dealt with in clause 67 and onwards?—Yes.

13. Is it not a fact that it is only in clause 7 that the Committee has the choice between two names?—Yes.

14. And are not those cases where persons are apparently of equal fitness?—Yes.

15. Is it true that the Committees have the last say except in the sense that they can make representations to the Board on the Board's choice?—Of course, at the present time the Boards have not always made them equal in qualifications.

16. There is to be a Dominion scale of grading, and I am speaking of the Bill and not the present practice?—Would you blame the teachers if they felt they were still better safeguarded by the Education Boards in making appointments? It may be only a question of feeling, but they have a feeling that Education Boards should, while submitting two or three names to the Committee, still have the final appointment.

17. Grade IIb may be dropped, you say, and included in Grade IVa. Do you think schools of Grade IIb are really as difficult as schools with two teachers?—They are all schools with, say, forty in the upper room and fifty in the lower. It is a fairly difficult school, because the head has the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards, and that is a more difficult position than a teacher in a town school teaching fifty pupils in one standard. I am speaking of the assistants in a high-grade school where the salaries are £230 to £250.

18. Do you know there is an increase in the maximum?—Yes. That does not alter the position, because you are still paying the third assistants in a town more than a head teacher in the country of a school averaging 80–121.

19. Are not the qualifications of a town school-teacher very different?—Our town teachers just hold these appointments temporarily, and go out to take a country school. I know of people who have been in town schools as third assistants and have gone out to take charge of country schools, and some of them have been sixteen and eighteen years and see no chance of promotion.

20. And do not they generally take larger country schools?—It depends on whether they can get them, and on the number in the district.

21. Are there not a very much larger number of schools of Grades IV and V than there are of third assistants in big schools—are there not four times as many?—Yes, that is so.

22. And is not the only promotion for a teacher to be from a school of Grade II to a school of Grade III?—It is usually from Grade II into a town. They get into the country and take charge of a school for two years, and then go into the town as assistants, and then go back to higher country appointments.

23. There is plenty of room for promotion from Grade II to Grade III now?—There may not be very much room for promotion from Grade III to Grade IV.

24. Do you think it advisable to establish a great many separate schools in New Zealand?—I would certainly think so if the Department had the money.

25. Would it not be very much more expensive?—I am granting that, but it is worth the expense. We feel it is worth the expense.

26. But would not the salaries be much higher?—That would have to be faced.

27. If you added together the salaries of three separate schools that would make a mixed school?—Yes.

28. Supposing you had a mixed school and then broke it up into three schools, the headmistress, I suppose, would become the headmistress of a separate school: would she not receive a higher salary than she now receives?—You are putting a hypothetical case.

29. By taking a mixed school and breaking it up into separate schools one advances the salaries all round?—We have cases of separate schools here. We are now discussing the question of taking our mixed schools and breaking them up into separate schools. We have separate schools where the women have to do exactly the same work as the men, and you will agree with me that girls are just as valuable to the State as boys. I know that the majority argue from an economic standpoint, and say you can get women cheaper, and therefore you should pay them smaller salaries; but if you ask women to do exactly the same work as the men, and expect them to take the same responsibilities, why should you not give them the same salaries? For instance, the men teachers in these separate schools are now up in arms to defend one man in the Nelson District who is in the unfortunate position of being head of a girls' school. He has an average attendance much larger than that of the head of the boys' school; he has the same work and responsibility, and yet he is to be paid a much lower salary; and on that account the New Zealand Educational Institute is with us in asking for this change. We have looked at the position from all points except so far as the economic point of view is concerned, and we see no reason why women teachers in girls' and infants' schools should not be paid the same as men teachers for the same work.

30. Have you examined it from the point of view of finding out whether if we did break up a mixed school it would be very much more expensive?—It may be more expensive.

31. Would it not be better to expend that money in restaffing all our schools throughout the Dominion?—I do not think I could very well answer that question offhand. It all depends, after the ten or twelve years that we have had mixed schools, whether we are fully satisfied with the position of the girls in those schools, whether we feel that our girls have received the best possible training. Very many educationists feel it is a great mistake, and I sympathize with them to a certain extent. I feel that the girls of the Dominion are not getting justice. I was through the separate schools in London, and I was charmed with the work being done for the London girls, and I came back with my mind made up that in many ways it would be a very good thing for New Zealand if the boys' and girls' schools were separate.

32. In regard to the fifth and sixth positions in Grade VII schools, you notice that the fifth position is £140 to £170, and that now under the Bill it becomes £190 to £220?—I notice that.

33. The fifth position is now £150 to £180 instead of £120 to £150, an increase of £30?—Yes, that is so.

34. So that women in those positions are getting an increase of £20 in the minimum and £30 in the maximum?—The majority of the women teachers in large grade schools will never rise any higher than that. Is not the increase worthy of the work demanded of them? We quite agree that in the majority of positions there is a slight increase.

35. The old maximum is now the minimum, and the new maximum is £30 in advance: is that not so?—Yes.

36. Is it not true that the salaries are higher than ever before?—In the higher grades. In the third-assistant positions, if you look at the next one, which is also marked 5, I think you will find a very large increase in salary, while at the same time the duties and responsibilities are not anything like as great as those demanded of the infant-mistress.

37. Does not the mistress get one of the two salaries, 5, 5?—Yes, and she has an increase of £10. What is the increased salary of the third assistant? And that is what the women teachers of the Dominion feel to some extent is an injustice to them that the framers of the Act could have obviated.

38. The whole grading of ten grades has been changed into seven grades?—Yes, that is so.

39. Do you notice that the grades have been made larger?—Yes.

40. And when we have included the higher grade we have carried the lower grades into the higher grades?—We quite agree with that, but we say at the same time that if you are going to raise the third assistant £70, the first female assistant, who is second assistant, should receive a salary corresponding to her position.

41. Was it not the women who wished to get that?—Only in the two districts, Auckland and Otago.

42. Was it not in the power of the Boards to give the third salary to women?—Yes.

43. And is it not the third salary that has been raised in every case?—Yes, but it has been raised in Otago and Auckland only. In the other districts it has been raised £10, but why should the minority rule? Why should not the will of the majority of the Education Boards be taken?

44. Has not the Bill provided that the will of the majority shall rule?—Yes, but it says that the second assistant's salary—

45. It has put the two salaries equal in order that the men might not suffer?—Did men suffer in the other districts?

46. Might not they suffer anywhere?—Did they ever suffer in regard to the duties exacted of them? A woman in the position has a tremendous amount of responsibility thrown on her in comparison to the assistant, who is only in that position for a few years.

47. Do you notice the salary of the highest assistant in a separate girls' school?—Yes.

48. What is the highest salary of the woman assistant there?—It is £150 to £180. It depends on the size of the school.

49. The highest grade is £450 to £500?—Are there any schools of that kind in the Dominion?

50. Last year the Nelson Girls' School was in that position?—But it happened to be a man at the head. No woman could hope to gain that salary. The one woman there will get from £220 to £250.

51. Do you not think £220 to £250 ought to secure a woman with good qualifications, and that she could keep herself on that salary?—I suppose she could do it on less. It depends on the duties she has, and it is a question of what she is worth to the Department.

52. *Mr. Poland.*] You are not complaining of the rise of £70 that a third assistant receives in a large school?—No, we are not complaining of that.

53. You are here representing the Institute?—Yes.

54. You are complaining on behalf of the teachers in the schools in the grade £180 to £200 that they are getting only a rise of £10 while others are getting a £70 increase?—Yes.

55. Are you aware that no member of this Committee and no member of the House could make any increase in the salaries of teachers, and that it can only be done by the Minister?—No, I was not aware of that.

56. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I understand you recommend a Dominion system of grading or classification of teachers, and that their pay should be in proportion to their grading or classification?—Yes, that is so.

57. In regard to your contention that equal pay should be given for equal work, are women entering the service in a greater proportion than men?—Yes.

58. How would you meet the argument that your proposition would drive men out of the service?—I think it is a very simple thing when you look at it. All over the world education or teaching is to a certain extent distasteful to men, and you cannot expect anything like the same proportion of men to enter the service as women. In any case, in our large schools we can always do with three-quarters of the staff being women. Men are only required for the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards. The men are not so necessary as the women.

59. *Mr. Guthrie.*] Are the opinions you have expressed here the opinions of your Institute?—The Institute I represent met a week ago to discuss this Bill, and every suggestion I have made, with the exception of my views on the question of separate schools, was agreed to unanimously by the teachers present.

60. You have asked for a Dominion scale and classification?—Yes.

61. With regard to separate schools, you are a straightout advocate of separation of the sexes in schools?—I have been converted to it since I saw the schools in other lands. I have always been a teacher in a mixed school, and I have seen the evils of allowing many of our inexperienced boys to teach the higher standards for girls. I do not think it makes for refinement or higher influences.

62. Has your Institute discussed the matter?—No, not in any way.

63. The opinions you have expressed could only apply to the larger schools?—Yes, it would be impossible in the smaller ones.

64. *Mr. McCallum.*] Do the teachers of Southland desire amalgamation with Otago?—I am afraid not.

65. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You urged that the Board's sole power of appointment should be explicit: were you referring then to page 29 of the Bill, which provides that application should be first sent to the School Committee?—Yes.

66. You are afraid that such a provision as that might leave room for the School Committees to still exert its authority?—Our Institute thought so.

JOHN DUNCAN examined (No. 14.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A settler in Marlborough and an ex-member of the Marlborough Education Board. I am here at the instance of the Marlborough Education Board, the members of which are very much concerned about the proposal to wipe their Board out, and more especially to include the district in the Nelson Education District. It has come upon them as a very great surprise indeed, and it seems to me difficult to understand the reasons for the proposed alteration. From the Minister's remarks I gathered that the reductions were necessary in the interests of economy and in the interests of the teachers. So far as we are concerned in Marlborough, we fail to see how those reasons bear at all upon the proposed change—that is, to take away our local administration and join us with the Nelson District. So far as the question

of economy is concerned, the cost of management of the Marlborough Board for the year 1912 was 5.2 per cent. Our district is a most peculiar one, and the main part of the cost of management is taken up in the work of inspection. The configuration of Marlborough is unique, and we have a greater number of aided and household schools than any other part of New Zealand. That is a very strong argument in favour of local administration. Deducting the cost of inspection from the cost of administration, we find that for 1912 the cost was 2.3 per cent., and in 1913 2.6 per cent. For 1912 the cost of administration in the Nelson District was 5.6 per cent. Then, in regard to the question of the interests of the teachers, we are quite ready to admit that the smaller districts do not give the same opportunities for promotion as the larger districts, but the joining of our district to the Nelson District would be of no advantage to the teachers. The argument in favour of the interests of the teachers for joining us with Nelson is quite absurd. There is very little chance of our young men receiving any benefit by being attached to Nelson. There is no community of interest between Marlborough and Nelson, and there is a lot of rough country between, and travelling takes up a considerable amount of time. Those are the main arguments. The peculiar configuration of Marlborough requires local administration more than any other district in New Zealand. We have to meet the teachers as far as possible, and it would be better to have a Dominion scheme of promotion, and our Board is quite in favour of that. In the past it has been found necessary to have a Dominion scale of staffs and salaries, superannuation, and so on, and we think, in the interests of the teachers at any rate, they would be better served by having a Dominion system of promotion. Under that we could then have a Dominion scale of grading for the teachers as well as for the schools. There are two other small matters I wish to bring forward. The first is in regard to the plea for aided and household schools. The salaries paid are altogether too small. The utmost a teacher can get in these small schools is forty-eight, but the average size of the schools in Marlborough is much less than six and probably about four. We suggest that there should be an increase to £10, and even then we would find that this capitation would not mean so much per pupil as the schools of the next grade—namely, Grade I. In Grade I a teacher may have a salary and house allowance amounting to £160, so that the cost per pupil would be nearly £18, almost double the amount I suggest should be given for each scholar attending an aided or household school. There are about forty-two household schools in Marlborough. Then, I would point out that right throughout the Sounds there has been very little expenditure by the Government for the erection of schools: not more than five or six have been erected at the Government expense. The accommodation is found by the settlers, and that is a saving in cost of education to the extent of 15s. per pupil. Well, our district is unique in respect to having so many of these small schools. It has also been unique in another respect—namely, that from the very beginning of 1877, when the Act was first brought in, right up to the present time not a member of the Education Board has ever taken any expenses. It was reckoned some ten years ago when the matter of secondary education and endowments was brought forward that there had been a saving of about £2,700 owing to the members not drawing their travelling-expenses. That money was saved to the district and went towards forwarding education. When I said that no members of the Board drew travelling-expenses, I should have mentioned that some eight or ten years ago two members who lived thirty or forty miles away did take their travelling-expenses, but during the last few years no member of the Board has drawn any salary whatever. As showing the interest taken by the local people in education, I might mention that some of the members of the Board have travelled sixty and seventy miles in order to attend meetings of the Board. That shows the advantage that is to be derived by having local administration. It is noticeable that a few country scholars take advantage of secondary education, and in Marlborough many of the country scholars are children of parents who are not able to pay the boarding-allowance for the secondary schools. Therefore I would suggest that it would be only fair to increase or make a special boarding-allowance for country scholars who have certificates of proficiency and who are perhaps recommended by the Inspector.

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you remember what the capitation used to be for Grade 0 schools in Marlborough?—Yes, £3 15s. I moved for it to be altered so as to give something for the teachers who were down there.

3. Those are schools of from one to eight children?—Yes.

4. Was it ever raised as high as £6?—The funds at the disposal of the Board would not allow us to go higher than we did, and we distributed the money saved by the members not drawing their travelling-expenses.

5. What did you make it finally?—£4 15s. or £5. We were the first to adopt the system of an increased sum to be paid to the teachers in the schools in the Sounds.

6. The average number of pupils in those schools is about what?—4.4.

7. Could not four pupils be taught in a room in a settler's house?—In some cases they are taught in one of the rooms of the house.

8. Is it true that in some schools of Grade 0 members of the family are the teachers?—It is some years since I was a member of the Board, but it was the rule that no members of the family should be the teachers.

9. No members of the family or relatives?—There is a difference in that. I might recommend a relative. There is a difficulty in getting teachers to go there. If larger salaries were offered we could get better teaching and better education.

10. Do you think it requires a teacher of the same training and qualifications to teach four pupils as to teach a properly organized school?—I am inclined to think it does, because children vary in ages.

11. What organization is required?—Well, I suppose organization is required even with four as with fifty. I hold that children even in the Sounds, and even where only four are gathered together, require the same opportunity for the best education as in places where the parents happen to be in the larger centres.

12. What would be the effect of raising the amount to £10: do you think it would tend to increase the number of such schools or demands?—I am hoping that not alone will there be a greater number but greater settlement.

13. But if there is greater settlement would it not do away with these schools by larger schools being erected?—It is almost impossible to have larger schools. You know the Sounds, and if you could institute a scheme by which those children there would be gathered together you would be a public benefactor. I would suggest, instead of making it £10, that the amount to be made available for these small schools should be the same as in Grade 1.

14. You recognise that the scholarship system here is not competitive, but that any one who qualifies will get a scholarship?—There are certain Junior Scholarships which are open to town children as well as country children. Our country scholars do not have the same opportunities for education.

15. The Bill provides that regulations shall be made?—If you are favourable you might draw out regulations to suit the country places.

16. The power there is to extend it and not limit it?—Yes.

17. If they do qualify do they not in every case get an additional £35 a year for board?—That is for Junior Scholarships. I would be prepared to advocate doing away with scholarships altogether.

18. The Bill does away with scholarships in the ordinary sense. Anybody who qualifies can get one of those scholarships?—Yes. I am not too familiar with the provisions of the Bill.

19. *Mr. Malcolm.*] If in the interests of education it is considered necessary to enlarge the Boards, do I take it that Marlborough would sooner be attached to Nelson than Wellington?—The opinion of the people there is that local administration is better than any attachment, and that to be merged with Nelson would be altogether unthinkable in the interests of the teachers.

20. Would you prefer to be joined with Wellington?—If it is a question of choice.

21. But if there is no choice?—Wellington would be better for us because it would give a wider and better scope for promotion for our teachers. At the same time, we hold that it would be better to have a Dominion scheme of promotion.

22. Where are the household schools situated?—In all parts of the Sounds, Port Underwood, Queen Charlotte Sound, and Pelorus Sound.

23. The difficulty of having the children gathered together in one school is the water. Would it not be possible to convey them to the school by motor-boat?—Very little. If there was an increase in the travelling-allowance it might assist, but not to any great extent.

24. You say that no travelling-expenses have been drawn by the members during the last five years. Do you mean that the members of the Board present here to-day have come at their own expense?—I do not know about the members of the Board nor the inner working, but I have not asked for my expenses.

25. *Mr. Hanan.*] Have you a high school or High School Boards in your electorate?—Yes.

26. Have you a separate Board of Management?—No, they are controlled by the members of the Education Board.

27. Have you a separate Secretary and Treasurer for the High School Board?—I am not directly connected with it now. Some years ago when I was a member of the Board the positions of Secretary and Treasurer were held by one man.

28. You have a separate Board dealing with high schools and another body dealing with primary education?—Yes, you may call it that.

29. What number of children have you attending the schools in Marlborough?—2,462.

30. Do you know the salary paid to the Secretary of the Board?—No.

31. Or of the salaries of the Inspectors?—No.

JOHN JAMES WINSBURY WHITE examined (No. 15.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Chairman of the Marlborough Education Board.

2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Yes. The Marlborough Education District at present comprises the counties of Sounds, Marlborough, and Awatere, and is, roughly speaking, about one hundred and twenty miles long by sixty miles wide. We have one hundred and two schools, of which ninety-six are public and six private. There are two additional public schools now being established, one at Hillersden and one at Wantwood. There is also an endowed High School, of which the members of the Marlborough Education Board are the Board of Governors. We have one Inspector, a Secretary, and a junior clerk in the office. There is a technical school at which cookery and woodwork are taught. The cost of administration incurred by the Board in 1912, exclusive of the cost of inspection, was 2.3 per cent. The cost of school inspection is heavy owing to the difficult means of travelling. The Sounds have a coast-line of between one thousand two hundred and one thousand five hundred miles, and as the occupation of this country increases so the number of aided and other schools will increase. The importance of close attention to such isolated schools would be apparent to all interested in primary education. In addition to the Inspector's visits and reports, the Board has the advantage of the local knowledge. If the Marlborough Education Board were abolished and the country comprising the district represented by one or possibly two members, the education of the children in all the outlying parts must, generally speaking, be seriously impaired. It will always be necessary to

have one Inspector in Blenheim. If the Board were at Nelson not only would at least six days a month of the members and Inspectors' time be taken up, but the expenses would have to be paid by the Department. The members would have to travel a good deal over the country to get even a smattering of information in regard to the outlying localities, and even then the efficiency of the present system could not be maintained. Nelson as the centre would be quite impracticable as to the time occupied in getting there and back as well as the question of expense. As I have said, it will always be necessary to have at least one Inspector in Blenheim, but, if a week out of every month is taken up by going to Nelson, more than one Inspector would be wanted for the Marlborough work. The cost of inspection and administration would be much increased if the Board was abolished, and the efficiency of the work impaired. The natural features of the country suggest that the west coast, with its railways from the Otira mountains to Nelson, should either be worked from Nelson or a centre on that coast, while the limits of the district containing the east coast and Sounds should not cross the dividing range separating Marlborough from Nelson. I can discover no other purpose in the change than that of giving teachers a greater scope for promotion. This our Board recognises is essential to the efficiency of education; but by giving the General Council, or the Minister on the Council's advice, the appointment of teachers, after reference to the Committees, the object would be completely attained instead of only partially as under the Bill as it now stands. Our teachers do not go to Nelson for promotion, but two of our Inspectors have come from Nelson. Most of our teachers come from the North Island, but that is not reciprocated.

3. Does not your information come from your Inspectors?—No, not entirely from the Inspector. The Inspector has over one hundred schools to visit, and we rely to a great extent upon the Board members.

4. *Mr. Poland.*] Your Board is unanimous in objecting to the abolition of the present Board?—Yes, quite unanimous.

5. *Mr. Hanan.*] Can you tell me how many children are attending your High School?—One hundred and twenty.

6. And how many teachers?—The principal, Dr. Innes, and four others. None of them are below the grade of M.A., and one M.A., M.Sc.

7. What is the cost of running the High School?—About £1,414, exclusive of expenditure on buildings.

8. Would it follow that if your Board is wiped out the small schools would be closed?—No, but their efficiency would be very much impaired, and that is most important.

9. In what way would the efficiency of the school suffer by reason of the Board being abolished?—Because a Board at such a great distance away as Nelson or Wellington would not get sufficient information.

10. What kind of information?—The information relating to the small schools and the localities.

11. Could not this information you refer to be obtained through the Inspector?—Yes, but it would not be obtained—it would be done without, to the detriment of education.

12. How often do the members of the Board visit those localities?—I do not know. One of our prominent members has a residence in the Sounds, and he is up and down Queen Charlotte Sound very frequently.

13. What is the special information regarding a school which is necessary for its administration which cannot be obtained from the Inspector?—There is very little except that the Inspector could not be there as often as the members of the Board. You would require two Inspectors instead of one. The Inspector visits each country school twice a year, and only on urgent matters could he make an additional visit. He would not have time with the means of travelling available.

14. Would you not prefer that your district be associated with Canterbury?—No, I think it would be absurd.

15. You prefer Nelson?—No, I think that would be preposterous.

16. Would you prefer Wellington?—If it were necessary. If the Marlborough District were abolished it would be less detrimental to our small schools to attach us to Wellington than to either Nelson or Canterbury.

17. In the event of a change or alteration, what is your choice so far as being associated with any particular Board is concerned?—Certainly Wellington. It is not open to question.

18. If that is so, how comes it that you make such a strong point about the supervision of your schools when you really desire a Board at a greater distance than Nelson to supervise you?—It is not the distance—it is the time it takes to get there and back: it is the accessibility.

19. What is the objection to Canterbury?—That it is too far off. You would have to go to Wellington and then take the steamer to Lyttelton.

20. In what way is the education of the children of your district going to suffer if the change is made?—By all the circumstances that have been detailed. And many of the schools are difficult to get to and from, as well as expensive.

21. You recognise that your cost of administration per cent. is pretty high?—Yes, but the cause of that is that there are so many little schools. There are forty-two grade O schools and 190 children attending them.

22. And the average is what?—4.4.

23. What large schools have you in your electorate?—Our largest school is at Blenheim, and the average attendance is over 500. The next is Picton, with an attendance of 239.

24. How many schools have you in your district with an average attendance of over 200?—Two—Picton and Blenheim.

25. Are you satisfied with the boundaries as they are?—Yes.

JOHN EDWARD WILSON examined. (No. 16.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am Mayor of New Plymouth.

2. You desire to make a statement to the Committee in regard to the Education Bill?—Yes. On behalf of the people of New Plymouth I desire to give evidence why in their opinion the Taranaki Education District, with headquarters at New Plymouth, should be retained, also why its boundaries should be extended. By the Education Act, 1877, Taranaki Education District, comprising the then County of Taranaki, was constituted. The population of the whole provincial district was then only 8,744, and the number of school-children within the same boundaries was only 726. These figures included the southern portion of Taranaki, now included in the Wanganui Education District, and it was so included because of the difficulties of access from New Plymouth—difficulties which no longer exist. The population of the provincial district in 1911 was 52,569, an increase since 1877 of 500 per cent., a rate of growth not approached by any other provincial district in the Dominion. Between 1891 and 1911 the rate of increase was 135 per cent., or considerably greater than that shown by any other provincial district, and there is every reason to suppose that the rate of increase in the immediate future will continue to be very great not only on account of the extension of settlement into new country, but also because of the closer subdivision of land already settled. The school population, which in 1877 was only 726 for the whole provincial district, in 1912 was 6,156 for that portion only which is included in the Taranaki Education District. If to these are added the children attending schools in that portion of the provincial district which is under the jurisdiction of the Wanganui Education Board, a total of about 8,500 children is arrived at, a number which with prospective increase fully warrants, in our opinion, the retention of Taranaki as an education district. The total area of the provincial district is 2,412,600 acres, of which 1,358,271 acres are under occupation. The balance is in process of settlement, and in a few years will add largely to the total population. The tendency in the older-settled portions is towards closer subdivision, so that under normal conditions a steady and rapid increase of population may be looked for. New Plymouth, the chief town, has exceptionally bright prospects of a more than normal growth. The completion of the harbour will make it an important deep-sea port. Electric tramways are about to be installed. An important petroleum industry is in course of development, and may with reasonable certainty be expected to bring a large influx of population, while there is more than a possibility of an iron industry, giving employment to a great number of men, being established in the near future. We have every confidence, therefore, that the population of Taranaki will increase even more rapidly than in the past, and we feel that it would be an unjust and unwise policy to remove the control of educational matters in the district from New Plymouth to Wanganui, especially as the existing authority has done excellent work in the past and is possessed of thoroughly efficient administrative machinery and new and ample offices of its own. It may be pointed out that were control removed to Wanganui there are schools in the northern and eastern portion of the district, now easily accessible within a few hours from New Plymouth, which would be situated up to 130 miles from headquarters at Wanganui and taking more than a day to reach them. With respect to the extension of the existing boundaries, we submit that the old provincial boundaries, which are coincident with those of the Taranaki Land District, would form a reasonably compact area, all parts of which could be easily reached from New Plymouth. The map which I put in will demonstrate this. The lower portion, outlined in yellow, is now in the Wanganui Education District. It will be noticed that it penetrates to the peak of Mount Egmont, and that on the Stratford-Opunake Road there are six schools, five of which are under the jurisdiction of the Taranaki Board, while the sixth, Makaka, is under Wanganui, though the Taranaki Inspectors must pass it on the way from Rowan to Puniho. Eltham, on the railway-line just over the Taranaki Board's border, is thirty-six miles, or less than two hours' journey, from New Plymouth, and seventy-one miles from Wanganui, whence it cannot be visited under two days, while Patea, at the extreme south of the area proposed to be placed under Taranaki's jurisdiction, is as easily reached from New Plymouth as from Wanganui. The upper portion of the map, outlined in pink, though part of Taranaki Provincial District, is under the jurisdiction of the Auckland Board of Education; but we submit that the schools in that area, numbering perhaps a score, with a total of three hundred and fifty to four hundred pupils, may be at least as easily reached from New Plymouth as from Wanganui. Towards the east the Taranaki Board's farthest school is at Tahora, about eighty miles from New Plymouth, but there are several schools within the provincial boundaries beyond Tahora at present controlled from Auckland. We submit that all of these might be controlled just as easily from New Plymouth as from Auckland. Matiere, the furthest east, is about one hundred and twenty miles from New Plymouth, as against nearly one hundred and eighty miles from Auckland, and all these schools might be visited in a convenient round by the Taranaki Inspectors. In the lower portion of the Auckland Province there are a number of schools which might be conveniently attached to Taranaki also. Mokau and Awakino, just over the border, can be reached in half a day from New Plymouth, while they are nearly two days' journey from Auckland. Mahoenui, Piopio, Paemako, Aria, Kaeaea, and others could be as conveniently controlled from New Plymouth as from Auckland, as their inspection would fit in with the inspection of the schools in the Ohura district. When the railway from Stratford to the Main Trunk line is completed the Ohura district will be even more easily controlled from New Plymouth. To sum up, we submit that the Provincial District of Taranaki forms a fairly compact area which can be more easily controlled from New Plymouth than from Wanganui or Auckland; that if it would facilitate any readjustment of boundaries of the Auckland District Taranaki might be given control of the schools in the extreme south-western portion of the Auckland District; that the present population of the district and the certainty of a steady growth fully warrant the retention of the Taranaki Education District with headquarters at New Plymouth, and that both on practical and sentimental grounds it would be an injustice to Taranaki to remove the control of the education of its own children to Wanganui or anywhere else.

3. The statement you have made represents the feeling of the people generally in New Plymouth ?
—Yes, the whole of the Taranaki District. The feeling is very strong in regard to our retaining the present administration and control of our own children.

4. *Mr. McCallum.*] Supposing you have to be amalgamated, would you not prefer to go into a larger district than the proposed Wanganui-Taranaki combination ?—I have not considered that point, and it would be unfair for me to express an opinion.

5. I am suggesting a scheme by which you would only have two Boards for the whole of the North Island, Wellington and Auckland only ?—Yes, we would not be satisfied with such a scheme.

THURSDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1914.

(No. 17.)

MR. OKEY, M.P., produced resolutions carried by various bodies protesting against the abolition of the Taranaki Education Board, and in the direction of extending the district so as to comprise the whole of the Provincial District of Taranaki. The resolutions were passed by the following :—

Shareholders of the Okato and Puniho Co-operative Dairy Company (Limited).

New Plymouth Chamber of Commerce.

Taranaki Education Board.

Taranaki School Committees' Association.

Meeting of New Plymouth townspeople.

Meeting of settlers at Bird.

Meeting of householders at Toko.

Meeting of householders in Pembroke district.

Public meeting held at Stratford.

Meeting of settlers in Raupuha district.

Meeting of Inglewood residents.

Meeting of Egmont Village residents.

COPY OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF SHAREHOLDERS OF THE OKATO AND PUNIHO CO-OPERATIVE DAIRY COMPANY (LIMITED) ON THE 29TH JULY, 1914.

"That the settlers of this district emphatically protest against the removal of the Education Board from New Plymouth, it being the capital town of the Province of Taranaki, for the following reasons :—

"1. That the district can be much better administered from New Plymouth than from any other town in the Dominion.

"2. That the members of the Board are elected throughout the district in such localities as put them in a much better position to look after educational matters than they would be if the Education Bill was given effect to as it now stands.

"3. That while we believe the Education Bill may be an improvement on the present system of education, the boundaries should be revised in the direction of making the Board districts more equal."

Taranaki Education Board, New Plymouth, 23rd July, 1914.

THE following is a copy of a resolution carried by the Taranaki Education Board at its meeting held on Wednesday, 22nd July, 1914 :—

"That the Taranaki Education Board emphatically protests against the proposal in the Education Bill now before Parliament to abolish the present Taranaki Education District, and urges that such a step would be against the best interests of education as a whole and of the Taranaki District in particular; and the Board is of opinion that for the efficient management of such an important district as Taranaki, containing large areas of close settlement and still larger areas where settlement is widely scattered, it is essential that there should be a Board in existence the members of which would be in touch with and have knowledge of all parts of the district; and the Board further urges that the interests of education would be better served by the retention of the present Taranaki Board and the inclusion within its jurisdiction of the whole of the Taranaki Provincial District and the southern portion of the present Auckland District extending along the coast as far as Raglan and inland to Te Kuiti."

P. S. WHITCOMBE, Secretary.

DEAR SIR,—

New Plymouth, 23rd July, 1914.

At a meeting of the executive of the Taranaki School Committees' Association the following resolution was passed, and I was instructed to forward it to you and ask you to use your best endeavours to give effect thereto :—

"That the executive of the School Committees' Association protest against the abolition of the Taranaki Education District, believing it to be inimical to the best interests of education in this district. It suggests that the present district should be enlarged to include the whole of the Provincial District of Taranaki, together with the Counties of Awakino, Ohura, Kawhia, Taupo West, Waipa, and Waitomo."

Yours faithfully,

GEO. STEPHEN WHITE, Hon. Secretary.

H. Okey, Esq., M.P., Wellington.

DEAR SIR,—

New Plymouth, 21st July, 1914.

At the request of those present at a largely attended and representative meeting of townspeople held last evening, I have pleasure in forwarding to you a copy of a resolution then passed, protesting against the abolition of the Taranaki Education District.

"That this meeting emphatically protests against the abolition of the Taranaki Education Board, as proposed in the Education Bill now before the House, and is of opinion that while still retaining five areas the boundaries can be so adjusted as to provide for (a) The retention of the Taranaki Education Board in its present location (New Plymouth); (b) a comparatively equal proportion of school population and schools of various grades; (c) districts more easily and efficiently worked from their various centres: and that in view of the very great increase in the population of the Taranaki District which will follow the development now in progress and anticipated in the near future, the removal of the control of educational matters from the capital town of Taranaki would be seriously detrimental to the best interests of the people."

A further resolution was passed that the members representing the Taranaki constituencies be requested to use their utmost endeavours to secure a readjustment of education district boundaries with a view to retaining a Taranaki Education District.

I would like to say that the people of this town are unanimous in their protest against the proposal as to the boundaries contained in the Education Bill, and consider that the growth of the Taranaki District to be anticipated warrants the existence of a Taranaki Board, in the best interests of education in the district.

A committee has been set up to bring our objections before the House. We urge upon you to assist us by all means in your power. Later on I will advise you what steps the committee is taking, and in the meantime would ask that you will give us the benefit of any suggestions that may occur to you to further our object.

Yours faithfully,

J. E. WILSON, Mayor.

H. Okey, Esq., M.H.R., Wellington.

DEAR SIR,—

Bird Road, 31st July, 1914.

At a meeting of settlers held in the Bird Schoolroom, 30th July, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—

"That this meeting protests against the proposal in the Education Bill now before Parliament to abolish the Taranaki Education District, believing that such a step will not be in the best interests of this district, but rather detrimental to the advancement of education in Taranaki, and we are of opinion that it would be better to extend the jurisdiction of the present Board."

We hope and trust this will strengthen your hand in making objections to these parts of the Bill.

I am, &c.,

G. S. GIDDY, Chairman, Bird School Committee.

H. J. H. Okey, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—

Stratford, 1st August, 1914.

At a meeting of householders held at Toko last night, 27th July, the following resolution was unanimously carried:—

"That this meeting strongly protests against the proposal to abolish the Taranaki Education District and amalgamation with Wanganui under the name of Egmont, but expresses the opinion that the present Taranaki District should be enlarged to include the whole of the provincial district."

Yours faithfully,

A. L. SHAINY, Secretary, School Committee.

H. J. H. Okey, Esq., M.P., Wellington.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT PUBLIC MEETING, STRATFORD.

"1. That this meeting, whilst approving of the Education Bill as a whole and welcoming many of its provisions, is strongly against the extinction of the Taranaki Education Board and the absorption of its territory in a new district with Wanganui for its centre. Such a step would be, in the opinion of this meeting, retrograde alike from a national, provincial, and a local point of view. It would tend to undue centralization with neglect of local interests; it would kill the pride of localities in their educational institutions; it would abolish a Board under which the standard of education, as judged by the results of competitive examinations, has risen to a point that is as high or higher than obtains in larger districts. Instead of abolishing the Board this meeting is of opinion that its district should be enlarged to include the whole of the provincial district and the south-western portion of the Auckland District. This meeting urges that a district with these or similar boundaries should be provided for in the Bill.

"2. That this meeting urges that clauses 78 to 85 of the Education Act, 1908, dealing with Taranaki Scholarships, should be re-enacted in the present Act.

"3. That this meeting compliments the Minister on the Education Bill as a whole, recognizing that if it becomes law the cause of education will be in many respects materially advanced."

RESOLUTION PASSED BY MEETING OF SETTLERS IN RAUPUHA SCHOOL DISTRICT.

"That this meeting of settlers in the Raupuha School District emphatically protests against the abolition of the Taranaki Education Board as proposed in the Education Bill now before the House, and is of opinion that by adjusting the boundaries and extending the district it can be more easily and efficiently worked from this centre than in any other way; and also considers that the removal of control of educational matters from the capital town of Taranaki would be seriously detrimental to the best interests of education."

RESOLUTION CARRIED AT INGLEWOOD.

"That this meeting emphatically protests against the abolition of the Taranaki Education District as proposed in the Education Bill now before the House."

"That in view of the rapid increase in the population of Taranaki, not only in the older and closer-settled portions but also in the back country, it would be detrimental to the best interests of the people to remove the control of educational matters from New Plymouth."

"That this meeting is decidedly of opinion that the present education district should be retained and enlarged so as to include the whole of the Provincial District of Taranaki."

RESOLUTION CARRIED BY HOUSEHOLDERS AT EGMONT VILLAGE.

"That this meeting of householders strongly protests against the proposed abolition of the Taranaki Education District, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Education and the member for the district."

HAROLD TRIMBLE examined. (No. 18.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am Chairman of the Taranaki Education Board.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. In supporting the claim of the Taranaki Education District to be retained as a separate district under the Education Act, I contend that it is possible to show that there will be a better area for promotion of teachers than is at present the case, and also that such a district can be easily and economically administered from New Plymouth. The map now laid before you shows the area of five districts in the North Island which it is suggested are better than those set out in the Bill now before Parliament. With the exception of Auckland they are fairly equal in population, and each district would be suitable, both in the number and character of the schools, for providing a reasonable scope for the promotion of teachers. The counties in each education district would be as follows: Auckland—Mangonui, Whangaroa, Hokianga, Bay of Islands, Hobson, Whangarei, Otamatea, Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, Manukau, Raglan, Waipa, Waikato, Ohinemuri, Thames, Coromandel; Taranaki—Kawhia, Awakino, Waitomo, West Taupo, Clifton, Ohura, Taranaki, Whangamomona, Egmont, Stratford, Waimate West, Eltham, Hawera, Patea; Wanganui—Kaitieke, Waimarino, Waitotara, Wanganui, Rangitikei, Kiwitea, Oroua, Manawatu, Kairanga, Pohangina, Woodville, Dannevirke, Waipawa, Waipukurau, Patangata, Weber; Hawke's Bay—Piako, Matamata, Tauranga, Rotorua, Whakatane, Opotiki, Waipuu, Waikohu, Cook, East Taupo, Wairoa, Hawke's Bay; Wellington—Pahiatua, Akitio, Horowhenua, Eketahuna, Mauriceville, Masterton, Castlepoint, Wairarapa South, Hutt, Featherston, Makara. The numbers and grades of schools in each district are as follows (figures for 1912):—

	Grade	0.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.	X.	Total.
Auckland	29	87	107	67	87	17	20	6	10	10	12	452
Taranaki	7	36	44	35	51	10	3	6	1	2	1	196
Wanganui	9	41	47	29	63	17	7	11	5	3	1	233
Wellington	9	23	33	24	36	10	10	9	9	1	6	170
Hawke's Bay	..	19	24	33	16	39	9	6	11	1	0	0	158

Such a district as I have outlined can be easily and economically worked from New Plymouth, the counties proposed to be added on the south—viz., Waimate West, Eltham, Hawera, and Patea—being easily accessible by rail and being well roaded, while those to the north—viz., Kawhia, Awakino, Waitomo, West Taupo, and Ohura—present no very great difficulty. The railway is now open to Whangamomona, and a further section to Kohuratahi nearly completed, and within a few years it will be open as far as Tahora, and work is also being done at the Ongarue end. From Tahora there is a good coach-road (with a regular coach and mail service) by which the schools in the Ohura County can be reached, and when once the main line of railway is reached the schools in Waitomo, West Taupo, Kawhia, and Awakino can be easily got at by road. And there is no doubt that within a very few years there will be good communication along the coast by steamer from New Plymouth. New Plymouth has an advantage in having been an administrative centre of education for the past forty years, the first Education Board having been established there in 1874, and the proposal to remove administration from there has already caused a good deal of heart-burning and ill feeling, and has been protested against by a large majority of the School Committees and local bodies throughout Taranaki. We contend that districts such as we suggest would be better than those set out in the Bill, both as being better served by road and rail and therefore more easily administered, also as giving better areas for promotion of teachers, while the number of districts would not be increased. With the exception of some of the counties added on the north the district suggested includes nothing which was not in

*the old Provincial District of Taranaki, the southern part of which was practically inaccessible from New Plymouth when the education districts were constituted in 1877. A large part of it is very closely settled, and much of it can be farmed profitably in smaller areas than it is at present. The population is increasing, and with the utilization of the areas at present unoccupied, or only partially utilized, not only will there be a great increase in prosperity, but the population also must very greatly increase.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] In your map of the district you put the Waitomo County in the new proposed Taranaki District?—Yes.

4. Are you not aware that Waitomo County's interests are with Hamilton and the southern part of the Auckland District? Is it not more closely connected, for instance, with Te Awamutu and Te Kuiti on the other hand?—What we contend is that we can administer it as well as Auckland.

5. Could you administer it as well as Hamilton?—Of course not. If you made the administrative centre at Te Kuiti they could administer it better than from anywhere else.

6. But Hamilton is the centre in the Bill?—Yes.

7. With regard to the Hawke's Bay District, you put Tauranga and Opotiki into that district. How would an Inspector who lived at Napier get to Tauranga?—By steamer or by road. The road goes to Rotorua.

8. How long would it take him to get there?—Two days, I suppose.

9. Could he not get there in half a day from Auckland?—Yes. I understood the idea was to make fairly equal areas. If you are going to do that you must make divisions somewhere.

10. The Bill does make such divisions, but accessibility has something to do with it?—Is it any easier to get to Tauranga from Hamilton than from Auckland?

11. But it is easier to get from Hamilton to Tauranga than it is from Napier?—Probably. If you make your centre nearer the town it is easier to get to it.

12. How would you get to Opotiki from Napier?—There are roads.

13. I do not think you can count on the roads?—Well, there are steamers. There must be some means.

14. Is it not easier to get to it from Auckland or Hamilton?—If they are going from Hamilton there must be a road to Opotiki.

15. You think that Opotiki and Tauranga are reasonably accessible from Napier?—I think so, yes.

16. *Mr. Sidey.*] Will you explain in what way your proposal differs from the existing Taranaki District on the map?—[Witness indicated on map.]

17. You propose to take a number of counties in to the north and also some to the south?—We propose to take in five in the north and four in the south.

18. You encroach on to the Auckland District on the north and Wanganui District on the south?—Yes. The Ohura portion used to be in the Taranaki District.

19. Do you understand that the chief object in enlarging the district is to give a greater opportunity for promotion to the teachers?—Yes, and we contend that by our suggested boundaries that would be given.

20. Are you in a position to say whether the Auckland District as it is administered at the present time is not satisfactory?—It is impossible for me to answer a question of that kind directly; but we have some teachers who have been in the Auckland District, and one of them remarked to me not very long ago that when a teacher gets into the backblocks he is lost.

21. You say in your statement that there will be a better area of promotion for teachers in the alteration you propose than at the present time?—Yes.

22. You recognize that the larger the area the greater opportunity for promotion?—Well, of course, there is in a sense, but not necessarily.

23. Would it not necessarily be so so long as you include city schools?—No, the great bulk of the teachers cannot get much higher than Grades IV or V of the present schedule. I have not worked them out in the new schedule.

24. Supposing the whole of the North Island was put into one district, would not that give greater facilities for promotion to teachers in the North Island?—I do not think it would, really. Of course, you enter into another question as to whether there should be local self-government.

25. I am viewing it purely from the consideration as regards the opportunity for promotion for teachers, apart altogether from the question of local administration?—I do not think it makes a great deal of difference. A great many teachers think that if the whole of the districts in one Island or the two Islands were run together that they would get better opportunities for promotion, but the great bulk of them would not.

26. Would it not bring the possibility of promotion into the larger schools to teachers who are now in country districts like yours who would never get such opportunities?—I very much doubt it. Some of them would get higher—those of considerable ability—but I do not think it would affect most of them.

27. You do not think there is much to be gained by it?—I do not think so.

28. And whatever gain there was you think would be lost by taking away the local administration?—I do.

29. *Mr. Poland.*] With regard to the proposed Hawke's Bay District, do you know Te Aroha?—No, I do not know that country personally.

30. You have recommended that should be the boundary of the Auckland District, and that you put Piako and Te Aroha into Hawke's Bay to be governed from Napier?—Yes.

31. You have said that in your opinion this proposal of yours is a much better division than that proposed in the Bill?—Yes. Supposing an Inspector was going from Napier, he would go to Te Aroha and inspect the schools in that district. He would work from school to school till he got to Tauranga

and Opotiki. As far as the exact boundaries are concerned I should not like to say they are the best. It may be better for one county to be in Auckland and another in Hawke's Bay. It is rather difficult to tell that. Wherever you put your boundaries there will be some disadvantages.

32. Every school has to be examined by an Inspector, and it is only a matter of getting at it in the easiest way. Taking the proposed Auckland District under this proposal of yours, there are twelve schools of Grade X?—Yes. I pointed out that Auckland was exceptional, and that you had to go by the four districts.

33. Do you not think it is in the interests of the teachers in any education district that there should be possible to them appointments such as are provided under your Auckland District—that is, that they should have thirty-two appointments possible in Grades VIII and X as compared with four appointments in the Taranaki District?—From the teachers' point of view it would be better to have no district at all.

34. Is not the teachers' point of view to a large extent the pupils' point of view?—No.

35. Is it not in the interests of education in a district that you should get the best class of teachers in that district?—Yes, you want the best class of teachers.

36. Then is it not in the direction of getting the best class of teacher that the teachers in the district should be able to look forward to appointments such as are possible in the Auckland Education District?—I do not think necessarily so.

37. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Do I understand from you that your suggestion does not mean an increase of education districts?—It means no increase in the number of districts.

38. The proposed Taranaki District, then, would mean the elimination of the Hamilton District?—Yes.

39. And your opinion is that educational affairs can be better administered from Taranaki than from Hamilton?—Yes.

40. The district you suggest, I understand, can be easily reached by road or rail?—Yes.

41. In regard to the difficulty in the Hawke's Bay District, you understand that it is proposed to appoint one Inspector for every fifty schools?—No, it does not say so in the Bill. I do not know what the proposal is.

42. Would it not be possible to have an Inspector situated, say, in the Opotiki, Tauranga, and Te Aroha district in order that he might be prevented from travelling over dead country?—Yes, I think it would be quite possible.

43. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You said that Waitomo County was taken out of the Taranaki District and attached to Auckland?—Not the whole of Waitomo—only a portion.

44. And you objected, did you not?—Yes.

45. Was it not done on account of the railway connection?—There is railway connection now. The schools in Ohura are nearer to us than to the main line.

46. You said that by road or rail you could get to all parts of the country. How do you propose to get to Kawhia?—By road or by steamer.

47. Your educational centre is really New Plymouth?—Yes.

48. And the principal teachers' classes are held there?—Some are held at Stratford.

49. How would the teachers get from that district to attend the secondary classes at New Plymouth?—I do not think at the present time they can get to any secondary classes.

50. You propose going south to the Patea River?—It is a little farther. The Patea County goes farther south than the Patea River.

51. How far is that from Wanganui?—I should think the nearest point is about eighteen miles.

52. Then if you move that district within eighteen miles of Wanganui it would make Wanganui the centre for the education district?—Wanganui would be a convenient centre, but I am not very particular whether it is one side of Patea or the other.

53. Take the whole of that district, Ohura, Waitomo, and up to Kawhia, what greater development can you expect than there is to-day there in the matter of establishing schools?—As settlement goes on there will be more schools. There is a lot of land to be settled there.

54. Take from Awakino to New Plymouth and Stratford: is there room for the establishment of many more schools in the locality?—Yes, a good many more.

55. A considerable number?—Yes.

56. With the roads improving?—Yes. You will want more schools then. You must do, because the land will be cut up into smaller pieces.

57. Considering the future development of the country, would you say that New Plymouth was a better centre for a large portion of the district than Hamilton is?—Yes, I think so.

58. Would you say that in the future it would be so?—I do not know, of course, what developments may take place in the next fifty years.

59. Is it not a fact that the Auckland District is far too large at the present time?—Yes, but we propose to cut a large part off.

60. There is only a small portion from Kawhia that you are cutting off?—Yes.

61. That is practically undeveloped at the present time?—Yes, but it is in process of development.

62. There are no roads there?—Yes, there are roads. You can get through in a motor-car.

63. In regard to Hawke's Bay, there are 158 schools established, and you know there is no communication between the north and east coast of Napier?—You can go by road from Napier to Rotorua, and then you could get to the other parts.

64. How would you get up to the East Cape?—The East Cape is in Hawke's Bay at present. We are putting the Hawke's Bay District in a much better position than it is in the Bill. It is not enlarged at all in the Bill. It is left as a very small district.

65. You say that such a district as you have outlined can be economically worked from New Plymouth?—Yes.

66. And you say that your proposal would be better than that proposed in the Bill in regard to the Waikato district?—Of course, if you make a centre anywhere you can work easier round the centre than you can from anywhere outside it.

67. I think that the crux of your argument is that New Plymouth has the advantage of being an old-established centre, and you are loth to lose your identity?—Yes, that is so.

68. *Mr. McCallum.*] In regard to teachers attending Saturday classes, would it not be just as impossible for teachers living about New Plymouth to attend the Wanganui classes as it would be for the Wanganui teachers to attend the New Plymouth classes?—But I take it that if we were merged with Wanganui classes would still be held in New Plymouth. We have classes both in Stratford and New Plymouth.

69. How many miles have you to connect between the two railways, Stratford and Taumarunui?—About forty miles.

70. When do you expect that to be finished?—I do not know. There will be twelve miles of that forty opened within the next two years, because they are working there now. Then they are starting from the Main Trunk end, and contracts are let for a considerable distance from that end. It will be fifteen years, I think, before the railway is actually connected.

71. With the railway connection between Taumarunui, does not the whole district centre in New Plymouth?—Yes.

72. *Mr. Hanan.*] What is the main ground upon which you base your representations to-day?—Particularly that we think that the administration can be carried out more easily from New Plymouth, and because it is convenient for us as an administrative centre. We do not wish to be swamped in Wanganui, and if our recommendations are given effect to there will be a good district for promotion of teachers and for general working altogether.

73. You do not place the interests of the teachers as the first cardinal consideration?—No, because I do not think that is the first consideration. The teachers are there to do as they are told.

74. In what way will the educational interests or the educational progress of the district suffer by reason of this change?—I think there would be loss of interest at once. We should have very little representation on the Board in Wanganui according to the Bill.

75. Have you found that members of Education Boards take a narrow view of their duties in the interests of the children?—Some of them do, but I do not think the whole of them.

76. Do you think the educational interests would suffer by reason of this alteration proposed to be made?—I think there would be a loss of interest in educational matters all through the district.

77. You think the members of the Board would not show that interest which is being shown now?—I do not think so—there would be so few of them.

78. You do not think that work done on broader lines would make for educational advancement?—Then you trench on the question of local government.

79. Do you wish to see education carried out on broader lines from a national point of view?—Yes, but I think it can be done through local influences.

80. Do you not think that local interests are very often prejudicial to national interests?—At times it may be, but not always. If you went far enough with that argument you would centralize everything, which would be a mistake.

81. Is it not now from a sense of pride for local interest and consideration for the district that your main reasons are influenced as against this Bill?—Perhaps it is.

82. How many schools have you in the district at the present time?—There are about a hundred. There were ninety-four in 1912.

83. And the number of your teachers?—That could be obtained from the blue-book. There are 160 adult teachers, and twenty-two pupil-teachers and a few probationers.

84. How do your schools in New Plymouth and Inglewood compare with Hamilton?—They are the same size as Hamilton. Hamilton is Grade IX.

85. Where is the largest school you have?—In Stratford, the District High School. The average attendance in 1913 was 638—517 in the primary school and 121 in the High School.

86. Do you know the schools at Hamilton?—No.

87. What is the cost of running your Board—the total expenditure and the percentage?—5.1 per cent. in 1910, 5.2 in 1911, 4.7 in 1912, and the average is 5 per cent.

88. Now give me the expenses of the administration, roughly?—£1,094.

89. That is made up how?—Secretary, £300; two clerks, £131; Inspectors, £550; Truant Officer, £113. The Inspectors are really paid more than that because they get something out of the Annual Fund.

90. As to supervision, do you think the schools in your district would suffer from the standpoint of supervision by this change?—I suppose they would be inspected even if there were no Boards.

91. How many schools have you got of Grade 0?—We have none at the present time.

92. Will Wanganui take a part of your district in under the Bill?—It will take in the whole of it. We have one Grade 0 school, but it has only been opened a very short time.

93. Wanganui is a very good Board, is it not?—I suppose so.

94. And has done splendid work?—Yes.

95. And has done some good work in connection with rural education?—We have tried to.

96. You do not like your district going?—No.

97. You are an educationist, and do you not think that now it is desirable from a national point of view that this change should take place?—No.

98. Naturally the local bodies and the members of the Board will be against it?—Yes.

99. The members of the Boards do not like being wiped out?—I fancy it would be a good thing if the Board were wiped out from my own personal point of view. I should have more time of my own.

100. Have you any high schools?—There is one high school.

101. Is there any reason why they should not be controlled by the Education Board?—No.

102. Would you favour them being controlled by the Board of Education?—Yes.

ROBERT MASTERS examined. (No. 19.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A member of the Taranaki Education Board.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. Section 14: "Where there is no 'urban' area in an education district the number of members of the Board should be nine." If the education districts proposed in the Bill were retained, and clause 14 were not amended on the lines suggested, there would be only eight members in the Hawke's Bay District as against ten in Egmont, seeing that in Egmont there will be two urban districts—viz., one at Wanganui and another at Palmerston North—whilst in Hawke's Bay there will be only one—viz., at Napier. I would point out that, although there might not be any urban areas in an education district on account of the large area a district might cover, it would be more necessary to have three members to a ward than a district that might have two or more urban areas. To make the point clear I will make a comparison of the wards represented by myself on the Taranaki Education Board and, say, Wanganui under the present Education Bill as an urban area. My district takes in from Opunake on the west to Eltham Borough boundary on the south, out to Ohura on the east, and to Inglewood on the north. For this district under the Bill there would be two members, and Wanganui as an urban area would be entitled to the same number. It would be obvious that in such a scattered district there is more necessity for three members than for two for the urban area of Wanganui. Section 15: If the foregoing amendment were made in clause 14 consequential amendments would require to be made in this section. Section 34: The following new subsection is suggested by my Board: "The Board may in every financial year out of its General Fund, or account expend for purposes not authorized by any Act or law for the time being in force any sum or sums not amounting in the whole to more than one per centum of the grant mentioned: Provided that if one per centum of such grant does not in any financial year amount to fifteen pounds the Board may in that year expend the sum of fifteen pounds for such purposes aforesaid." Clause 121 of the Public Revenues Act, 1910, makes provision for a limited amount of unauthorized expenditure in the case of County Councils, Borough Councils, Town Boards, &c., and it seems reasonable that Education Boards should be placed in a similar position. The stricter the Audit Department is the more necessary is it to allow the Board a reasonable amount of latitude in expenditure not clearly defined by the Act and yet not opposed to the spirit of it. To quote an instance of the unfair position in which Education Boards are placed: Last year a member of the Taranaki Board was appointed by resolution to attend a conference of Education Boards in Wellington, which was, of course, to further the interests of education in the Dominion, and during his stay in Wellington he interviewed the Education Department and the Minister of Education in connection with matters of interest to the Board; yet the Audit Department disallowed the expenses for that visit, and each member of the Board was sued and has to pay the whole of the expenses of the visit. My Board is of the opinion that in such a case as this the expenses should be paid by the Board, and as at present there is no fund out of which it can be paid a clause should be put in the present Bill as suggested, and that Education Boards should be put on at least an equal footing with other local bodies. Section 35, School Libraries: Apparently subsidies would be paid twice on the same donation, once by the Department and once by the Board. This can hardly be intended. Section 41: This section does not seem to agree with section 50. Section 51, subsection (3): "Three" should be substituted for "five" in line 1. If "five" is retained in section 51 it may entail that children, even only five years old, may have to walk considerably over three miles to school. Take a case in the Taranaki District—Urenui and Waihi Schools, both on the same main road, about five miles apart. Children living, say, two miles up the side road that branches off from this main road about midway between the two schools may be required to walk close on five miles to either school. Section 51, subsections (4) and (5): These subsections should be struck out as being altogether too arbitrary and placing too much power in the hands of the Minister. Section 51, subsection (6): All words after "0" should be struck out. According to subsection (1) of the Sixth Schedule of the Bill a teacher in a Grade 0 school shall be paid £6 per annum for every pupil in yearly average attendance. It is recommended that £12 be substituted for £6. This would bring the payments of teachers in schools of Grade 0 and Grade I more in harmony than at present. It might be pointed out that teachers in Grade 0 schools have to put up with many disadvantages. £12 per unit would only mean a maximum for Grade 0 of £96, whereas an average of one or more would place the school in Grade I, and the teacher would then be entitled to a maximum salary of £100 and £20 house allowance, which amounts to over £13 per pupil. Most of the Grade 0 schools in the Taranaki District are in the backblocks, and if it is absolutely necessary to establish a school it does not seem reasonable to require struggling settlers to provide part of the teacher's salary. All that could be reasonably expected is that they should provide (as they generally do now) a room or building. Part VIII, Technical Education: Provision should be made for the salaries of directors of technical classes and schools being paid on a fixed scale in a similar manner to the teachers in primary schools. Where it is possible to establish sufficiently large classes, payment of salaries of

teachers of technical classes might be provided on a fixed scale somewhat in the same manner as in the Sixth Schedule, Part V, District High Schools. Section 127: The Senior Inspector in each district and the Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors should be appointed by the Board, but their number, grades, and salaries should be as set out in the Twelfth Schedule, and provision similar to that in the case of primary-school teachers should be made for the payment of the salaries of the Inspectors. If the Inspectors were under the direct control of the Department they would to a great extent lose their independence and initiative. They would thereby be deterred from freely criticizing and offering advice upon changes in the education system that might be introduced from time to time. Circumstances might arise where the Board would be deprived of their expert advice, for as officers of the Department they would very naturally feel reluctant to express an opinion on matters connected with the Department. Dominion Scale of Salaries for Inspectors: Some years ago a Dominion scale of salaries was established for the payment of teachers, and, as it seems to us that every branch of the teaching service from the lowest to the highest should be brought under the same system, we would strongly urge that a Dominion scale of salaries should also be provided for the Inspectors. At present the salaries of Inspectors are at the mercy of the finances of different Boards, with the result that there are gross discrepancies between the salaries paid to Inspectors—*e.g.*, some receive £600, and others as low as £300. The position of Inspector is looked upon as one of the highest in the service, and no Inspector should receive a lower salary than the maximum received by the highest teacher in the service. The education district, however small, should not be handicapped by having to pay its Inspectors salaries incommensurate with their responsibilities nor adequate enough to attract the best men for such important positions. If, moreover, an education district is not in a position to obtain men with the highest qualifications, then the efficiency of education in the district must suffer in consequence. To nationalize the salaries of the inspectorate would also tend to increase the chances of promotion for every teacher. The salaries, too, should be such that the most able head teachers in the service may be induced to enter the inspectorate. The stronger and abler the men are that are chosen for Inspectors the better it will be for education throughout the Dominion. Clause 131: This clause seems to be unnecessarily harsh, and we would suggest that the clause should be deleted, or failing that a subclause be added as follows: "That the parents or guardians of such a child not being in a position financially to obtain medical or surgical treatment, the cost be borne by the Department." Section 154: After the words "Native school" should be added "or any Education Boards' offices." There does not seem to be any reason why the Boards' offices should not be included in the clause, seeing that practically every other building and land is to be exempt. Fourth Schedule, Part I: My Board is of the opinion that the present system of election of members to School Committees would be more satisfactory than the system proposed in the Bill. It is more than probable that if nominations are not allowed to be accepted at the annual meeting the present difficulty of getting householders to act on Committees, especially in scattered country districts, will be more intensified. Eighth Schedule: The salaries provided in the Bill are not sufficient to induce the brighter boys and girls to enter the profession, and we suggest that the salaries of pupil-teachers be as follows: First year, £50, with allowance of £30; second year, £55, with allowance of £30; third year, £60, with allowance of £30. There seems to be no good reason why the allowances in the Bill should be reduced as it is. Moreover, the amount of allowance is not sufficient, as a pupil-teacher would find it very difficult, in the Taranaki District at least, to get board under £30 a year. It might be pointed out that the Bill recognizes this in the case of Junior and Senior Scholarship holders, and provides in section 99 (2) that they should receive a boarding-allowance of £35 per annum. The salaries in the Bill do not compare favourably by any means with other branches of the Public Service. In the Clerical Division of the Railways a cadet gets—First year, £50, with £26 allowance; second year, £65, with £21 16s. allowance; third year, £80, with £13 allowance. In the Clerical Division of the Post Office—First year, £50, with allowance £28; second year, £65, with allowance £23; third year, £80, with allowance £18. All the banks operating in New Zealand pay higher salaries to the juniors entering their employ than the pupil-teachers are given in the Bill, and in some cases start on a salary of £30 per year better than the teacher. It must be obvious that if the Department wish to attract boys and girls to the service they must place the salaries on a better footing than those proposed in the Bill. Sixth Schedule, Part II, Separate Schools: The principle has been laid down by the Department that male and female teachers doing equal work shall receive equal pay, but this does not obtain in reference to separate schools in the Bill. For instance, a male teacher in a separate school having control of 400 to 450 boys would receive a minimum salary of £370 a year, while a female teacher having control of the same number of girls would receive £260 a year. The same applies to the assistants in the separate schools. There seems to be no reason why this should be, as the responsibility is just as great, and the qualifications required are equal in either case, and under those circumstances what applies in the primary schools should apply in separate schools. We notice that no provision has been made in the Bill for the Taranaki Scholarships.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to technical schools, you say a scheme of salaries of teachers which you suggest should be arranged in the same way as for teachers of high schools?—Where the classes are sufficiently large.

4. Is it not a fact that a large number of teachers of technical schools are only part-time teachers?—Yes, because the classes are not sufficiently large to keep them employed.

5. You do not know that in Wellington a large number of the teachers of evening classes are engaged during the day and teach in the evening?—That is for special classes.

6. Would you pay them a salary also as if they were whole-time teachers?—Oh, no, not in that case—only in the case of whole-time teachers.

7. Are you aware what proportion of the teachers of technical schools are whole-time teachers ?—No.

8. Would you be surprised to hear that there is a very small proportion in the Dominion ?—I would not; but that does not alter the fact that they should be put on the same basis as the primary schools—I mean on the same system.

9. Do you think they would like to go down to that scale ?—I do not mean the same rate of salary, but the position in the Department.

10. Do you think it is possible, in the state of development of technical education, to make such a scale ?—I think it is possible where you have teachers continually employed.

11. In the case of teachers continually employed, will you look at the provision made under the head of technical schools in clause 111 ?—That is capitulation.

12. Is not that treating them very much in the same way as secondary schools are treated now ?—I suppose it is as far as that is concerned.

13. Does not that meet most of the cases of whole-time teachers of technical schools ?—Of course, it leaves the matter open for the Board to pay what salary they like.

14. Then would you suggest in regard to those teachers that some proviso such as that relating to the secondary schools in the Tenth Schedule should be included ?—I would suggest that.

15. With regard to the position of Inspectors, as to whether they should be officers of the Department or officers of the Board, have you considered the question of a Dominion system of grading of teachers ?—Yes, I cannot see but what that could come about exactly the same with the Inspectors under the Board as not being under the Board. It is proposed, I understand, to have a conference of Inspectors every year, and also a conference every third year of all the Inspectors, and they could arrive at some system quite as well as the Inspectors being under the Department.

16. Are you aware that there has been a system of marking for grading ever since the teachers' certificates were issued, marks of proficiency from Grades II to X ?—Yes.

17. Are you aware that efforts have been made at the Inspectors' Conferences to make the standards uniform ?—No.

18. And that they have entirely failed ?—No.

19. If they have not failed why should they ask for any other system of grading ?—If they are anxious that this system should come about, why is it they want to stay under the control of the Boards in many instances ?

20. Who are anxious ?—The Inspectors.

21. I am looking at the point of view of the teachers. Do you think there is any hope of getting a Dominion scale of grading as long as the Inspectors belong to different Boards ?—I should think so if the Inspectors are willing to do it. I do not see why they should not.

22. Why should they be able to do it better than before ?—There is one main point in connection with the Inspectors, and that is that you are depriving the Board members of the advice that is necessary to those Board members. You must realize that members of Education Boards have their own business to attend to, and they cannot give the same amount of thought that the Inspectors do to their business. We look to the Inspectors for advice, and if the Inspectors become officers of the Department naturally their sympathies would be with the Department; and when the question of the Department or the Board came up the advice that we looked for before would be wanting because the sympathy would be with the Department, and that is why we suggest that the Inspectors should be under the Board.

23. You have seen subclause (3) of clause 128, have you not ?—Yes; but what would be the effect of administering that provision ?

24. Do you know of any large self-governing colony with an education system that does not have the Inspectors under the central Department ?—No, I do not. I am not acquainted with the systems of other countries.

25. Now, with regard to medical inspection, you say that the Department should pay the cost in the case of indigent parents ?—Yes, that is the effect.

26. Would not that be the proper thing for Hospital Boards ?—I do not care who pays it as long as it is provided for.

27. Is there not a certain amount of provision for that being done now ? This only relates to a serious defect or disease. Does not clause 131 relate to those cases that are supposed to be treated by a Hospital Board ?—Perhaps they should, but here you take action.

28. No, we do not say we take action at all. Are they not cases that would come within the cognizance of a Hospital Board ?—One would think it naturally came within the power of the Department according to the Bill.

29. You said that you thought nominations should take place at the annual meeting as well as before ?—Yes.

30. Are you aware of the confusion in several places ? For instance, in Auckland, where there were five hundred or six hundred people trying to get into one room at the annual meeting, and it was utterly impossible to get either nominations or votes ?—Yes, there were very special circumstances in connection with that. I am referring more particularly to the different country districts. You know and I know that we have difficulty very often in getting Committees to work at all, and in some cases we have to call a second meeting.

31. They know that they have to give the nominations before in the case of County Council elections and Road Board elections, do they not ?—Yes. There is not the same interest taken, though. There is not so much glory attached to it, and they are not so keen after it.

32. With regard to allowances to pupil-teachers, you said you did not see why they should be dropped gradually as the salary rose. Are you not aware that in all Departments of the Public Service, in order to make a transition at the close of the apprentice period, they drop the boarding-allowance and increase the salary? Did you not quote some cases in which the allowance drops?—I admit that.

33. Is not that a sound principle, so that at the end they should not suddenly lose all boarding-allowance?—Not if you bring the salary up. What is the object of raising the salary and dropping the allowance?

34. We do not drop it so much. You make a net increase, because at the end of a certain time you must stop the boarding-allowance, must you not? You do not give any boarding-allowance to a man getting £200 a year. You must stop giving the allowance, and you make one merge into the other by lessening the boarding-allowance, but not so fast as you increase the salary?—I fail to see that it is any advantage. As long as the man gets the money it does not make much difference.

35. With regard to the Public Service, did you say that the scale is not nearly so good in the teaching profession as in the Public Service? In the Public Service do they provide tuition for them? Are they in the position of apprentices learning their trade, or are they in the position of from the first giving their full services—I mean in the Public Service?—They are in the position of apprentices, in this sense: they have to learn their business the same as a school-teacher. In the Railway Department they get an extra allowance, if they have passed the Civil Service Examination, over and above the amount I have mentioned in my evidence.

36. If a pupil-teacher has passed the Civil Service Examination what does he get?—He gets the extra allowance too.

37. What is the salary that would be reached by most employees in the Public Service—by the great bulk of them—without a bar—without unusual promotion: do you know the amount?—No. It is a difficult question for me to answer.

38. It is £220, while the bulk of our teachers can rise to £250 under this Bill. With regard to separate schools you say “equal pay for equal work,” and you say that that is recognized in the mixed schools but not in the separate schools?—Yes.

39. Have you compared the salary that one of these teachers would get if the separate schools were united into one mixed school?—That is not the point that I gave evidence on.

40. Is not the work the same?—Yes.

41. What would be the difference between the work of a second assistant in a girls' department, as in the West Christchurch School, and that of a second assistant in a separate girls' school?—In that case why not put the men on the same basis?

42. Are they not on the same basis, except that both women and men are better there?—Women and men are the same in the mixed schools.

43. Then follow those same men into the separate schools and the women into those separate schools, and can you not find the salaries there for those same men and women?—I fail to see that.

44. Have you had any experience of separate schools?—No; I was going on the broad principle.

45. Then you have not discussed what the separate-school teachers in the separate schools would get if the separate schools were united into one mixed school, have you?—No. That is only reverting back to the argument that was used previously.

46. With regard to the Taranaki Scholarships, have you read the explanation of the Bill that was circulated among members of the House? Do you know that they are being dealt with in the University Bill?—I have heard so since.

Mr. HOGBEN made a statement. (No. 20.)

Mr. Hogben: I desire to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that Mr. J. C. Adams, Mr. A. W. Adams, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Herdman-Smith came to see me as arranged yesterday afternoon, and I went over with them the different parts of the Bill relating to high schools and to the School of Art. The first part related to the effect of clause 85 on the governing bodies of girls' and boys' high schools. The Minister has already decided that an amendment would be made, as I informed the Committee yesterday. In regard to the Tenth Schedule, the Minister has already promised the Committee that he will omit paragraph (vi) of the proviso. I went through the question of finances with them, and they were satisfied that if that part of the proviso was removed their finances would be secure. The next point was in regard to the School of Art—first as to the government, and second as to the capitation. In regard to the government of the School of Art, it is affected by clause 108. The Canterbury School of Art is controlled now by the Board of Governors of Canterbury College, and they expressed their wish that the same government should be continued—that is to say, three of them did, and Mr. Herdman-Smith dissented and thought that the provision in the Bill was better as giving a greater share of popular control of the School of Art. The other three desired that that proviso should not apply to Canterbury College School of Art. I suggested that if the Canterbury School of Art was removed to the second part of the Eleventh Schedule it would overcome the difficulty in regard to the proviso on page 42, and they agreed. I agreed to put the matter before the Minister. That, of course, does not touch the Christchurch Technical School. That is provided for under subclause (3), and they do not desire that it should be altered. The only other point was in regard to capitation. The capitation now is provided by the regulations—so much for classes the first year, a larger amount the second and third years, and so on, and the amount may be as much as 9d. It is only 9d. in the higher art classes. Mr. Herdman-Smith thought it ought to be retained at 9d., and the others did not see that it mattered. I pointed out that Canterbury College received 9d., and also the School

of Art, and that there is now a surplus of £1,000, so that 9d. appears to be too much. No other school gets so much. It seems to be more than the schools require for their maintenance. Mr. Herdman-Smith wished it to be retained at 9d., and I promised to bring the matter before the Minister, and at the same time told him what I should say to the Minister. There were one or two other points mentioned during the discussion, but they expressed themselves as being satisfied in every respect. One point was in regard to secondary education and the effect of the admission of free pupils to all secondary schools. That does not affect any Christchurch schools, because it only differs from the existing law in this, that it would bring into the free-place system the only school not now in. All the secondary schools except one have come in. The Christchurch schools have come in. It does not affect them at all. I gave them an assurance that it was not contemplated that an alteration would be made in the regulations at the present time, but, of course, I could not speak as to the future.

GEORGE DIVORTY BRAIK, Chief Inspector, Wanganui Education District, made a statement and was examined. (No. 21.)

Witness: I have been asked by the Wanganui Board to offer evidence to your Committee. Owing to an unfortunate accident the Chairman of the Board, who very much desired to appear in person, has been unable to do so. He more particularly desired to appear as he happened to be a member of the last Royal Commission on Education. To expedite matters we have had printed, somewhat hurriedly, certain evidence that it is proposed should be given. It is as follows:—

An Examination of the Education Bill, with Suggestions for its Betterment.

Clause 2, interpretation: "By-laws"—how are they to be made?—"Urban school district."—It seems unfair to give an urban school district two members of the Education Board, and an urban district a small share of two. Besides, it may not be advisable to place all the schools in a city of sixty thousand under one Committee if the residents prefer a Committee for each school. The proposals of the Commission for School Boards (which an attempt has been made to copy under another name) provided for the system of "co-opting." Town districts adjoining, as well as suburban boroughs, should be included in an urban school district.

Clause 6 (i.): There should be provision for a grant to Education Boards to pay teachers' expenses of transfer, especially as old Grade V has been reduced by £10, so far as head teachers are concerned. (ii.) There should be provision for the payment of Board scholarships which are current. (iii.) The abolition of the grant of £250 to each Board places the smaller Boards in a relatively worse position than at present. The reduction of the capitation to 11s., and the imposition of an extra grant of 6d. per pupil for Committees and 3d. per pupil for school libraries, the heavier travelling-expenses of members, the extra expense of rearranging districts (especially in the case of Wanganui), the alteration of its name, the greater burden of payment of agricultural, woodwork, cookery, and drawing instructors (owing to the management of technical schools being taken out of the hands of the Board), the payment of audit fees, the cost of advertising all appointments, the increased cost of relieving teachers, additional expense of election of Board members, &c., will reduce the amount available in the General Fund by at least £500 in the case of the present Wanganui Board.

Clause 8, Council of Education: While expressing no opinion as to the prospects of usefulness of a body like this with purely advisory powers, the Board believes that the composition of the Council is defective in that, while the teachers have six representatives, the Inspectors and School Committees have no voice at all, and the Boards have only four representatives altogether. A much better proposal would be—Director of Education (or in his absence the Assistant Director); two members by the Education Boards of the South Island and three by the Education Boards of the North Island; one member elected by the inspectorate; the President of the New Zealand Educational Institute; one member elected by the women teachers in the primary schools; one member elected by the male secondary-school teachers; one member elected by the technical-school teachers; one woman elected by the female secondary-school and technical-school teachers; one member appointed by the Senate; one member elected by the members of registered employees' unions; one member elected by the registered employers' associations; one member appointed by the Minister to represent agricultural interests; one woman appointed by the Minister.

Clause 11, District Councils: It is difficult to reconcile the Inspector-General's description of the District Council's membership, "consisting chiefly of the members of the General Council belonging to the district," with this clause, for of five members the only one—the Senior Inspector—would belong to the district, as no education district is directly represented on the General Council, and the senior Inspector is an officer of the Department. There are to be three or more members directly appointed by the Minister, or really the Department, to act as censors to veto the recommendations of an Education Board, and the other two members are necessarily in a hopeless minority. If an impartial tribunal is wanted, why not provide for one or leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Department? Considerable expense will be incurred in connection with the Councils, and in most cases the effect will be to militate against the efficient working of the education system by unnecessarily retarding progress. For instance, amongst the duties cast on it are—In clause 51, subsection (2), the Council is to advise the Minister as to whether it should direct an Education Board to arrange for the conveyance of children to and from an existing school; subclause (3) empowers it to advise the Minister to close a school, and, despite the objection of the Education Board, such school is to be closed and no further grants are payable in connection with it; subclause (5) empowers the Minister, on the advice of the Council, to provide conveyances for pupils to attend school, and to deduct the cost from general grants payable to the Board. Clause 84, subclause (1), a secondary, district, high, or technical

high school can only be established or disestablished on the advice of the District Council, except when the attendance falls below the minimum, while subclause (5) gives the Minister power, on the advice of the Council, to direct that the property and income of a secondary, district high, or technical high school which may be disestablished on the advice of the Council be transferred to another similar school, again on the advice of the Council. It will be seen that the powers of the District Council are greater than those of the General Council.

Clause 13, subclause (1), Education Boards : In the first place the question arises, why, alone of all the districts, alter the name of the "Wanganui" District to "Egmont"? Wanganui with its river is situate almost in the centre of the new district; the present Board has justly earned the reputation of being in the van of educational work of all branches, secondary, technical, vocational, primary, and infant schools; its secondary-school teachers are the best paid in the Dominion; most of its school buildings and furniture are superior to anything in the Dominion; its system of classification and payment of teachers have been models for other Boards to follow; and yet, probably because it is anathema to the departmental officials, its very name is to be wiped out. Deeds, stationery, impress stamps, &c., have to be altered, and a new name substituted which has no more relation to the district than Mount Cook would have to the new Canterbury District, or Ruapehu to the Hawke's Bay District. Surely Parliament will not perpetuate such an anomaly as that proposed. If the Hawke's Bay District were extended further into the Auckland Provincial District on the east coast, and Wanganui or "Egmont" extended in a similar way on the west coast, while Nelson and Marlborough were added to Wellington and Southland to Otago, three proposed Board districts would be abolished without injury to the administration.

Clause 14 : The different methods of electing members of the Board are bound to cause confusion, and an undue preponderance of members is to be given to the two urban districts of Palmerston and Wanganui compared to the rest of the education district. Taking the last census, about twenty-eight thousand of a population are to elect four members, while ninety-eight thousand are to elect six—a country quota with a vengeance! The population of an urban district should be reduced to six thousand for one member, over thirty thousand for two members, and over sixty thousand for three members, while the requirement making it compulsory for one School Committee to control the whole of the schools in an urban district before direct representation is given should be abolished. It is unquestionable that in towns especially far more interest is taken in the real work of Committees and voluntary effort is stimulated to a much greater extent when there is a Committee for each school than when one Committee is responsible for four or five. All the members of a Board should be elected on the same franchise—by Committees by post, as at present, by those on the municipal or county roll or by those on the electoral roll, and by proportional representation. There are several grave omissions in the machinery clauses relating to the Education Boards in the amalgamated districts. Who is to carry on the work in the South Auckland District, the Taranaki District, the Marlborough District, the South Canterbury District, the Grey and Westland Districts, from January till May, 1915, and which Secretary is to preside at the annual election of Chairman? What is to become of the officers in the amalgamated district who are not taken over by the Civil Service Commissioner or the Education Boards, and who is to pay them compensation for loss of office?

Clause 34, subclause (b), Grants to Committees : Unnecessary labour and delay will be occasioned by the proposal to calculate the capitation to Committees quarterly instead of yearly as at present. In this connection something should be done to obviate the system of compelling Boards to finance payments totalling many thousands of pounds while awaiting remittances from the Department. Interest, which has not been allowed for, has to be paid for such accommodation, and surely means could be devised of honouring a Board's drafts for special payments and of providing for reclamation when there is overdrawing.

Clause 38, School Districts : In addition to adjoining boroughs forming part of an urban school district adjoining town districts should be included. Urban school districts should be struck out, and urban districts should comprise boroughs over six thousand in population without the amalgamation or abolition of school districts.

Clause 41 : No provision is made for the two-year period.

Clause 45, proviso : Why should the appointment of School Commissioners, in the event of failure to elect a School Committee, be confined to members of the Board? Surely this proposal must be an error.

Clause 46 : Committee may appear in all legal proceedings by its clerk, Chairman, or solicitor. Why does not this apply to Education Boards?

Clause 47, Powers of Committees : Subclause (1)—This seems ambiguous. It is suggested that at the end of this subclause the following words be added : "as defined in the following subsections." Subclause (3)—Why should sewing-mistresses not be appointed for all schools?

Clause 50, subclauses (2), (3), (5) : There is a conflict between this clause and 41, which provides for an annual report to last day of January. This clause provides for balance-sheet to the end of February. Why not make both dates the same as the Education Board year, the 31st December?

Clause 51 : Subclause (2)—This should be purely a matter for the Boards. Subclause (3)—The minimum should be three miles, and should not apply to an infant school. Subclause (7)—Itinerant teachers should be allowed to teach one school for a period of months at a time when the roads are bad, instead of spending a portion of a week at each school.

Clause 53, subclause (7) : The Minister should supply stationery and other school requisites of the kind now purchased by Committees, as he can procure them very much cheaper.

Clause 54, subclause (2) : What need is there for the Boards to fix the time for physical instruction and the mode of instruction when the Department already does it?

Clause 56, Compulsory Education: Subclause (1)—The school age should be raised to fifteen. Where pupils over school age are allowed by the Committees to attend and are on the school roll the compulsory clauses should apply. It should also be compulsory for a child to attend the school nearest his place of residence, unless the Committee grants a transfer to another school.

Clause 57: Subclause (1)—Exemptions should only be granted by the head teachers or the Board. Subclause (2)—The proviso is absurd. What can the Senior Inspector know about every pupil in the district?

Clause 59, subclause (1): A fine of 2s. for a week's absence is insufficient. It should be 2s. for each non-attendance.

Clause 68: Except subclause (1) it seems unnecessary, as the sending of more than one name to a Committee where grading is equal is provided for in clause 67, subclause (7).

Clause 75, subclause (8): The salary for a relieving teacher should be specially provided by the Department.

Clause 78, proviso: Service should terminate on the 31st December, otherwise a new teacher would not receive any salary till March, and in the case of trainees from the training college this would be a great hardship, especially as the teacher who had really left would actually get an increment when not in the service. Besides, it is necessary that a teacher should intimate at the beginning of December his intention to leave the service, otherwise it is impossible to fill the vacancy till March, as it is not possible always to communicate with teachers during the holidays as to accepting a transfer.

Clause 79: There has been considerable difficulty at times in deciding what portion of the school glebe a teacher is entitled to, and to make the matter clear the words "by the Board" should be inserted in the last line of the clause after the word "use."

Clause 85, subclause (1): As the Board controlling the Wanganui Girls' College is under special Act defined as the Wanganui Education Board, what will happen if the name of that Board is abolished and "Egmont" substituted? Why should the School Committees of the rural districts in the ward in which the secondary school is situated not have a representative?

Clause 86, subclause (4): Unless the words "or by the Education Board which has control of such school" be inserted serious trouble will be occasioned in the Wanganui District. In Wanganui a Technical College has been built on loan at a cost of £10,000. This building is used for a Technical High School, for technical classes at night, for teachers' instruction classes (especially in science), for primary-school working classes, and other such purposes. Some of the instructors assist at the evening classes, and others assist in the District High Schools vocational classes. It is only by combining the work that the great strides taken in this district in agricultural and other scientific work can be carried out satisfactorily on the grants paid by the Department, and if the control of the institution is taken from the Board everything but the secondary work will be entirely at the mercy of the Board of Managers, and the cohesion now existing would be destroyed. The difficulties the Board have now with the Palmerston Technical School in connection with the woodwork and cookery classes from the primary schools are quite sufficient to show what would happen in Wanganui. The Wanganui Board has elaborated a scheme for the local management of technical schools which has placed the Wanganui Education District in a pre-eminent position so far as technical education is concerned. The Board has technical schools at Eltham, Hawera, Patea, Wanganui, Marton, Bull's, Feilding, Hunterville, Taihape, Apiti, and Pohangina, and has recently established classes at Rangiwhia, Kimbolton, Waituna, Rongotea, and Foxton. The fees paid, according to the Minister's report for 1912, totalled £1,040 against £1,109 in Auckland with three times the population, and donations totalled £1,789 against £1,087 for Auckland. No other Board came within cooe of these totals. When it is remembered that Palmerston is not included in these totals, for although it is within the education district the Technical School is under the control of the High School Board of Governors, the result is even greater than it appears. The Education Board has endeavoured to inculcate self-reliance in technical education with considerable success, but the proposals in the Bill will absolutely destroy this, and introduce an isolated system of management instead of a comprehensive system of local government assisted by the local residents. Members of the Committee have only to look at Table F1 of the Education Report of 1912 to see the position at a glance. It is impossible to contemplate without regret the breaking-up into separate and possibly conflicting units a system of district education that has been built up by the expenditure of so much pains and foresight. There should be provision for the establishment of agricultural high schools instead of technical high schools in districts where this is possible. If Boards are to pay over all the capitation for technical schools, who shall pay the management expenses to the Boards? At the present time the Wanganui Education Board has to finance the salaries of instructors in the technical schools to the extent of thousands of pounds until the Department pays the capitation. Will a body like the proposed Managers do that, or will the Boards be expected to finance these bodies? Directors or supervisors who are at present partly engaged in technical work are not provided for in the measure. There will also be an embargo on the present system of technical schools in small centres assisting in the pioneering technical classes in the backblocks. How are these charges to be met? No provision is made for the organizing work of instructors in the country districts.

Clause 92, proviso: A parent should give a guarantee that a pupil will continue his studies for at least a year, at any rate as long as teachers are paid out of capitation, or the existing anomaly of a reduction of revenue in the middle of the year without any alteration in payments to teachers will continue.

Clause 93: Why should holders of certificates of competency be compelled to pay fees while holders of certificates of proficiency are not, especially in the case of lads taking the agricultural course or girls taking the domestic science course?

Clause 104, Technical Education: The Education Board should be the controlling authority of every technical high school or technical school established by it.

Clause 108, Managers : This clause should be altered to place the local control “under Managers or such Committees as the controlling authority shall see fit.”

Clause 111, Capitation, proviso : The system at present pursued is an absolutely wrong one, especially so far as technical schools are concerned. Payments should be on the basis of classes above a certain minimum, and instructors should be paid all travelling-expenses and not mere railway fare and half coach fares. This is an exceedingly unfair discrimination against country districts off the railway-line. Special provision should also be made for the payment of a definite sum for maintenance, cleaning, and rebuilding of technical schools in the same way as in regard to primary schools. In line 10 of the second proviso the words “who does not possess a proficiency certificate” should be added after the word “years,” otherwise many pupils who obtain a certificate when under fourteen years will be debarred from going to a technical school until they attain the age of fourteen.

Model Schools : There seems to be no provision for extra pay for teachers of model schools. This work is so important, and will benefit the backblocks teachers so much, that the provision in the Bill (clause 75, subclause (9) (a)) will not be of much use unless some incentive is given to carry out this essential work in a thorough manner.

Inspectors' Salaries : As the Chief Inspectors are apparently departmental officers, the proposal to fix the maximum of pay for other Inspectors at £550 and the minimum at £365 is exceedingly unfair, especially so as no house allowance is provided, when it is remembered that a head teacher in a district high school may reach £470 and £50 house allowance, besides having his work limited to a few hours a day, whereas an Inspector outside the Department has frequently to be working at a school during school hours, writing up his notes afterwards, and then travels miles on horseback on a muddy road to get to the next school. If the work of Boards' Inspectors were compared with that of the Department's Inspectors it would be found that the former's work was infinitely more arduous.

Centralization of the Inspectorate : The Board disapproves of this proposal, not because of any loss of prestige that it will suffer, but because it thinks the step retrograde. At present the Inspectors are allowed some power of initiation, of striking out on new and progressive lines, which uniformity, in itself unprogressive, would limit or destroy. The relation between the Board and its Inspectors has heretofore been personal and intimate. When he becomes a public functionary the Inspector may, after his kind, deem it his duty to adopt towards the Board an attitude of indifference or antagonism. Under the new regime the Board's interest in education is bound sooner or later to become more or less formal, and so all that is best in local government will be lost. The Board desires to repudiate two suggestions made when the Bill was introduced : the Board has not at any time or in any way influenced its Inspectors with respect to the issue of educational certificates or reports dealing with applications for new schools.

Medical Inspection : The reports of the Medical Officer should be promptly available to the Board and the Committees. It is eighteen months since the first medical examination of school pupils was made in the Wanganui Education District, and the Board has not received a single report on the work yet.

School Books and Stationery : It would be true economy if the Bill made provision for the State to supply school material, apparatus, uniform school books, and school stationery, instead of allowing the present haphazard and wasteful system to continue.

Teachers' Salaries : The great blots in the scale of teachers' salaries are the differential treatment of the girls' and infants' schools, the teachers in schools between 15 and 21, and in schools of between 80 and 120.

In a mixed school or boys' school of 161–200 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In an infant or girls' school of the same size the head teacher receives	..	200–250
In a mixed school or boys' school of 201–240 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In an infants' or girls' school of 201–240 the head teacher receives	..	200–250
In a mixed school of 241–280 the head teacher receives	..	320–360
In an infants' or girls' school of 241–280 the head teacher receives	..	200–250
In a mixed school of 281–320 the head teacher receives	..	320–360
In an infants' or girls' school of 281–320 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In a mixed school of 321–360 the head teacher receives	..	320–360
In an infants' or girls' school of 321–360 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In a mixed school of 361–400 the head teacher receives	..	320–360
In an infants' or girls' school of 361–400 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In a mixed school of 401–450 the head teacher receives	..	370–400
In an infants' or girls' school of 401–450 the head teacher receives	..	260–310
In a mixed school of 451–500 the head teacher receives	..	370–400
In an infants' or girls' school of 451–500 the head teacher receives	..	260–310

Or a difference against the infant-teacher of—

		Minimum.	Maximum.
		£	£
IVB	60	60
IVC	60	60
VA	120	110
VB	60	50
VC	60	50
VD	60	50
VIA	110	90
VIB	110	90

When it is remembered that infant-work is much more highly specialized and has to be kept up with the frequent developments to be successful, and that the average attendance on which the salaries are paid is much lower in the infant departments than in the standards, the proposal of the Bill to reduce the minimum salaries of the old scale is a striking contrast to the increase made in nearly every other grade. The salaries of the assistants, especially the first assistants in infants' and girls' schools, are also entirely out of proportion to the assistants in mixed schools.

Grade II (16-25) of the old scale is struck out in this Bill, and a consequent reduction of £20 minimum and £30 maximum, or £9,440 minimum and £14,160 maximum for the Dominion, and yet we are told that the measure is to help the teachers in the backblocks. Grade II of the new scale also suffers a reduction in the minimum of £10, a loss of £3,120, which they make up if they remain six years in the one grade, a most unlikely contingency. Old Grade IV (new III) and old Grade V provide a puzzle in the new scale. The same grade of salary is paid for an average attendance of 36 as for 120. This is another instance of the injury done by abolishing a grade, and the experience of the Board is that the present Grade V teachers are amongst the best in the Board's service and deserve better treatment. Moreover, the salary attaching to schools of this size should be such as to tempt really good men to take charge of them, since they are often township schools where the influence of the teacher counts for so much. Surely such teachers should not be placed in a relatively worse position than the teachers of the new Grades IV and VI, whose salaries are handsomely increased. Generous treatment here would do something to take away the sting of a reduction in grade, which, though nominal and of all-round application, is none the less painful to earnest and ambitious teachers.

Nominations for election to School Committees (Fourth Schedule, Part I, 1): The proposal to close nominations one week before the date of the annual meetings will take away a good deal of the interest in the election of School Committees, especially in the country districts. The present system under which nominations may be made at the annual meetings should be allowed to continue.

The Chairman: Since the adjournment at noon when Mr. Braik finished his statement he has gone over part of his statement with the Inspector-General, and Mr. Hogben will now ask a few questions and explain what has been gone over.

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to clause 2—by-laws, how they are to be made. You understand that there is provision in the Bill—subclause (2), clause 30—for the making of by-laws? Power is given to the Board to make by-laws?—Yes, that appears to be so.

2. With regard to urban school districts—the number of members from urban school districts—that is arguable, and I do not propose to ask any question on it. I have marked it to bring it before the Committee. Clause 6: What you mean, as to old Grade V being reduced by £10, is this—that old Grade IV and old Grade V have been amalgamated, and the minimum of the combined grade is £10 lower than the former minimum of Grade V, while the maximum is £10 higher than the former maximum of Grade V: is that so?—Yes.

3. As to the payment of Board scholarships, there is provision for payment, is there not?—That is so.

4. Taking the Boards as a whole, this abolition of the grant of £250 to each Board with the new finance does not leave the Boards any worse off than they are now?—I could hardly say that. The statement that you went through with me would certainly point in that direction, but there are all these additional charges to be made which in the meantime are of a somewhat indefinite nature.

5. Which additional charges?—Clause 6, paragraph (iii).

5A. The imposition of an extra grant of 6d. per pupil for Committees: that can be calculated, can it not?—I am considering the latter part of the paragraph in our statement.

6. "Threepence per pupil for school libraries": that can be calculated—£1,800?—Yes.

7. If every school had voluntary contributions?—Yes.

8. "Extra expense of rearranging districts": I do not quite understand what that means?—The extra expense of members travelling.

9. But if you put two or three districts together there will be fewer members travelling, will there not?—Rearrangement of the districts would not be recurring expenditure, but it would be extra expenditure for the year.

10. Will you explain exactly to the Committee what you mean by "extra expense of rearranging districts"?—If the districts were rearranged there would necessarily be expense attached to the rearrangement.

11. Moving the office?—There might be office furniture and that kind of thing to consider.

12. In what case would you have to move office furniture?—It would depend where the office happened to be situated.

13. Can you tell me any case in which you would have to move it except Hamilton?—Either New Plymouth or Wanganui. But there must be expenses attached to the amalgamation of two offices, it does not matter whether the office is in Wanganui or New Plymouth. There would be a transference of material, and perhaps a rearrangement of the organization. The office might have to be reorganized to facilitate the greater execution of business.

14. Did you see that the surplus officers can be taken over by the Public Service Commissioner?—I did not notice that.

15. Any other points?—There is that matter that we went into—the payment of the instructors, assuming that the technical schools were left in the hands of the Boards.

16. You mean if control was transferred to the Managers? That is to say, the expense in clause 6 depends on the assumed expense in clause 86: is that it?—Yes.

17. Is there anything in clause 86 of the Bill to imply that control will be taken out of the hands of the Board and put in the hands of the Managers? Do you think that is necessarily implied?—You said there could not be separate control, so that we should be able still to have the same organization, which means a saving of money. I am referring to the management of technical schools.

18. Is there anything to show that the Board would not have the control it has now? Do you see any reason to fear that the powers of the Board would be taken away?—The only thing is that they are given autonomy. We want to give them autonomy, but it depends on the degree of autonomy. The Board of Managers may say, "We do not want your instructor; we have one of our own."

19. Is there a proposal to take that power away from the Board in the Bill?—You say there is not that power in the Bill, so that will be satisfactory.

20. You think it is a good thing that there should be local representation on the body that deals locally with the technical schools?—Yes. We have had representation, and in our annual report we suggest that there should be further responsibility thrown on the residents; but we do not want to lose control of the schools, because then we simply cannot organize the work of instruction.

21. Do you not think it would be a good thing to have that recognized by law? What you have given of your own free will should be recognized by law?—Yes, I think that would be a good thing.

22. With regard to clause 11, you say that the District Council advises the Minister. Is it the District Council that advises the Minister there? Is it not the Council?—Yes. In clause 51, sub-clause (3), there is an alternative given.

23. That is not a secondary school or a high school or technical school. This refers to clause 84?—Yes, but this alternative leads to a presumption that it might be extended into subclauses (4) and (5) unless you make a further definition of "Council" or "District Council."

24. The clauses you refer to now are not the clauses you refer to in the memorandum. The memorandum refers to clause 84 of the Bill concerning secondary schools. That clause says "the Council," does it not?—Yes, that is right.

25. That means, of course, the General Council, does it not?—Yes. There is a slight ambiguity.

26. *The Chairman.*] The word "district" should not be in that memorandum of yours?—That is so.

27. *Mr. Hogben.*] Clause 14: the matter you bring up is connected with the urban school district, clause 2. It is the same subject, is it not, the number of members for an urban school district?—Yes; it contains a suggestion for reconstitution.

28. Clause 34: would the Boards, do you think, lose or gain by the grants to Committees being calculated on the quarterly attendance? Supposing that a district was increasing fairly rapidly, and instead of being paid on the previous year's attendance it was paid on the quarterly attendance: would not the Board gain?—Yes.

29. How would labour and delay be occasioned? Could the capitation not be paid on receipt of the average-attendance return from the Board?—It is a matter of labour; but we are quite prepared, if it is to be an actual gain, to see that the extra labour is done.

30. Would you have to do any extra labour at all, except to take the return giving the total average attendance for the quarter? The labour would be done in five minutes by an officer in our Department?—Yes.

31. With regard to clause 38, school districts: would there not be a difficulty in including town districts unless you could have a municipal roll?—There would be a difficulty; but there is going to be a serious difficulty if it is not included, especially in our case. It seems a very great hardship that if these people want to come into a school district they should not have facilities for so doing.

32. They have their own school districts now, have they not?—Yes.

33. It would not take away any rights they have now, and would not affect a right which some other people have?—As a matter of fact, we rather prefer that they should stay in their own districts.

34. So they will. Clause 41: provision is made in the Bill for the two-year period, is it not?—Yes; but I think there is some mistake there.

35. "January" ought to be "February"—that is all?—Yes. It is the ambiguity in the word "Board." "Board" is used in two senses—the Board that exists and the Board that does not exist.

36. The Board never dies: this Bill does not kill the Board. Does not the last clause of the Bill preserve the Boards until their successors come into office? With regard to the next point, clause 45, proviso: there is a mistake in the Bill, by the omission of certain words. It is not evident what "members of the Board" are meant. "For such urban school district" ought to be inserted. With those words put in it will be all right?—Yes.

37. Clause 46: you understand that an Education Board, being a corporate body, has a right to appear, without special provision being made?—Yes.

38. Clause 47: I suppose you would be willing, as the Department was, that the Law Draftsman should say whether or not those words are necessary?—If the Law Draftsman says they are not, then of course I agree.

39. We generally have to be guided by him. However, I will put the case before him. Clause 47, subclause (3): is it not better to leave it open to the Board to disapprove of a teacher of sewing, or to appoint its own teacher? The only objection there is that there is a suggestion that a sewing-mistress need not be appointed if you say the Board "may" appoint.

40. The syllabus implies that she must, does it not?—I think you should include in the Bill or in your regulations the provision that you mentioned—that a Committee or the Board might appoint a sewing-mistress for a group of schools.

41. Is that not assumed in the regulations as they exist now?—I do not recollect it.

42. Could not that be done under the regulations as they exist?—I really do not remember the provision. In any case it is a desirable provision. If it is there, well and good.

43. At all events, it is better to leave the Board power to disapprove of a sewing-mistress if the Committee, say, appoints a person who is not qualified to teach? Would it not be better to leave it as it is in the Bill?—Would it not be well to say in that case that with the approval of the Board a Committee may appoint a sewing-mistress?

44. So it does say that?—Then that is all right.

45. Clause 50: that is explained, is it not? They are both to be February. Do you not think it desirable that the Committee should bring up its accounts and its report to the last moment to which it is convenient to have them audited?—I do not see any benefit to be derived, because the school year really is from the beginning of February to the end of December.

46. I am speaking of the accounts of the Committee. Could they not in the last two months after that, while still in office, play "high jinks" with the money, if they were so disposed and had rendered their account for the year?—February is a non-efficient month in the year so far as a school is concerned, and if you bring your business up to the end of December it seems to me that you have done all that is necessary.

47. Clause 51: it does not say the schools shall not be established, but that if they are proposed to be established within five miles the matter can be referred to the Council. Is that not so?—The point here is that we consider the distance—five miles—is too great.

48. It becomes an arguable question whether the school should be established or not?—Yes.

49. Should it not be within the power of some one—the Minister—to say, "I should like to consult the Council over this and see what the Council says about having schools as near as this"? Would not that be reasonable? It might be a school within three miles: it might be within a mile and a half of each?—This appears to me to be a matter for local consideration, and if it is unreasonable the Department should simply say, No.

50. The Department has no power to decide whether a school shall be opened, has it? The power is in the hands of the Board?—I do not know whether the Department has power or not, but by negation it does not do it—by not moving.

51. The Board can get a room put up and establish a school without asking the Department, can it not?—I admit that.

52. Then, clause 53: what do you mean when you say that the Minister should supply stationery and other school requisites—do you mean free?—Either free or bought, and distributed from the centre and supplied on the most reasonable possible terms.

53. You mean that the Minister should engage in trade—should buy at wholesale prices and sell to the Committees?—It is a proposal that is worth consideration, in any case.

54. It is done in Australia to some extent?—Yes.

55. The Bill does not prevent that being done if it is found to be desirable?—The Bill does not make provision for it.

56. Would it not be just as well if it were done through the Government Printer?—Well, if it were done through any Department so as to cause the least possible expense and give the best possible material to every child in the country.

57. You remember a circular being sent out to the Boards saying that certain forms of exercise blocks and books could be brought from the Government Printer?—I have no recollection of that.

58. Do you not think the Board should have a say when physical instruction should be given—that it should be open to the Boards to say which was the most convenient time?—It depends upon whether it is the usual routine or whether it is a matter of conflicting interests. If the Department of Physical Training wishes to go into a school at any time and give physical training it may be extremely awkward for the Board.

59. It would be, and therefore the Board ought still to have the power?—Yes.

60. Does not the Bill leave it so?—Yes, but the point is that it was redundancy to make provision seeing that it was already made.

61. But it leaves it in the power of the Board to arrange it in accordance with the regulations, so that both the Board and the Department should have a say in the matter. Is it not right that both should have a say?—When one considers the expense of the two Departments, the Physical Training Department is really a separate organization.

62. Oh, no?—That is to say, the instructors come from outside—we hardly know of their movements. We certainly get intimation, but it is just possible the instructors may come along and say, "We are going to take a series of schools," when the Inspectors were engaged on those schools. So far as that is concerned, I agree with the provision, but we thought that the Inspectors should say when the physical training should take place.

63. Is it not better to leave the Board a voice in the matter, which the Bill does?—Yes, I think it is.

64. "Compulsory education with the school age raised to fifteen": have you any reasons for saying that?—Well, the tendency all round is to raise the age of exemption.

65. Do you think public opinion would support it being done, especially in the country districts where it is rather difficult for parents to do without the help of the boys and girls of fourteen years of age?—Yes, it would be awkward in the country places, I admit.

66. Do you think the country is ripe for raising it in New Zealand to fifteen, taking into consideration the development and the conditions of the country?—Yes, I think so; but there is plenty of scope for children of average ability for getting free of the school, and this refers rather to backward children.

67. In regard to clause 57, do you not think the Board might want the advice of the Inspector as to whether a School Committee had not been too lax in giving exemptions?—I do not think that is a detail that the Inspectors should be troubled with at all.

68. Should not the Board have power to cancel the certificate of exemption?—Yes.

69. And should it do that without advice if it had been deliberately given?—I think the Board could get sufficient advice without appealing to the Inspector.

70. Would you cut out the words "on the advice of the Senior Inspector"?—Yes.

71. You know the Senior Inspector would represent the other Inspectors, would he not?—Yes, I understand that.

72. As to clause 59, subsection (1), which provides for a fine of 2s., is the law proposed to be altered in the Bill?—No, I do not think so.

73. Do you think subclause (1) of clause 68 is unnecessary? Might not a Board when it announced a vacancy recommend the promotion of another teacher in the same school?—This I take to be one of the most important matters that we have come to. So far as we are concerned, if a Board has selected the best teacher, why should there be so much machinery about getting him to a school? Machinery always means delay. This is a matter we have had practical experience of, and it is sometimes extremely difficult to get the teacher to his post at a convenient time. There is a great deal of delay.

74. Is not all that machinery for the purpose of securing the consultation of the Committee?—We do not see the necessity of consulting the Committee in such a formal way so far ahead.

75. But does not this clause clear that up?—Well, it may be necessary to provide that you are going to consult the Committee in this formal way, but as the Board actually makes the appointment why consult the Committee? I simply say, intimate to the Committee. Our experience has been that this consultation of Committees has led to a great deal of delay which has been unnecessary sometimes, and you secure nothing at all by it, because you send your teacher along all the same.

76. What do the Committees say to that?—We have had actual experience of this, and we know what the difficulties are, because we appoint the teachers exactly on the principle set out in the Bill.

77. In regard to clause 75, subclause (8), that only determines the rate of salary the relieving teacher is to be paid?—Yes.

78. Is there power under the law now for paying relieving teachers?—Yes, but not the full payment. We pay a certain allowance, but it does not cover the actual payment for that purpose.

79. It is the allowance you are referring to?—Yes.

80. There is no provision in the Act for that—that is to be done by vote of Parliament?—What we wish to see is that in every case the allowance should be made adequate. You now make the condition that he shall be paid the full salary.

81. That is the law now, and this is intended to make it clear. How did the Boards pay for it before 1903?—Just out of their funds, I think.

82. Do you not think they might pay for some of it out of their funds now? Do they get more funds now?—Yes. This adds an extra burden on the Board, because hitherto we have not paid the full salaries.

83. Do you know the Egerton case in England, in which it was decided that a teacher was entitled to the salary for holidays after he had been teaching for the term preceding?—I do not know of that case.

84. Do you know that some Boards do pay for January and some do not?—Yes.

85. Is it not as well that it should be a uniform practice?—The practice ought to be on the principle of equity.

86. Do you not think the practice ought to be in accordance with the English practice?—I would not go as far as that. I think December is a reasonable arrangement. We have to consider not only the teacher there, but the teacher coming.

87. But if paid for December and January is not the teacher paid for the school at which he was before?—You could not pay for two teachers during January filling the one post.

88. The difficulty arises when it is not uniform?—Yes, I understand that is the difficulty. Still, I think December is really the reasonable and equitable period.

89. You understand that the Wanganui Girls' College was overlooked—it would have to come under clause 86?—Yes, that is correct.

90. *Mr. Malcolm.*] In regard to clause 68, do I understand that you recommend that the Education Board make the appointment without consulting the Committee in any way?—Yes; not by consultation but by intimation.

91. And you found that work well in the Wanganui District?—We do as much as possible to keep within the four corners of the law. We tried to do it. It was with the utmost difficulty we were able to do it, because of unnecessary delays occurring.

92. And you are of opinion that if the Act simply required that the Board should intimate to the Committee, and did not appoint it, it would expedite the matter?—I am quite of that opinion.

93. *Mr. Sidey.*] Is your only objection to the Boards being consulted the question of delay?—Yes, I think that is practically the only objection we have.

94. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Is there not also the further objection that the Committee, if it considers it is entitled to a consultation in any way whatever, will attempt to assert that privilege?—Yes, I admit that is a practical objection to it.

95. *Mr. Guthrie.*] In regard to the question of the transfer of teachers, can you tell the Committee why the Board finds such a recommendation necessary?—Yes, I could give you instances. One of our teachers got a transfer from a Grade IV to Grade V school. He has been in his present position for three years, and he has not made up by his increments what he lost by his transfer. It will take him another year to do so. There is no doubt it is a very serious matter indeed. Teachers are not too well off, and if they have a railway and a coach journey to make and carry all their goods and chattels with them, break up their homes and make a new home, it is quite enough to put a teacher back to the extent of £25 or £30, and that takes up a great deal of the increment.

96. Will you tell the Committee the experience of your Board in the transfer of teachers to back-block schools?—That is a typical case I mentioned just now.

97. Speaking generally, does the same thing apply?—Generally it has borne very heavily on the teachers.

98. In regard to paragraph 11, what is your Board's impression of the necessity for the District Councils?—Well, the Board's impression of the District Council is that it is quite an unnecessary institution, and that the Board as constituted is perfectly well able to manage any matter of local control likely to be referred to it.

99. In the experience of your Board has any case arisen where it is necessary that there should be an investigation Council such as that proposed?—None at all. The only possible case where a Council like this might perhaps be useful would be in the case of appeal as a preliminary Court of investigation to bring the parties together and try to have an amicable arrangement made before going to the Appeal Court. That is the only case where a District Council would be of real service.

100. As to clause 13, which refers to the change of the name "Wanganui," it is a small matter, but are there institutions known all over the colony as Wanganui education institutions?—If the name of the Board is not known, certainly the most characteristic geographical feature is perfectly well known, and that is the Wanganui River.

101. What other high schools or colleges bearing that name?—There is the Wanganui Girls' College, the Wanganui Technical College, and the Wanganui Collegiate School.

102. As to clause 56, there is a definite recommendation that the school age should be raised to fifteen. Can you give the Committee any information as to whether that is the unanimous opinion of the Board or otherwise?—It has been the general expression of opinion of the Board, and at the Board meeting a resolution to that effect was adopted without dissent.

103. As to relieving teachers, is it not absolutely necessary in the experience of your Board that a definite arrangement ought to be made for the payment of relieving teachers and not through the chance expenditure of the Boards?—I might say that not only under the Wanganui Education Board but under the Southland Education Board we had continual trouble coming up about allowances for relieving teachers being insufficient. The result is that instead of getting men and women well qualified to fill temporary positions you simply have to take what you can get. For instance, we want for a relieving teacher a man who can take a responsible position, but we cannot afford to pay him. We got a man recently for £150, but the man would not stay for that when there were better opportunities at hand.

104. Does your Board find it necessary that a distinct position of relieving teacher should be made, and an arrangement made for his payment?—Yes, most certainly, because I say the schools suffer on account of the fact that we cannot pay a sufficiently qualified man to fill the position.

105. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Do I understand you to mean his salary should be quite independent of the position he is filling at the time?—It should be of such a nature as not to attract a man to another position too readily.

106. Then probably you consider he would require to be paid a salary which would probably be in excess of the salary paid to the position he was temporarily filling?—Well, to attract a suitable man, yes, because of the disabilities he has to undergo. There are many things he has to do which another teacher has not to do. He has often many discomforts that another teacher would not have to face.

107. *Mr. Guthrie.*] As you are a Director of Technical Education under the Wanganui Board, do you think that if the powers of the Board were transferred to any Committee or Technical Board that it would be conducive to technical education, or are you of opinion that the powers of the Board should be retained?—Well, if the effective power of control is taken from the Board, of course the organization will break down. There is no doubt about that at all, unless there are conditions made to guard the Board's interests in the matter.

108. Would you approve of any proposal to remove the control of technical schools as at present governed and placing them under the High School Boards?—Under Boards of Managers?

109. Yes?—I believe in local control and in control by the people, but it all depends upon the degree of control. If the effective control is to pass out of the hands of the Board into the hands of a Board of Managers exclusively, then I say it will be a very bad thing for education in the Wanganui Education District.

110. With regard to model schools, do you think it is necessary in the interests of education that model schools should be instituted and provision made for them?—I think there ought to be a model school in every district outside the districts that have training colleges. It is a matter of vital importance to a district like Wanganui. We appointed an organizing Inspector to do the work that might be expected to be done in a model school.

111. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Need we delay over this, because the Bill provides for it?—The point is that it does not provide the money.

112. *Mr. Hogben.*] Oh, yes; see clause 75, subclause (9)?—"The Board may pay such additional sums in the way of salary as may be prescribed."

113. That means by regulation?—It is a departmental salary apart from the Board's funds.

114. Yes. Then clause 6 provides that all the moneys required shall be provided for "(b) The payment to the Board of every district—(i) of a sum sufficient to pay the salaries and allowances of teachers, pupil-teachers, and probationers in the district in accordance with this Act." The regulations are under the Act?—If the Department provides the salary, then I say the Department is doing a handsome thing.

115. *Mr. Guthrie.*] Would you give the Committee the Wanganui Education Board's opinion upon the centralization of the inspectorate?—It is an extremely difficult and delicate matter, because an official does not care to lay his mind bare altogether, but there are perhaps one or two views I might express.

The Chairman: The Board has expressed its opinion in the written statement.

116. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You do not wish in any way to amplify that, do you?—Not unless a member of the Committee wishes me to do so.

117. *Mr. McCallum.*] There is in your statement one very strong sentence dealing with clause 13 which I wish to ask you about. You make a very strong animadversion against the Department: "Probably because it is anathema to the departmental officials its very name is to be wiped out." What is the trouble between your Board and the Department? Is the Department treating you badly?—I believe there has been no love lost between the Department and the Board. And then we have great rhetorical facility of expression in Wanganui.

118. Clause 86: do you not think, while Committees have the power of appointing members to the Board, as they still have in the country districts but not in the towns, they should be consulted and not have an intimation made to them? The power of consultation should remain rather than your suggested intimation while the Committees appoint the members of the Board? The Committees are the constituencies of the Board?—Yes, I admit that.

119. Wipe out the constituency, then, by all means; let the Committees go hang; but while the Committees appoint the Board should you not pay them the deference of consultation rather than intimation?—I admit that as a matter of form and courtesy, perhaps dignified procedure, the Committees should be consulted, but there is the other matter of business and expedition that perhaps would help the actual working of the machine.

120. What is your experience of the Appeal Board under the Act in Wanganui?—We just had one case since I went to Wanganui eight and a half years ago.

121. And you won it?—Yes, we won it. With regard to the District Councils, I think it is very desirable indeed that before any case goes to appeal there ought to be some form of consultation to see whether we cannot come to an agreement.

122. *Mr. Hanan.*] As an educationist of long standing, do you not think that from a national point of view the centralization of the inspectorate is desirable, apart altogether from your Board's views?—I may say that I was at the first Conference of Inspectors that took place in Wellington—I should not care to say how long ago. It was under Mr. Haben's regime. I then voted against centralization, and I have done so ever since consistently. There is much to be said on both sides, but the point I make is this: in intensity of interest in one's work it does not seem to me to be possible to make the same amount of sacrifice and to throw one's self so heartily into one's work if you are detached in a measure from your immediate employers. You work for the Board as you work for a person. I am not saying that if one were under the Department one would do the "Government stroke"—not for a moment. I do not believe there is an Inspector in the Dominion who, if taken under the wing of the Department, would not give of his best, but the personal interest seems to be in a measure gone. That is my attitude.

123. If the position would be as you state in New Zealand with regard to centralization, is that in accord with what obtains in the Old Country?—I think it holds entirely in the Old Country. But there is just this to be recollected, that in the Old Country the Boards have Inspectors of their own.

124. Do you think there is any lack of activity on the part of centralized Inspectors?—I do not think so. I think there is a formal element that comes in. I am sure that the inspectorate would be a little more formal in its ways. That is what I fear. I fear uniformity very greatly. It may be the best thing for the Dominion, but the same rule of uniformity seems to me to be a thing that one has to reckon with.

125. Now look at it from the national point of view of educational progress: do you not think that the centralization of the inspectorate will make for that?—I am willing to admit that you could transfer ability from one part of the Dominion to another, and in that way perhaps it would be an advantage from a national point of view. You see, some of us have been born and bred under the parochial system to some extent, and we will not readily part with the associations that we have formed with the Boards—which says a good deal for the Boards.

126. Would you not have more liberty of action and be less subject to parochial influences if you were centralized?—The influence certainly would not be parochial at all if we were centralized.

127. Is it not a fact that under present conditions there are local influences controlling an Inspector?—Yes, but some of these influences work entirely for good.

128. Does it not narrow a man in his views, in his activities?—No, I should say it rather acts in the opposite direction sometimes, and really is an incentive to originality and to educational activity all round. If you get a sympathetic Board you simply give them unconditionally of the best that you have to give.

129. On the other hand, if you get a dogmatic Board?—Then, of course, irreparable damage may be done.

130. How would you bring about a Dominion scheme of grading under the present conditions?—The Boards had the chance and they lost it. We met here in February and a scheme was evolved which was sent along to each of the Boards. I do not think one made a thorough examination of it or looked at it sympathetically. That I take to be the very reason why centralization has been suggested and hastened.

131. Forced upon you?—Yes, practically forced upon us. But in any case our Board will wash their hands of that matter, because we were the first Board to have a promotion scheme in operation. We have had it now, I think, for five or six years, and it has worked on the whole very well.

132. That is a local scheme?—Yes.

133. How about a Dominion scheme of grading?—The chance of the Boards doing it has been lost, and by the Boards themselves.

134. And to-day it is necessary, if we are to have a Dominion scheme of grading, to have the inspectorate centralized?—I must agree to that.

135. In your district does the one Board control the operations of the High School Board and primary education?—The one Board controls all forms of education in our district—primary education, secondary education, the district high schools, the Technical College, and all the technical schools, and it keeps in informal touch with the Girls' College too.

136. It has worked well and is working well: is that so?—I believe so. I believe there is a good deal of heart in the whole business.

137. Do you endorse the view advanced by the Southland Education Board, dealing with School Committee allowances?—I will read the statement to you, and I want to know if you approve, or, if not, in what respects you disagree. It is as follows—Section 34 (b), School Committees' allowances: The adoption of this clause will perpetuate the present extremely unfair method of providing for these allowances. A Dominion scale of allowances should be provided by the Government, for the following reasons: (1.) There is the same dissatisfaction now in some education districts because Committees in adjoining districts receive larger grants as there was formerly among teachers because their salaries were lower than those paid in adjoining districts. (2.) Boards controlling relatively great numbers of large schools can pay higher allowances than Boards controlling relatively great numbers of small schools. Small schools earn less in capitation than they receive in allowances, and this loss to the Board has to be made up from the profit on the large schools. Consequently the greater the number of large schools the greater the profit and the more liberally the smaller schools can be treated—e.g., adopting Southland's present scale, a school of twenty earns £6 and receives £11; a school of four hundred earns £120, and receives £73. (3.) The inequality and inadequacy of the grants lead at present to so much friction between Boards and Committees as to make administration difficult, and all this trouble would be obviated by the adoption of a Dominion scale, as now urged. (4.) The proposals in the Bill, instead of reducing these differences in grants, will increase them and also the difficulties of some of the Boards. (5.) Further, when allowances for administration and Committees are paid on a capitation basis, the cost of administration in a district with a large number of small schools is greater than in a district with the same attendance in fewer schools. Consequently, in the former the money available for Committees is much less than in the latter. (6.) The present time is opportune for the adoption of the proposed change by the Government, because the allowances are being increased by the Bill, and it will be found that a Dominion scale can be drawn up that will reduce the present allowances in very few instances. On the other hand, if the Bill is passed in its present form the opportunity may not occur again for many years?—I am quite in sympathy with that proposal, for this reason: I believe that a school in a remote district ought to be placed in as good a position as the best school in the best town. But perhaps if the districts are rearranged and made larger the difficulty might be got over then.

138. You are acquainted with the Southland District, and you are also acquainted with Otago. What would be the position under this Bill so far as the schools are concerned in our district as compared with Otago? In Otago they have large schools to a greater extent than we have—a greater number of large schools?—I believe that Otago has always been able to do more for its schools than Southland has been able to. I suppose that may to some extent be the explanation.

139. Would I be right in assuming that it means 6d. loss to Southland and only 2d. to Otago under this scheme, relatively speaking?—I am sorry to say that the spirit of accountancy has not been at all developed in me.

140. Would you approve of a scale of, say, 6s. 6d., instead of the suggested 6s.?—I have hardly been at an Education Board meeting where some Committee was not in dire straits—where some Committee has not asked tearfully and prayerfully for more assistance.

141. Under this Bill Southland would be in a worse condition than she is in to-day, as far as this clause is concerned—and your Board, too?—I should say that the Committees will not be very much better off, if any.

142. Will they not be worse?—I am not an accountant sufficiently strong to give a financial opinion.

143. What do you think about the twofold franchise for Education Boards and Committees?—I express the view of our local Schools Committees' Association. They think it is unfortunate. The Board says that it may lead to misunderstanding.

144. Do they regard it as an incongruity?—They do not regard it as a good thing. It does not matter what the basis of election is, let it be uniform. Have it simply on the ordinary electoral franchise, and make it uniform.

145. If you could have one day set apart for the local election of bodies, that would get over the difficulty: it would help, would it not?—Yes.

146. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Have you any idea of the cost of adopting a general roll?—No; but I understand it would be an expensive matter.

147. Do you know that it would approximate £20,000 every election year?—I was not aware that it would amount to that.

148. Do you think it would be wise to put £20,000 into that, or would you rather have it for the schools?—I should say, rather use it for the schools.

149. With regard to the District Councils: did I understand you to say that your Board do not think it necessary to have the District Council, because the Board could do all the work that a District Council would?—Yes, more particularly with the enlarged area. I should say that a Board is made up, as a rule, of intelligent, business, far-seeing men. That has been my experience. The members have, I should say, just as many qualifications as perhaps the men who compose such a Council as we have here.

150. Does not the Board control just one portion of education and not the whole?—In the first place, it is a subordinate body—subordinate to the Government and the Department—and in that sense it controls a part and not the whole.

151. Does it not control mainly primary education and district high schools, and in some instances technical schools? Does it control all the secondary schools?—No, not all the secondary schools.

152. If the Minister wants to know about some question that arises as between the primary and district high schools and the secondary schools or the University, would it not be desirable for him to have the opportunity to appoint some body to give him that advice?—We will assume that the Department has taken over control of the inspectorate; if the Minister wants information—unbiased information, and, I hope, intelligent information, and given with insight—I should say that to refer the matter to an Inspector would be as convenient and expeditious a way of doing it as any other.

153. Do you think that simply referring the matter to an Inspector would of itself satisfy the public mind?—Not referring it to one Inspector—certainly not the one Inspector in a district; but now you are to have a number of districts with Senior Inspectors, and perhaps a Chief Inspector. I should say, simply refer the matter to a number of Inspectors—say, three or four Inspectors. They are expert men.

154. It comes to this: it is merely a difference as to who is to give the advice locally. You suggest the Inspectors, and we suggest a Board, which will have an Inspector on it?—Yes.

155. About relieving teachers: do you understand that in the Bill provision is made for relieving teachers?—Apart from the general grant, there has always been a certain allowance for relieving teachers.

156. If the Department were to give unlimited power to Education Boards to spend all the money they liked on relieving teachers, should we not be involved probably in very heavy expenditure?—I should say that that would not be an impossible proposition.

157. I want to ask you the same with regard to the transfer of teachers: should we not be involved in pretty heavy expenditure if we gave you the money and said, "Spend what you like on the transfer of teachers"?—Yes; I admit that.

158. What suggestion have you to make to us to limit the expense?—I should say that the money should be spent under strict conditions and strict limitations.

159. Is not that what is provided in the Bill as regards relieving teachers?—[No answer.]

160. With regard to clause 75 of the Bill, you suggest regulations?—We suggest that it should be done under strict regulations.

161. If we have in the Bill provision for such regulations, do you think we have got all that is required?—I think so.

JAMES MITCHELL examined. (No. 22.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—I am Chairman of the Otago Education Board.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. The Otago Education Board has in part considered the new Education Bill now before Parliament, and submits for the consideration of the Minister and of the Education Committee certain suggestions. It is proposed to consider further aspects of the question, and thereafter to advise as to the conclusions arrived at. In the meantime the Board desires that the following points should be considered before the Bill is returned to the House: Council of Education: That if the General Council is to be set up, its constitution should be somewhat altered in the following directions—(a) by giving Education Boards more adequate representation; (b) by reducing the representation of the Department; (c) by providing for the election of the Chairman by the Council itself. District Councils: This Board sees no reason for the setting-up of the District Councils, the existence of which would, in its opinion, be more likely to lead to friction than to harmonious working. Education districts: The Board is strongly of opinion that the severance of the Clutha County from the Otago District is inimical to the best interests of education in that county, and contrary to the wishes of the people; further, that education in that county can be better administered from Dunedin than from any other centre. Constitution of Boards: In the opinion of the Board the alteration in the method of election of members representing urban areas is a retrograde step, and would tend to destroy the interest now taken by School Committees in their schools. Election of School Committees: The principle of oral nomination at the householders' meetings should be restored, at all events in the case of school districts outside urban areas or boroughs. As the Bill stands it would lead to largely increased failure to elect. Establishment of public schools, &c. (section 51): The Board, being familiar with the local conditions, is better able than the Council possibly could be to determine the practicability of conveying children to school, and to decide as to the necessity for opening or closing schools. It is recommended, therefore, that all reference to the Council in section 51 of the Bill be struck out. Staffs of public schools (Sixth Schedule): The Board expresses disappointment with the proposed new scale of staffs of schools, more particularly as it affects the large schools, Grade VIA and upwards. It is pointed out that, so far as Grade VIIc is concerned, an actual reduction in the staff is proposed. Inspectors of Schools: The Board is satisfied that the transference of the Inspectors to the control of the central Department will not be in the best interests of education, and that it is essential if they are to continue to be the advisers of the Board they should be officers of the Board, and available for the investigation of special matters upon which the Board desires information. Further findings by Otago Education Board: The Education Board, at its meeting last night, decided to forward to the Minister of Education and the Chairman of the Education Committee of the House the following additional findings of the Board with respect to the new Education Bill: Staff of district high schools: In the opinion of the Board, any principle adopted to fix the numerical strength of the staff of a secondary school should also be made applicable to the secondary department of a district high school. Conveyance of children: The Board points out that, while under section 51 of the Bill it is made obligatory upon Boards to provide for the

conveyance of children to school, no specific provision is made in respect of the payment of the cost of such conveyance. Salaries of pupil-teachers and probationers: The salaries provided for pupil-teachers and probationers do not offer sufficient inducement to young people, especially males, to enter the teaching profession. The Board suggests that the rates should be equal to those paid to cadets in any other department of the Public Service. Quorum of the Board: That a quorum of the Board should be half the total number where the latter is an even one, and a majority where the total number is an odd one. Salaries of relieving teachers: That the provision of section 75, subsection (8), which fixes the salaries to be paid by Boards to relieving teachers, cannot be given effect to unless an increased grant be made to Boards for the purpose.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that so far as Grade VIIc is concerned an actual reduction in the staff is proposed. I might inform you that there is a misprint, one assistant teacher of Grade I has been missed out in column (5) and one teacher too many inserted in column (6)?—That will be all right then.

4. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] In regard to the centralization of the inspectorate, is that the only reason you have to suggest?—No, I am prepared to amplify that.

5. What other reason have you?—I am prepared to say that it is a retrograde step. We claim in New Zealand to be in advance of the Mother-country even in the matter of provision for education. It has been the principle adopted from the outset of our Act in New Zealand to have the Inspectors as officers practically of the Boards. That principle is being now brought into operation or has recently been brought into operation in England. It is true there are departmental Inspectors, but the local authorities have their own Inspectors, and they are the officers responsible for education being properly conducted. Another thing is that the removal of the Inspectors from being officers of the Board and centralizing them will have the distinct tendency to reduce interest in education. In Canada at the present time the effort is being made to stimulate local interest, and the experience we have had in New Zealand has been this: that the local interest given to education by reason of having the Inspectors under the Boards had caused a wider interest to be taken in the matter of education than you could get under any system dominated from any one particular centre.

6. Do you consider the local interest is created by the inspectorate?—Local interest is largely helped by the Inspectors. We have found in Otago on very many occasions that little troubles arise, particularly in the outlying districts, possibly between the parents and the Committee, and by the Board being in a position to send the Inspector to the district and bring the parties together trouble has been avoided and a better feeling created in the community.

7. What would prevent that being done under a centralization of the inspectorate?—Because the Board would not have authority to despatch the Inspector.

8. Does the Bill say so?—No, it does not; but the only Inspector provided under the Bill who will come in contact at all with the Board is the Senior Inspector.

9. Does the Bill say that?—The Bill says that the Senior Inspector is to advise. It does not mention anything in connection with the Boards and other Inspectors.

10. Have you read the Bill?—I have, but I am speaking from memory.

11. See clause 128, subclause (3)?—Yes. [Clause read.]

12. Does not that cover every point you have been referring to?—No, I do not think it does.

13. Are you aware whether or not all the Boards in England have Inspectors of their own?—I know a number of the controlling authorities have their own Inspectors.

14. I want to know whether they all have?—I cannot say if all have.

15. What are the functions of the Inspectors at Home?—There are two sets of Inspectors at Home.

16. I want to know about the Inspectors for the local authorities: what are their functions?—They have the general oversight. I think they are generally responsible to the local body for the management of education.

17. Are you quite sure of that?—Yes.

18. And if some other witness says that is not so, will you deny it?—If he produces something more than his own word—some documentary evidence—I will not.

19. In regard to the salaries of Inspectors, what are you paying in Otago to your Inspectors?—The Chief Inspector is paid £550, two Inspectors £475, and a Junior Inspector £425, and he will get an annual increment of £25 until his salary reaches that of the others.

20. Do you know that one Education Board district is paying its Inspector £700 a year?—That is Auckland. It is a very much larger district.

21. Are you satisfied that there should be that difference between the salaries of Chief Inspectors in the various districts?—No, I do not think that is the right thing.

22. How are you going to get over it if we do not centralize them?—You are not proposing even now to have one Chief Inspector for each of the education districts you are proposing to set up. There will be under your own scale of salaries a difference.

23. But would not the salaries be graded under the Bill?—Yes, certainly.

24. Is there any equity, uniformity, or justice about the salaries of the Inspectors now in the various Education Board districts?—It is not equitable, and that is consequent upon having so many Education Boards.

25. Well, is your district a very small one?—No.

26. Then why do you not pay a better salary?—Our district is not as large as Auckland by a long way, and the amount of money granted to us by the central Department is not so great. The payment to Inspectors is largely governed by the payment made by the Department. It is another form of the absurdity of paying upon the *per capita* grant, the same as the absurdity of paying teachers upon the number of children in the schools.

27. Is your district as large as Hawke's Bay?—Yes.

28. Then why do you not pay as much as Hawke's Bay?—What is Hawke's Bay paying?

29. They are paying £575?—Well, what are the travelling-expenses in Hawke's Bay?

30. The travelling-allowance is £100?—Well, our travelling-allowance is £150, so that our Chief Inspector gets an extra £50 for travelling-expenses.

31. Are you quite satisfied that the Inspector in an Education Board district is free from all influence that may affect his judgment?—Yes, I am perfectly satisfied of that. I have sat upon the Otago Education Board for seventeen years, and I have never known that any hint has been given to the Inspector as to any particular matter he has to deal with.

32. And are you satisfied that the provision with regard to free places is uniform in the various districts?—Yes, it is controlled by regulation—the method of examination and value of every subject is controlled by regulation.

33. But who makes the examination?—The Inspectors in the district.

34. What uniformity is there between the judgment of the Inspector in your district and that of the Inspector in the Hawke's Bay District?—I cannot say there is any uniformity, and I take up the position that it does not matter whether the Inspectors are under the control of the Department or the Board you cannot get absolute uniformity, because the whole matter of inspection in an examination of that kind depends largely upon the man and upon the estimate that Inspector is prepared to place upon any particular number of pupils. You could not get your Inspectors to act uniformly any more than you could get a number of other men to act uniformly. You lay down a general method at the outset, and you expect the Inspectors to act as nearly as possible up to the regulations they have to interpret.

35. *Mr. Sidey.* Has your Board considered the proposals in the Bill with regard to the consultation of Committees?—Yes, we approve of the proposals in the Bill. The proposals contained in the Bill are practically an endorsement of the policy pursued by the Otago Education Board.

36. For how long?—For many years.

37. That is the sending-down of one name only?—Under the Bill it is not proposed to send down one name only. It gives to the Boards—and rightly too—the option, where there is one candidate with outstanding claims, to send forward one name only, but we have gone to the full extent provided of sending on four names when we are satisfied that there are four men or women having equal claims to promotion.

38. Has it not been your rule to send more than one name?—I would say this: that out of any hundred lists sent forward to the Committees there has not been 3 per cent. of single names.

39. Does not this Bill therefore propose a very radical alteration in the methods of the Otago Education Board?—It is not radical.

40. I thought you started by saying that it practically confirmed what you had been doing?—We have adopted the principle that where there is one candidate with outstanding claims that name only is sent on. It does not often happen that you get one person with outstanding claims either in the matter of ability or length of service.

41. Is it not very rare that you will find three candidates whose qualifications are equal?—It depends entirely upon the position you are calling applications for. In my experience on the Board in consultation with the Inspector I find that there have been some positions in which we have had eight and ten candidates whose qualifications it has been most difficult to separate.

42. We have been told in evidence that it would be extremely unlikely that there would be any occasions where the qualifications of all applications could be said to be exactly equal to one another?—Possibly not equal on all points, but in making a selection of a teacher you have to consider more than one point. An applicant may be better qualified from one aspect than another.

43. Then from your reading of the Bill you consider you will still be able in the majority of cases to send down more than one name?—I think so. At any rate, the Board sees no reason to take exception to the clause in the Bill as it stands.

44. Do you speak for the Board when you give your interpretation of the clause?—Yes. We have carefully considered it.

45. What alteration is proposed in the Bill in the present boundaries of your district?—The proposed alteration is to take away from us the County of Clutha and to give us the County of Waimate from the South Canterbury District.

46. You object to that?—We object to Clutha being taken out of our district. We say it can be better managed from Dunedin than from Invercargill. The means of communication are better. Take almost any part of Clutha, it will be necessary for the Inspectors to go right up from Invercargill to Balclutha, which is the extreme northern end of the district, in order to get into any other part of the Clutha County.

47. You do not object to the inclusion of Waimate?—We are perfectly content to remain as we are, but if it becomes necessary to make an alteration then we look for compensation, and the compensation offered in this case is not equal to the loss either in the number of schools or in the attendance.

48. But do you not think it would be to the general advantage of the teachers to have large districts whereby they would get wider opportunities for promotion?—No, I do not think the advantages are so great as some people imagine. You are certainly increasing the number of plums, but you are making the pudding a great deal bigger, and the proportion of plums is no greater to the pudding than it would be in a smaller one with less plums. If you extend your districts, unless you are taking a district where the proportion of very small schools is great and the proportion of large schools very small, they gain nothing at all by being taken into another district unless the proportion of big schools is very much greater than the proportion of small schools.

49. You have given your opinion, at any rate, and that is that you do not think that large districts necessarily offer greater facilities for promotion?—I do not think they do.

50. *Mr. Guthrie.*] Does your Board support the establishment of District Councils?—No; we most emphatically object to it. We do not see the necessity for them.

51. With regard to the election of the Board, do you think the proposal in the Bill an improvement upon the present system?—No. I think that no matter what principle you adopt in regard to the election of any body that principle ought to apply all round. By giving to the ratepayers of the urban districts the right of electing members of the Board you will be taking away from the School Committees of the urban areas a privilege that is enjoyed by the rest of the School Committees of the district. The rural Committees will still enjoy the privilege of electing the members of the Board, which will be denied to the members of School Committees in urban areas.

52. Is it the experience of the Board in your district that there is a demand for some other form of franchise than election by Committees?—No. It has been urged only in one particular direction. There has been no general pronouncement of opinion upon the subject at all.

53. Is there a demand in your education district for a change in the method of electing School Committees in the direction indicated by the Bill?—No. In our district the present option—that of prior nomination—is very little adopted. The general practice is the nomination of the School Committee at the meeting of householders, and it is, I take it, one of the means of drawing people to the meetings of householders. If your Committees, particularly in the country districts, were nominated prior to the meeting of householders you would have no meeting of householders. You would never have anybody to whom you could present your accounts and your report.

54. Do you think there would be a danger of withdrawing from the School Committees a certain amount of local interest?—Anything that is calculated to diminish interest in School Committees must have a baneful and bad effect.

55. Is your Board in favour of a Dominion classification and scheme of salaries for teachers?—Yes, always provided you begin at the right end. I have always advocated—I have done it before both the Royal Commissions—that the right way is to begin by determining that there shall be an individual payment and not a payment contingent upon the attendance at any school.

56. Under the present method of payment of salaries would you be in favour of Dominion grading?—Dominion grading would have no value whatever for the teacher unless it was accompanied by a grading of salaries—not a salary based upon position, but a salary given to the man—a salary carried by his grade.

57. Are you in favour of the centralization of the inspectorate?—No. I have already given my reason.

58. *Mr. McCallum.*] Do you not think that householders should have sufficient interest in the election of School Committees to send in the nominations before the meeting?—That would apply all right where you had a population fairly concentrated, but in the country districts a man would have to go hunting round to get the nomination filled up, and there is so little inducement offered to men to join the Committees that you would find very few people willing to take the trouble of getting the paper filled in.

59. I suggest that all those who are nominated a week before up to the number wanted—five, or seven, or nine—should be declared elected, and there should be only a contest for the extraordinary vacancies on the night of election. Would not that create an interest which you have not under any of the schemes?—It might, but it would carry a very serious danger. The most objectionable man in the community might be the first man nominated under that system, and the fact that he was so nominated and there was not a sufficient number nominated to create a contest could not be disclosed. The Chairman of the Committee could not, when he had received a nomination paper, declare who was nominated and who was not until he posted them the week before. In that case the most undesirable man in the community might be the first man nominated for the Committee under your proposal, and he would necessarily be declared elected—a man that the householders would not vote for.

60. *Mr. Hanan.*] Have you gone into this question of the £250 being withdrawn?—Yes. It does not affect the Otago Board materially. I can see that it will affect the finances of the smaller Boards, but it does not seriously prejudice the finances of the Board in Otago.

61. Threepence farthing, is it not?—Yes; but if the Inspectors are centralized the balance remaining in that direction will more than compensate for the loss of the £250.

62. Auckland, 1½d.; Otago, 3¼d.; Hawke's Bay, 6d.; Southland, 6d.—that is, doing away with the £250: is not that very inequitable?—I grant you that the principle of granting a first payment in all cases is a very proper one. It has been continued and extended to the secondary schools. We have adopted that principle in regard to the payment of our School Committees. We make a first payment and it goes up to a certain point, and thereafter our payments to School Committees are based upon attendance on a graduated scale.

63. Are you in sympathy with a Dominion scale of allowance for Committees?—If you are going to fix the scale on the basis on which it is fixed in the Bill we shall have all our School Committees in Otago up in arms, because we are paying more than the 6s. I think our payment works out at 6s. 4½d.

64. *Mr. Hogben.*] And the minimum is 5s. 6d.?—Yes.

65. *Mr. Hanan.*] You are in a very much better position than Southland?—Yes. A larger body with larger schools is necessarily so.

66. In that respect you have the advantage of a district like Southland, have you not?—Yes.

67. Do you think that is fair?—Do you think there is nothing unfair in connection with the whole thing? Do you think it is possible for human ingenuity to devise a scheme that will work out absolutely fairly?

68. You might devise something more equitable, could you not?—I might, certainly.

69. Speaking of the population of some of these districts, do you know what the population of Waimate is?—I think it is somewhere between two and three thousand.

70. I will give you the figures: South Canterbury—Mackenzie, 2,341; Geraldine, 8,157; Waimate, which is to be transferred to Otago, 8,492. You are going to have Waimate transferred to your district, representing 8,492, and you are going to lose Clutha, 7,266. So you see you are going to gain more than you will lose?—Yes, in population, but not in the number of schools nor in the school attendance.

71. Have you gone into that matter?—Yes.

72. You are going to gain 8,492 in population and lose 7,266. Now give us the schools?—I think the number of schools in Clutha is forty-two. The point is the relative numerical strength in Clutha and Waimate, not in population, but in the number of schools and the children in attendance.

73. There are more children in Waimate than there are in Clutha?—No, pardon me, not in Waimate County. We will lose twelve schools by the exchange, and 195 children in average attendance.

74. On what do you base that statement?—On a return made up to the 31st December, obtained from Mr. Valentine, the Secretary of the South Canterbury Board, who gave us the details of every school in the Waimate County.

75. Clutha comes into Southland. How many schools are payable there? Would you not be glad to get rid of it?—Some of it. I do not know whether I am correct in assuming—I think I am—that it is not proposed to transfer the Balclutha District High School to Southland. I reach that conclusion by taking the population given by the Inspector-General in his summary. To reach the figures he has there we have to exclude the Borough of Balclutha.

76. *Mr. Hogben.*] I took the figures from the Registrar-General. They are the population at the last census?—Remember this: the Balclutha School district is partly in the Clutha County and partly in the Bruce County, though the school itself is located within Clutha.

77. *Mr. Hanan.*] Are you not gaining more than you are losing?—No, we are losing more than we are gaining.

78. Take Tapanui: is it nearer Invercargill than Dunedin?—If you want readjustment I am prepared to meet you there. If it is proposed to readjust the boundaries, I say that you ought to abandon the idea of following closely the county boundaries and seek a natural boundary.

79. What do you suggest?—A natural boundary, and a boundary which provides you with the best means of access.

80. Do you not think that Tapanui ought to go into our district?—My suggestion regarding the boundary is this: All that portion of the Otago District including Waipahi, and bounded by a line running in a northerly direction to the Blue Mountains; thence on the east by the Blue Mountains and continuation ranges to the saddle between Edievale and Rae's Junction, including Moa Flat School district; thence by a line running west from the northern part of Moa Flat School district to the eastern boundary of the Southland Education District; thence on the west by the eastern boundary of the Southland Education District to the railway-line at Waipahi. I grant that all the schools that are tapped from the branch line from Waipahi will be better reached from Invercargill than from Dunedin.

81. Tapanui is nearer Invercargill, is it not?—It is, or you would not have had such a demand for the Lawrence-Roxburgh Railway.

82. Tapanui should come into Southland: you agree with that, do you not?—Yes, that you should take in the schools from Waipahi and right away up. Those are twelve schools, with an aggregate average attendance of five hundred.

83. Take the districts that are enlarged. Supposing Clutha comes into our district, a number of schools will require to be rebuilt, will they not, and the same with schools coming into your district?—There is no provision made in this Bill for the rebuilding of those schools as far as money is concerned.

Mr. Hogben: Yes, there is. All the money goes with the schools.

Witness: There is on paper, but there is not in substance.

84. *Mr. Hanan.*] Where are you going to get your money from to rebuild the schools you are going to take over?—Do exactly the same as we have been doing—ignoring the suggestion of the Education Committee that a certain sum of money should be accumulated, and spending the money as required in rebuilding. We have done that, and we claim that in Otago the condition of the schools will more than favourably compare with the condition of the schools in any other district in New Zealand, including even Southland.

85. With regard to the High School Boards, do you not think it would be better to have high schools under the administration of the Education Board?—No, certainly not. As a representative of the Waitaki High School I would not think of putting that school under the Otago Board of Education.

86. Have you anything to say with regard to relieving teachers?—We say that if you are going to insist upon the relieving teacher receiving the full salary of the position in which he is placed for the time being it will be necessary for a further allowance to be made.

Mr. Hogben: We pay that now.

Witness: We have been running £500 to the bad on our relieving fund in consequence largely of sickness. In Otago we have adopted this principle: we have a first-class man; we are paying to him a salary of £300 a year. He is available for temporary appointment as a relieving teacher to any school in Otago. He is capable of taking the headmastership of the largest school, and of taking any other position where required. It means that we should have to pay him, if he were sent to a school where the salary was £240, not at the rate of £240 but £300. Directly he went to a school with a

salary of £400 we should have to pay him, not at the rate of £300, but £400. We give him a salary of £300 and travelling-allowance. As I see it—I may be wrong—the operation is this: we send the relieving teacher to a country school where the salary is £200, and he draws at the rate of that salary. There is no provision for travelling-allowance. The Board pays, but in the case of the man that we have got his salary would be necessarily reduced. He is more often employed in schools with salaries of less than £300 than in schools with salaries of over £400. His position would be worse.

87. *Mr. Hogben.*] It says "not lower than" the salary, so it does not say that you have got to reduce it?—No. We are in this position: we must pay for him. We are giving him now a definite salary of £300, and if he is sent to a school of £450 we must pay him on the basis of £450.

GEORGE CRAWSHAW examined. (No. 23.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am Secretary of the Hawke's Bay Education Board. The Chairman of the Board died last week, and the Acting-Chairman was at the last moment unable to attend here, so I was asked to be present and place before the Committee the views of the Board. They are as follows: Section 6 (b) (iii): As the result of the proposed reduction of the general grant to 11s. per annum per child and the deduction of £250 per annum, as against payment by the Department of the Inspectors' salaries and allowances, this Board will reap no financial advantage, as the additional expenditure provided for School Committees, plus the capitation payable on account of school libraries, just about absorbs the difference. The Minister states that the Board will be expected in future to provide for new sanitary works, so that, as a matter of fact, the Board may be in a considerably worse position than heretofore. Section 8: Assuming that the inspectorate is centralized as proposed in the Bill, the Board cannot see any necessity for a Council such as is proposed. Surely a Council composed of Inspectors (male and female) of primary, secondary, special, technical, and Native schools, together with the Medical Inspectors and the Inspectors of Physical Instruction, would be better capable of giving advice to the Minister on all matters in connection with education than a Council composed more or less of non-experts. Section 11: Similar remarks apply to District Councils. The Board considers this proposed Council an unnecessary advisory body in a system already overlaid with advice. Section 12: The Board notes that it is proposed that members of General and District Councils shall receive "such sum for attendance at such meetings as may be prescribed," and observes that no such provision is made in connection with attendance of Education Board members at Board meetings. The Board is of opinion that such allowances should be provided for. Section 14: The Board recommends that provision should be made for the representation on every Education Board of the teachers employed by that Board. Such representative should not, however, be a teacher. Section 40 (a): The Board suggests the insertion, after the word "Committee," of the words "Managers of Technical Schools." Sections 41 and 50: Section 41 (2) provides that the Committee at its annual meeting shall give a full account of its proceedings for the year ending the 31st January. Section 50 (2) provides that every Committee shall in April forward to the Board a report of its proceedings (including financial) during the year ending the 28th February. It is suggested that the report to be forwarded to the Board be the same as that submitted to the annual meeting of householders—viz., for year ending the 31st January. Section 45: It is not clear whether it is the members of the Board who were elected by the urban district concerned who are to be appointed Commissioners. Section 47 (4): There is nothing in section 34 (b) to show how the money should be expended or on what lines the Board's regulations *re* expenditure of Committees' moneys should be framed. The Department's previous regulations and section 47 (2) of the Bill infer that repairs are to be carried out from School Committees' general incidental funds. In order to avoid misunderstanding and possible friction it is suggested that the words "repairs to schoolhouse and teacher's residence and other" should be omitted. Section 51 (2), (4), and (5): It is not clear if, in the event of the Minister giving instructions for conveyance, the Department will find the funds therefor. If a new school is erected the Department finds the whole of the cost. If conveyance is decided upon it appears that the Board is to be responsible for the cost, certainly for a part of it. Such inconsistencies should not exist. Section 51 (3): At the present time with every application for a new school a report from the Inspector is submitted. Frequently months elapse before the Department comes to a decision. What will happen when General or District Councils have to be consulted is problematical. Surely the Education Board and the Inspectors could be expected, with their local knowledge, to come to a fairer conclusion than a visiting body. Section 84: It is provided that secondary, district high, and technical schools may be established without any consultation with the Education Board. The Board considers this wrong. The Education Board of the district should certainly be consulted on all matter pertaining to education in the district under its control. Section 84 (2): It is provided that School Committees of urban districts may apply for the establishment of secondary, district high, and technical schools. Remarks in section 84 apply. Section 97 (3): As Standard VI examinations are generally held in December it appears necessary to make provision that candidates may sit without the proficiency-certificate qualifications, but that the certificate must be produced before a scholarship can be awarded. These arrangements would cause additional work, but something of the kind seems essential. Section 97 (4): Similar remarks apply to this section with regard to the intermediate certificate. Section 105 (2): It is provided that urban School Committees may make direct application to the Minister for recognition of technical classes. The Board is of opinion that such application should be forwarded through the Education Board, which is the controlling authority. Divided

authority would probably lead to trouble. Sixth Schedule—Staffs and Salaries: The effect of the staffing provisions of the Bill appears to be that schools with an attendance of 1–240 are unaltered in staff; from 241–250 an increase of either a pupil-teacher or an assistant is provided for; from 501–600 there is no alteration; and from 600 upwards the staff is reduced by one assistant. The last-mentioned reduction is strongly disapproved by the Board. The Board notes with regret that better provision is not made for the assistant in schools of IIIA and IIIB. In these schools the lady has great responsibilities. As a rule these schools are situated in the country, and most female teachers will not go into the country if they can avoid it. The Board has had many instances of a teacher preferring to accept a position in the town at £90 rather than take a position in the country at £120. Apart from the isolation attached to many of these positions the accommodation offering is frequently very bad, and the Board is of opinion that the teachers should be paid a salary sufficiently high to enable them to pay a fair price for good accommodation. Under the present circumstances it is only uncertificated teachers who will accept these positions, and once in the country a teacher has not much chance of obtaining a certificate. Consequently the Board is of opinion that in schools of Grade IIIA and IIIB the first female assistant should be paid a salary of £150 to £180. Eighth Schedule: It is provided that first-year pupil-teachers commence at £35 per annum. This salary the Board considers insufficient. The teaching profession requires the very best men and women, and there appears little hope of getting them when the initial inducement is less than that in other Government and commercial services. It is true that they are to be trained for the profession, but the study and additional work necessary to obtain a teacher's certificate is not always attractive, and when the arduous preparation carried out in addition to the daily occupation is completed the teaching service offers little, if any, better prospects than the other public and private services which do not require the same "overtime" training, and for which the salary payable from the beginning is greater than that provided for pupil-teachers. Twelfth Schedule: The Board is of opinion that only the best teachers should be appointed Inspectors. The minimum salary paid to an Inspector should be higher than that payable to any headmaster. It is evidently wrong that an Inspector should be receiving a less salary than a headmaster whose work it is his duty to report upon. Native schools: In 1912 there were 108 Native village schools under the direct control of the Education Department. Twenty of these were in Hawke's Bay, and the departmental Inspectors, in visiting these Native schools, had to pass public schools, while the Board's Inspectors passed the Native schools on their journeys to the public schools. The Board is strongly of opinion that these Native schools should be placed under the control of Education Boards. The proportion of Native children in attendance at some public schools is greater than that in connection with some Native village schools. Travelling in Hawke's Bay is difficult and expensive, and the Board considers that much unnecessary expense would be saved if the Native schools were placed under the jurisdiction of the Education Boards. The Board knows of no reason whatever why this should not be brought about. In the Native-school code it is provided that a junior assistant may be appointed when the average attendance is 21 and two assistants at 51. In the public schools the first assistant is appointed at 36 and the second at 81. The Board is of opinion that where the number of Natives in attendance at a public school of Grade II (new) or higher is not less than 25 per cent. of the total roll number, some additional assistance, if only a pupil-teacher, should be provided for. Teachers' removal expenses: There is no provision in the Bill for the payment of teachers' removal expenses. The Board inaugurated a scheme of classification and promotion of teachers. The scheme, which provided for the transfer of teachers, had the approval of the Board, Inspectors, and teachers; but when put into operation it partially broke down owing to the fact that teachers transferred were required to pay their own travelling-expenses, which amounted in most cases to a greater sum than the additional salary for three years attached to the higher position offered. The Board is convinced that no promotion scheme can be complete which does not provide for the transfer of teachers, and no such scheme is possible until the cost of the removal of the transferred teacher, his family, and effects is provided, as is done in every other branch of the Public Service. It has been suggested that the Boards may, under the new conditions, undertake this expense. As regards this Board its receipts for administration have for some years scarcely covered the expenditure, though it is one of the most economically administered of the Education Boards, and, as has been pointed out above, the proposals under the Bill will probably place the Board in a worse position than formerly. It is therefore hopeless to expect the Hawke's Bay Board to deal with this matter, much as it would like to do so.

2. *Mr. Hogben.* As far as I understand, you imply that in IIIA schools there is not an improvement?—I did not say that. I said that the Board would like to see a further improvement!

3. The Board are aware, I suppose, that the salary, for instance, of the assistant mistress used to be £100 to £120, and under this Bill it is proposed to make it £120 to £140. What you want is to raise it further still?—Yes, even if you take it off those in the town schools. In a school of that kind you must offer some special inducement for a girl to go there. You want a capable girl there, and you want to offer her some special inducement. If necessary, take it off the assistants in the town schools, where they have the supervision of certificated teachers. In the country they probably have not. The female teacher has the female side of the school and the arrangements in connection with needle-work and domestic work, and it is a special department.

4. Suppose this relates to a school of 150: what do you mean by her having the female part of the school?—She is responsible for the administration of the female part of the school outside school hours, and for the infants in school hours. It is specially necessary in a school of that kind that a teacher should be a certificated teacher before she goes out there, and she should be a good teacher.

5. You admit she gets an improvement of £20 under the Bill?—Quite: but I do not admit that it is enough.

6. With regard to scholarships, I should like you to make that point clear respecting clause 97. Perhaps, however, it would be better for me to explain what is meant than to ask you. The way the Bill proposes to award scholarships is on a qualification. For the present that qualification would have to be—say, a Junior Free Place Examination conducted by the Department, and the evidence referred to would be supplied by the marks that the candidate got in that examination. It does not say that he shall produce evidence: it says, “they have given evidence.” Well, they have given evidence in the examination, indicated by the marks obtained?—That is so. That is the way we read it.

7. *Mr. McCallum.*] Is your Board satisfied with the boundaries?—Our boundaries are not interfered with, so we have not said anything on that subject.

FRIDAY, 7TH AUGUST, 1914.

ALEXANDER BELL, Secretary, Southland Education Board, examined. (No. 24.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] You are Secretary of the Southland Education Board?—Yes. Prior to receiving my present appointment I was Inspector and Secretary to the South Canterbury Education Board. I propose dealing with points of the Bill not alluded to by Mr. Fisher—Section 6 (b) (iii), capitation grants to Boards: the average attendance is an unfair basis on which to make grants to Education Boards to cover costs of administration and allowances to School Committees. A grant per school, plus a capitation, would be more equitable. The expenditure under these heads varies as much with the number of schools as it does with the total attendance. Therefore Boards controlling a proportionately large number of small schools are at a great disadvantage compared with Boards controlling a proportionately greater number of large schools: *e.g.*, compare Southland and Wellington:—Southland—District schools, 181; attendance, 9,555; capitation at 11s., £5,733; schools over 200, 5. Wellington—District schools, 170; attendance, 16,198; capitation at 11s., £9,719; schools over 200, 14. Manifestly under the proposals of the Bill these two Boards are not placed on similar financial footings. Southland therefore protests strongly against the proposals in the Bill. A capitation grant on the attendance, plus a grant per school, would work out more fairly than the present system. Grant of £250 withdrawn: the withdrawal of the grant of £250 hitherto paid affects very inequitably the various districts: *e.g.*, this is equal to reductions in capitation allowance as follows: Auckland, 1½d.; Otago, 3½d.; Hawke's Bay, 6d.; and Southland, 6d. The proposed capitation allowance in the Bill undoubtedly accentuates the present unfair financial advantage of the more populous districts. Section 31 (6): The existing provision by which Boards may transfer 7 per cent. of the building-maintenance grant to the building special grants should be continued; otherwise, how are Boards to provide for extras on new buildings when Government grants are insufficient? The Bill allows the Board to pay these extra moneys out of the general fund, but our general fund in Southland is insufficient for the purpose. Clause 34 (b), School Committees' allowances: The adoption of this clause will perpetuate the present extremely unfair method of providing for these allowances. A Dominion scale of allowances should be provided by the Government, for the following reasons: (1) There is the same dissatisfaction now in some education districts because Committees in adjoining districts receive larger grants, as there was formerly among teachers because their salaries were lower than those paid in adjoining districts. I have an example here which I may give. A school with an average of forty in Otago receives £22, while a school of the same size in Southland receives £14. There is a difference there of £8, and there is possibly only a river between the two schools; in some cases there is only a road. (2.) Boards controlling relatively great numbers of large schools can pay higher allowances than Boards controlling relatively great numbers of small schools. Small schools earn less in capitation than they receive in allowances, and this loss to the Board has to be made up from the profit on the large schools. Consequently, the greater the number of large schools the greater the profit and the more liberally the smaller schools can be treated—*e.g.*, adopting Southland's present scale, a school of twenty earns £6 and receives £11, and a school of 400 earns £120 and receives £73. (3.) The inequality and inadequacy of the grants lead at present to so much friction between Boards and Committees as to make administration difficult, and all this trouble would be obviated by the adoption of a Dominion scale as now urged. There is a great deal of friction in Southland at present owing to the small allowances to School Committees. (4.) The proposals in the Bill, instead of reducing these differences in grants, will increase them and also the difficulties of some of the Boards. The Bill strengthens the finances of the large Boards, but it does not strengthen the finances of the small Boards, so that there is likely to be greater differences in these allowances to School Committees. (5.) Further, when allowances for both administration and Committees are paid on a capitation basis, the cost of administration in a district with a large number of small schools is greater than in a district with the same attendance in fewer schools, consequently in the former the money available for Committees is much less than in the latter. (6.) The present time is opportune for the adoption of the proposed change by the Government, because the allowances are being increased by the Bill, and it will be found that a Dominion scale can be drawn up that will reduce the present allowances in very few instances. On the other hand, if the Bill is passed in its present form, this opportunity may not occur again for many years. I have worked out what the cost to Southland would be if we adopted Otago's scale of grants to Committees; it would absorb a capitation of 8s. 2d. to equal Otago's present allowances. Under the Bill Otago will be able to increase those allowances, and Southland would probably require to take 9s. out of its capitation to make the allowances Otago will be able to make under the proposals in the Bill. That shows the

unfairness of the system. Clause 38 (4): When a new school district is proclaimed it should take effect on a date to be fixed by the Board, so that a new Committee could be elected at once and placed in charge of the school, which might otherwise have to be placed for some months under the control of a neighbouring Committee with no interest in it. According to the Bill the new Committee would not be elected until the annual election of Committees in April. We have an instance of where that will happen in Invercargill. Clause 53 (7): It should be made clear that Committees are not compelled to provide out of their ordinary funds the stationery used by pupils. Clause 96: The number of scholarships for each district should be defined, and the present provision for Junior National Scholarships for sole-teacher schools and also for schools under 200 should be added to the Bill. Clause 111 (1): Boards should be allowed a small percentage on moneys received for managers of technical classes to help to pay for the Board's cost of administration. Fifth Schedule, teachers' salaries: Teachers of the largest sole-teacher schools should be paid as well as if not better than head teachers of the smaller two-teacher schools. This could be provided for at no additional cost by increasing the salaries of the former and decreasing the salaries of the latter. Then Grade III in the Bill would have to be divided at, say, an average of fifty. The largest Grade II school is much more difficult to manage and requires greater skill on the part of the teacher than the smallest Grade III school, and when a school rises in grade there should be an increase of £60 in possible salary and at the same time such a material reduction in the work required. The minimum salary for Grade I schools should be increased to £120.

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] Have you calculated what your Board will get by way of capitation grant under the Bill?—Yes.

3. Will it get less than it is getting now?—We will be in just about the same financial position. We are relieved of the Inspectors' salaries, but then our capitation is reduced, and we have extra expenditure placed on the Board. The decreases in revenue and expenditure are almost equal. Of course, my point is that, while in Southland we will be no better off under the Bill, in some of the other districts they will be much better off and will be able to treat their Committees much more liberally.

4. Take the question connected with it—clause 34, School Committees' allowances: the method in the Bill does not differ in principle from the method in the present Act, does it?—Except that the £250 is withdrawn. The method is the same, but under the provisions of the Bill these larger districts would be able to treat their schools still more liberally. The difference between the two allowances will tend to get greater. I can bring evidence to prove that.

5. You think there is opportunity for reform in the present system?—I am quite sure of it.

6. Have you worked it out to see what grant per school would make it as nearly as possible equitable?—No. Of course, I prefer a Dominion scale to Committees.

7. What do you mean by that?—The Government should take 6s. or 6s. 6d. of the capitation to Boards, and out of that provide a scale of allowances to Committees, and should pay the Boards the total sum earned by the Committees in their districts and give the Boards the balance for their administrative expenses. Another remedy would be an allowance per school plus a capitation allowance.

8. You would not make that allowance the maximum as well as the minimum?—It might be necessary to give more, because if you take 6s. 6d. you would not be able to treat some Committees as liberally as they are treated now. It might lead to a reduction in the allowances in some of the more favoured districts.

9. Is there not another point? How many months of the year do you require to have fires in Southland?—I suppose for quite eight months of the year, whereas in Auckland, I suppose, they have not to provide fires at all in some districts.

10. The Board should have the power to increase the grant above the minimum in order to provide for that?—Yes. That seems to imply that Southland should get more than Auckland to make up for climatic differences, but we are not asking for that.

11. If clause 111 (1) was altered so as not to conflict with clause 31 you would be satisfied in regard to that?—I think we would.

12. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I was much impressed with your proposal for a system of capitation framed not only on attendance but on the number of schools. You would suggest an amendment in that direction?—Yes.

13. Would it not be better to make it on the number of rooms, otherwise mixed schools would be penalized?—That might be even better than my suggestion. In drawing up the scale of allowances for Southland I was guided by the number of rooms—an allowance plus so-much per room.

14. Have you any Grade 0 schools?—Nine or ten.

15. Have you any suggestion as to the minimum capitation for those schools?—I think I would favour an increase from £6 to £10 if possible.

16. It would not be a big matter in your district?—No.

17. *Mr. Hanan.*] You heard the evidence of Mr. Mitchell, Chairman of the Otago Education Board, with reference to the boundaries: what is your opinion in regard to them?—I think he suggested that Clutha should be retained by Otago. He said they would rather have Clutha than Waimate. Tapanui district and Waipahi are much nearer Invercargill, and should be added to Southland.

18. What schools at present in Otago would be ceded by this Bill to Southland?—There are forty-three schools—one Grade VIII, two Grade V, six Grade IV, and thirty-four sole-teacher schools. With regard to allowances to School Committees, I may say that this makes our task much harder because of the number of small schools. It tends to lower our allowances to Committees.

19. Have you any observation to offer with regard to that?—I have gone into figures. Our present School Committee allowances in Southland cost us a capitation of 6s. 0½d. last year, and these Clutha schools would cost 7s. 1d. on the same scale.

20. What about the rebuilding of schools?—Mr. Hogben has explained that the money already granted for rebuilding will be handed over with the other property. The Board from which we get these schools will have to hand over the accumulated funds they have for rebuilding.

21. Have you any more figures to give with reference to the change of boundaries?—There is the question of area. The area of the new Southland District will be over 15,000 square miles. Southland will be one of the largest, if not the largest, education districts in the Dominion. The area of the new Otago District is just a little over 11,000 square miles.

22. Have you any observations to offer with regard to the scale of salaries adopted for women teachers?—I have not made a very close study of the new scale of salaries, but I have noticed the point raised the other day that women teachers are not to receive the same increases that some of the men are.

23. Would you endorse what that witness in the main said?—I would require to consider it before I could say that.

24. *Mr. Sidey.*] Have you anything to remark upon the disabilities of the backblocks settler?—The Bill gives the Minister greater power to restrict the establishment of small schools, and at the same time the policy of the Government is to push settlement as far as possible into the backblocks. In Southland we have a great area of backblocks country which is gradually being brought under settlement.

JOHN FISHER, Southland, examined. (No. 25.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] Whom do you represent?—I am representing the Southland Education Board and the Southland Technical College.

2. Have you a statement to make?—In order to save time, Mr. Bell, the Secretary of the Southland Education Board, and myself have divided the Bill; I will take certain sections, and Mr. Bell will take others. Further than that, we have had a conference with Mr. Hogben, the Inspector-General, with the result that several points have been cleared up and will not now need to be referred to by us. With regard to clause 11, District Councils: The Board opposes strongly the proposal to constitute District Councils, because the proposal casts a reflection upon the integrity of the Boards. With regard to clause 13 (a), the ward system for Board elections should be abolished, because it creates parochialism and places the election of Board members in the hands of too limited a constituency. Clause 14: The Southland Board suggests that Board members should be elected by householders. The teachers could compile the rolls and act as returning officers. Thus a more equal franchise for both rural and urban districts would be arranged for. Clause 34: The proposal in the Bill to limit the expenditure of moneys by departmental regulations is an unwarranted curtailment of the Board's powers. The present Act allows Boards, within the provisions of the law, to expend moneys "as they think fit." The check exercised by the Auditor-General should be a sufficient guarantee for the integrity of Boards without further interference from the central authority. Clause 43: Provision should be made for monthly or fixed meetings of Committees; otherwise, under paragraph 12 of the Fourth Schedule, a Chairman might, by using his powers to convene meetings at unsuitable times, unseat a member of the Committee. Clause 47: Whenever a School Committee refuses to carry out its duties Boards should have power to assume control of the school and the school fund, and such Committee should lose its office. Clause 49: There should be provision for the withdrawal of School Committee's funds from the Post Office Savings-bank by cheque, or for the Board to act as banker for the Committees in the same way as commercial firms act as bankers for their clients. Clauses 53 (2) and 75 (9): This is an excellent proposal with regard to model schools, especially in districts where there is no training college. The extra pay to the teachers, however, should be provided by the Government. Clause 67: The Boards' present power to transfer teachers from any position to any position should not be restricted to the cases mentioned in the Bill, nor should Boards be compelled to advertise for applicants for vacancies. Clause 74: Probationers' salaries are at present altogether inadequate to attract male applicants, and there does not appear to be any reason for reducing a pupil-teacher's lodging-allowance by £5 after each year's service. Out of almost fifty pupil-teachers and probationers at present employed in Southland only seven are males. £25 for a boy of sixteen or seventeen who has spent two or three years in a secondary school is nowadays absurdly low pay, especially when much larger pay is offering by other Government Departments for young persons with lower qualifications. Clause 75 (8): The proposal in this section will so materially increase the payments for temporary teachers that the small allowance provided for relieving teachers will be quite inadequate unless the clause is amended to indicate that in cases where the headmaster is absent for less than a week the assistant should not necessarily receive the headmaster's pay. Clause 127: The Board opposes very strongly the proposals in the Bill for the centralizing of Inspectors, for the following reasons: (1) Boards will not have the same confidence in the advice received from officers not under their control; (2) friction is likely to arise between Boards and Inspectors, since the latter can no longer be directed to give effect to policies framed and inaugurated by the Boards; (3) under the new conditions the Director of Education may become an autocrat, and, however unwise or impracticable his schemes may be, he will be able to impose them on the country; (4) the Inspectors will lose their freedom to criticize the Director's proposals, and will thus be less able to fashion the education policy; this would be a serious loss. Most of the objects mentioned by the Minister in his speech introducing the Bill in the House could be attained without this drastic proposal to rob Boards of the power to appoint and control their Inspectors. If the Department paid Inspectors in accordance with the Dominion scale, such as is proposed in the Bill, the Minister could make it a condition that the Inspectors should do the work of supervision,

examination, and inspection required by the Department. Third Schedule, paragraph 9 (Board elections): The present delay of fifteen days before voting-papers are opened could be obviated by slightly extending the time for voting, and requiring papers to be returned by a fixed day. Fourth Schedule, paragraph 9 (School Committee elections): The second chance for election should be deleted on the score of trouble and expense and of delay in preparing rolls for the Board election. In the case of no other public body is a second opportunity for election given. Verbal nominations at householders' meetings should be continued, and voting-papers should not be required to contain the names of the candidates. Second Schedule (district boundaries): The new Southland District should include the schools near the Waipahi-Edievale Railway, the Blue Mountains or the Clutha River being made the boundary. This district can be reached much more easily from Invercargill than from Dunedin. Twelfth Schedule (Inspectors' salaries): The fourth class of Assistant Inspectors should be cut out, and the minimum raised to £500. The Southland Board enters its protest against the numerous and insidious ways in which its powers and duties are encroached upon and curtailed by the proposals in the Bill, and also against the corresponding increase of the powers of the central authority, which may in time become thoroughly autocratic and oppressive. These proposals are undemocratic and rob the public of their right to control their own affairs. This will lead to a great reduction in the local interest in education, which is one of the best features of our New Zealand system. The following are a few examples of these proposals which tend to destroy the powers of Boards and reduce their status to that of glorified School Committees: (1) The appointment of Inspectors is taken away; (2) the power to establish new schools is curtailed (51); (3) the power to spend money is limited by regulations (34); (4) the power to transfer teachers is restricted (67); (5) the transfer of funds is limited (31); (6) the Minister may compel Boards to close schools and to pay for conveyance (51 (4)); (7) the power to establish scholarships and district high schools is deleted (30); (8) the formation of the Councils will undermine the very foundation of the Boards' powers in every direction.

3. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to clause 34 of the Bill, you are aware that any regulations that could be drawn would have to be in accordance with the appropriations of Parliament?—Yes.

4. And practically the Board is now controlled by those appropriations, is it not?—Yes.

5. Could the regulations go outside those appropriations—could they alter those appropriations?—Why does it become necessary?

6. Are you aware that now differences of opinion arise from time to time because the Auditor-General has taken a view of the regulations that neither the Board nor the Department has taken, so that the Board is hampered, not understanding the appropriations of Parliament: so that this really helps the Boards?—I am aware that certain payments have been made which have been tagged by the Audit Department.

7. And that the Department has taken the same view as the Board, and not that of the Audit Department?—Your contention is that this extends and does not limit the powers of the Boards. It limits the power of the Board in this: it does not allow the Board to construe matters as it thinks fit, but it must be in accordance with the Department's opinion. It does limit the Board's power to the extent that it is not left to the Board to interpret the Act and to expend the money in such direction as it chooses within the provisions of the law. You want to take away the power the Board has now got, and to give the power to the central authority to make regulations and say, "You must expend the money in accordance with this."

8. Money could not be expended except in accordance with the appropriations of Parliament?—That is so.

9. Then the regulations must allow the Boards liberty to the same extent as the appropriations of Parliament do?—Yes.

10. Then the only thing is to make the matter clear as between the Audit Department and the Board. That is the intention. And the Audit Department wants to know too?—The words in the present Act, "as they think fit," have been deleted and been replaced by "as by regulation prescribed."

11. Clause 45 provides that a Committee shall cease to exist if for a period of three months it fails to hold a meeting. What do you mean by a Committee failing to carry out its duties?—We had a case in which this occurred: A Committee to whom we paid the schedule rate for incidental expenses that the Board had adopted considered that that amount was not sufficient, and as a protest, after requesting us to increase it, declined to carry out the duties appertaining to their position. They also declined to resign, but they closed the school. The Board authorized the teacher to reopen the school, and instructed the teacher to carry out the duties of the Committee in the meantime, in so far as providing the necessary fuel, charring, sanitary arrangements, and so on were concerned, and to generally maintain the school as if the Committee was in full control. The Board paid for these services out of the grant that would have been payable to the Committee. What we want to get at is, in the event of a Committee being provided with the payments prescribed and it refuses to conduct the affairs of the school, that the Board should resume control of that school, and that the Committee should automatically go out of existence.

12. Would it not be rather a serious thing to abolish a Committee unless the act by which it refuses to go on with its work was very clear and definite?—Yes. But this is an absolute case I am giving you.

13. Can you suggest any definite acts that should lead to the abolition of a Committee?—Its refusal to carry out the duties prescribed for it, conditional on its being provided with the funds prescribed by Act.

14. That is under subclause (2) of clause 47?—Yes. This Committee declined to do any of those things. We do not want to interfere with the rights of Committees at all, but to have the right to meet abnormal cases.

15. Were you present when the Otago evidence was given with regard to model schools?—Yes. We approve heartily of this. We understand that it is not intended that the payment shall come out of the general grant.

16. With respect to the transfer of teachers, what cases would the Board want to transfer that are not provided for in subclause (3) of clause 67?—Supposing the Board has a vacancy and it has a teacher in the same grade or a grade a little lower whom it considers suitable for this vacancy, and that teacher has not applied for a transfer, the Board could not appoint him without inviting other applications.

17. Could it not do it by ascertaining from him whether he desired a transfer, and doing it under paragraph (c)?—That puts the onus on the Board of ascertaining the teacher's desires.

18. The Board would have to know whether the teacher was willing to be transferred or not?—Would that do away with the provision that "in all cases the Board shall call for applications?"

19. If it is done under paragraph (c) would that not be an exception?—After the vacancy occurs you mean that the Board might ask the teacher whether he would like a transfer?

20. If the Board had a teacher in its eye it would not be entitled to find out whether that teacher desired a transfer or not?—That means a certain amount of delay, but I think it would be better to obviate any necessity for advertising.

21. Would not the Board have to find out in any case whether the teacher was willing to transfer?—Have they not power to notify the teacher that he would be transferred? I would suggest that the words "or in any other case where the Board may deem it advisable" should be inserted.

22. Appointments are made open to the Dominion so as to secure Dominion promotion. The Board might never make a position open to the rest of the Dominion at all?—Is that not met under the other provisions? The Department is going to modify the various Boards of the applications they have for transfer.

23. Only where the grade has fallen?—The contention of the Department is that it is more important that such teachers should be transferred than that the business of the Boards should be expedited.

24. How many hours a week do probationers teach?—Fifteen.

25. How many hours a week does a cadet in the Government service work?—I do not know. I presume they go on at 9 o'clock and work till 5 o'clock.

26. Supposing a youth is going to be a lawyer, what wages would he get while he was learning his trade?—I do not know.

27. Would he be paid more than 10s. a week when he enters?—I do not think he would.

28. Is not this rather an analogous case? You limit the duty of the probationer to fifteen hours a week, and you are teaching him all the rest of the time?—I do not think the cases are analogous, for this reason: In the case of the probationer he certainly has a certain amount of time in which he is studying, but he is going into a profession of which, before he enters, he knows the limitations. If he enters any other branch of the Public Service he is paid from the start. He knows the limitations, too, but they are not so great as in the teaching profession. It takes him longer to earn a reasonable salary than is the case in any other Government Department.

29. In other words, you think the prospects are better in the Government Departments than they are in the teaching profession?—Yes. A probationer must be not less than sixteen years of age, and he has very little chance of complying with the regulations and entering into the training college unless he has matriculated—no chance at all unless he has matriculated before his probationership has expired. That means that he is eighteen years of age before he is earning more than sufficient to pay for his food. Then he has to go for two years to the training college, where he earns £60 a year. He is therefore twenty years of age before he earns sufficient to pay for his board.

30. At the training college is he doing any work at all?—Yes; he is fitting himself for the profession he is entering upon.

31. Does he take the place of any other member of the staff?—No.

32. Does a probationer on the staff of a school?—No.

33. What has been your Board's practice with regard to relieving teachers?—Our practice has been to confine our payments for relieving teachers to the amount provided by the Department. We have not been paying for relieving teachers out of the General Fund. The effect of the new provision will be apparently that in the event of the headmaster leaving his school for any time at all—one day a week—the assistant can claim the head teacher's salary. We have not been in the habit of paying the assistant extra if he has been acting in place of the headmaster for only a limited time. If he was acting for, say, a month then we would anticipate that we would pay him; but for a limited period, such as a few days, we have not paid. We think there should be a limitation of at least one week before payment is made.

34. You would suggest putting in "for a period of not less than one week"?—Yes.

35. Are you aware that some of the Inspectors are now getting only a little over £300 a year?—Yes.

36. Would you raise them at once to £500 when taken over by the Department?—Our contention is that an Inspector should not be an inferior officer. The natural step is from the teacher to the Inspector, and provision is made whereby a teacher's salary may be £490.

37. Yes, but would you raise the salaries to £500 a year right away of those Inspectors who at present are only getting £300?—No. I do not think so.

38. Supposing you were told that that was only a temporary provision to meet these cases, would you be satisfied?—If we received a promise that this was not to be made the minimum for future Inspectors. In any case we contend that the fourth grade should be cut out.

39. You must provide for these people; you cannot put them out altogether?—The number is not large, and the increase would not be great to bring them all into Grade III. We think that Grade III for a Dominion scale of salaries is low enough to start an Inspector at.

40. *Mr. Sidey.*] With regard to the district bounds, you suggest the Blue Mountains or the Clutha River as being the boundary between the Otago and the Southland Districts. Do you suggest that the Clutha River should be the boundary all the way, or only one small part?—We do not press the boundary matter at all, but a more equitable division might take place than what is proposed.

41. Do you think that Balclutha could be more conveniently worked from Dunedin than from Invercargill?—I think Balclutha town could be.

42. Do you not think that the district as far as Waipahi might very well be worked from Dunedin?—I think that as far as Clinton is nearer to Invercargill. At any rate, the tongue of land that is proposed to be left in Otago, running up to Crookston and Heriot, lies naturally to Invercargill, and could be more economically worked from Invercargill.

43. Do you propose that the Clutha River right up should be made the boundary?—We would take it, but we do not press it.

44. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Would you tell me from the railway time-table how far Balclutha is from Dunedin and from Invercargill?—Fifty-three miles from Dunedin and eighty-six miles from Invercargill. That is by the present railway. I do not know how far it will be when the Tokonui Railway is through.

45. *Mr. McCallum.*] Can you name a single local body in Southland that favours amalgamation with Otago?—No.

46. Or an individual?—No.

47. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Including teachers?—Yes. Miss Birse knows that the Southland teachers do not want to be joined to Otago.

48. *Mr. McCallum.*] What is your secondary school?—Invercargill Boys' High School. Invercargill Girls' High School, Gore High School, and the Southland Technical College.

49. How are they managed?—They have separate Boards.

50. Are they affected by this Act?—The Gore High School is. The Southland Boys' and Girls' High Schools are constituted under another Act, and are endowed schools.

51. *Mr. Hanan.*] You made a remark that the Director might become an autocrat. Are you aware that he would be subject to Ministerial control?—Even so, he has an immense power. Any officer is subject to Ministerial control.

52. You do not think the Boards would have the same confidence in the advice to be tendered by centralized Inspectors?—We do not.

53. What do you base that on?—They will be departmental officers. Their first duty will be to their employer. If there should be a question arise as between the Board and the Department, the sympathy of the Inspector will not be with the Board in an effort to get an equitable settlement.

54. In what respects have you found a clash between the Board and the Department, and why do you think the centralized Inspector will act detrimentally to the Board's interests?—The question of the establishment of a new school might lead to friction. The question of the interpretation of a syllabus might do so.

55. Do you not think it desirable to secure uniformity in the interpretation of the syllabus and regulations?—I do not think that uniformity makes for efficiency at all times.

56. You do not desire uniformity of interpretation of the syllabus and regulations?—Not all over.

57. You want a Dominion scheme of grading?—I prefer it, although I am not particularly in love with it. I think a Dominion scheme of promotion would be advisable, but a Dominion scheme of grading would be dangerous.

58. You do not believe in it?—I do not know that I do. There is this further point I would like to mention: At present the tendency is for the Education Department to come into conflict with the policy of the Government in regard to its land-administration. The effort of Parliament is to induce people to leave the towns and go into the country. If the people then go out into the backblocks, is it not a fair thing that the Education Department should follow these people and give them as nearly as possible the privileges they are forfeiting by going out? We contend that in the proposals of the Bill the country settler is not helped. On the one hand the country is asking these men to go out and settle the backblocks, and on the other they are asking them to forfeit the education of their children. That should be a strong claim on statesmen to frame some measure which will give the people who are willing to sacrifice something in the interests of the Dominion some compensation from the education votes that will partially make up for the loss they sustain in going into the outskirts.

JOHN FISHER recalled.

59. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*]—I understand the Southland Technical School is under the control of the Southland Education Board?—I wish to put forward on behalf of the Southland Technical College Managers the following suggested amendments of and additions to clauses dealing with technical education:—

- (a.) Clause 2: Definitions.—Existing "technical day schools" should be included in the definition of a "secondary school." The definition in the Bill appears to include only technical high schools to be hereafter established under clause 84.
- (b.) After representation in clause 8, (f), (h), to read: "one member elected by teachers in secondary schools" and "one member elected by teachers in technical schools." The object of this change is to secure representation of technical teachers on the Council.
- (c.) Managers of secondary and technical schools should be represented on the Council of Education.

- (d.) The conditions for admission to a technical school should be as in subclause (2), clause 92, and not as set out in clause 93. The provisions of the Bill allow holders of Standard V certificates to enter a secondary school, but exclude them from a technical school. The holder of a Standard VI competency certificate should be admitted as a Free Place student to the domestic, agricultural, or trades courses in the technical school. Such students often show great ability in practical pursuits, though lacking in scholastic ability.
- (e.) Technical high schools should receive maintenance grants as defined, clause 95, subclause (2). At present there is no adequate provision for the maintenance and repair of technical buildings.
- (f.) Clause 108, subclause 3A : The controlling authority should have the power to appoint in any case three members and one-third of the total number of managers in excess of nine. This would reduce the representatives of Education Boards which might have too much power under the provisions of the Bill. One manager should be appointed by the parents of pupils of the technical high school and one by the parents of evening students under twenty-one years of age and students twenty-one years of age and over. Clause 108, subclause 8 : The powers of control and management of Boards and managers should be defined by the Act.
- (g.) Clause 111, subclause 1 : Maximum capitation should be 9d. as at present. All rates should be defined in a schedule attached to the Act and should be not less than those at present obtaining. Clause 111 : In technical high schools the payment should be based on the average attendance and not on the 800-hour basis. Capitation should be paid monthly on the basis of the earnings for the previous year, and adjusted at the end of the year. Under the Bill Boards are created and obligations placed upon them without provision being made for meeting the cost.
- (h.) All pupils applying for technical or continuation instruction should be admitted as Free Place students at evening classes so as to receive voluntarily what in some districts is imposed compulsorily (clause 120).
- (i.) Clause 55 : That the limits in respect of subsidies, voluntary contributions, and bequests should be increased. Under old Act there is no limitation.
- (j.) That the scale of capitation to technical high schools be so adjusted as to allow Boards of managers to pay salaries at least equal to those given in secondary schools.

60. *Mr. Hogben.*] What do you mean by an 800-hour basis ?—At present the capitation is based on the fact that a pupil must be in attendance 800 hours. If he attends 200 hours the Board receives one-fourth, if 400 hours the Board receives one-half, but if he attends 1,000 hours the Board receives nothing in excess of 800 hours.

61. What pupils are you referring to ?—I do not know that I can give an answer. I got the information from the Principal of the College.

62. If the technical schools became secondary schools they would have to teach Latin. You would be quite content provided they were compelled to take a general course—I only mention Latin as one subject ?—Pupils leave the primary school for the technical school, and it should be considered a secondary school. They go through an artisan course, and this would enable them to do that without reducing their status.

63. Show me any disadvantage they are placed at ?—No, I cannot. This probably is a point our Principal should have explained.

64. Holders of Fifth Standard certificates are not excluded from a technical school, are they ?—They are from a day technical school.

65. You know that if they enter a secondary school they have to pay ; they do not get a free place ?—Under clause 93 they are not allowed in technical schools even if they do pay. Subclause (2) of clause 92 says, "A secondary school may admit other pupils who have obtained certificates of competency in the subjects of Standard V or Standard VI of the public-school syllabus." Clause 93 says, "Pupils who are the holders of certificates of competency in the subjects of Standard VI of the public-school syllabus may be admitted to the secondary department of a district high school or to a technical high school on the payment of such fees as may be prescribed."

66. You know that subclause (2) of clause 92 is only left in from the former Act ?—Why not put it in this, too ?

67. You would stretch it as far as certificates of Standard V ?—For this reason : should it be necessary that a higher standard of efficiency should be made compulsory for a technical high school than for a secondary school.

68. They would continue that general education so as to get a certificate of Standard VI ?—In the majority of cases we find that they would be leaving school. The technical school gives a general instruction in arithmetic and English. We take evening pupils to qualify for Standard VI certificates.

69. Why do you want subclause (3) (a) of clause 108 altered ? How does that give too many representatives ?—In many cases the Education Board has not got very much to do with the establishment of a technical school or college—it has been largely due to the efforts of others ; but according to the provisions of the Bill the Education Board would always have the preponderating influence.

70. But would it ? Supposing there were fifteen Managers, how many would the Board have ?—Three out of the first nine, and half afterwards.

71. That would be six out of fifteen ; is that a preponderating influence ?—No.

72. They must be in a minority ?—That is so.

73. Can you give any instance where they would be in a majority?—Where they contribute the money they might. In our case our contribution was so overwhelming we could have swamped the Board.

74. If the Education Board provides the money, should it not control the school?—What is the use of a Technical School Board, then? It would become the Education Board, so why create a new Board? That is why we suggest that the Board's quota should be reduced to a third for Managers over nine in number.

FRIDAY, 7TH AUGUST, 1914.

CHARLES SMEATON, School-teacher, Dunedin, examined. (No. 26.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] Do you represent a group of teachers?—I am here, with Mr. Hunter, representing the male assistant teachers of Dunedin and suburbs. The male assistants of Dunedin and suburbs wish to express their appreciation and thanks to the Minister of Education for the very generous attempt he has made to improve the conditions of teaching in the Dominion of New Zealand. We consider that a very fair attempt indeed has been made to cope with the difficulties involved in the increased cost of living, and in many cases the allowances made to teachers generally have been quite generously provided. But there are several matters that we desire to direct attention to, and we have to repeat something that has been said very often better perhaps. We do not feel satisfied with the system of classification, and would be better pleased with a system of classification based on service and efficiency. We are prepared to acknowledge that there are difficulties in the way of such a system of classification, but at the same time we think it would be better that an attempt should be made to get over those difficulties rather than that the present system should be retained, a system based on the average attendance of schools. If the Department or the Minister cannot see their way to bring in the system of classification which we consider is an improvement, then I suggest that the schools be classified not on the basis of the average attendance but on the basis of the roll number. We will take one illustration. Supposing a school of 510 children on the roll, and the teachers are paid on an average attendance at that school of 460, the teachers would be teaching fifty children under circumstances of greater difficulty than the first 460 children; but, although the work of training that extra fifty children is necessary, the Department does not pay for that training. With regard to the work of the assistant male teachers, we consider that the first assistant has to do very responsible work in the school. Under the previous Bill the disability between the first assistant and the headmaster in the matter of salary was too great. We now find that the disability has been increased, and we cannot see that there is any sufficiently good reason for it. We may be told that the headmaster has the whole responsibility of the organization of the school. I maintain that there is not a first assistant in my experience who is not capable of attending to the organization of the school in which he is teaching, and the first assistants very often are of great assistance to the headmaster in the work of organization. The possession therefore of the power of organization by the headmaster, and the fact that he has the power to organize, are not taken by myself and my colleagues as evidence of great superiority on the part of the headmaster. The superiority of the position is undeniable, but not the superiority of the work. I am in favour of the salary of the second assistant being made to more nearly approach that of the first assistant, and the salary of the first assistant being made to more nearly approach that of the headmaster. The assistants do not think it is in the best interests of education that the number of lady teachers should vastly exceed the number of male teachers. They would not like to see the number of lady teachers now employed largely increased and the number of male teachers decreased. In the past the tendency has been to underestimate the importance of the work of the male assistants in the upper classes of our large schools. It is now being recognized by most students of education that the work of male assistants is most important in the framing of the character of our future men and women. Therefore what has existed in the past—namely, the great disparity in the salaries of the headmasters and male assistants—should not be taken as an indication that such should exist at the present time. It can be pointed out, by comparison with salaries paid to assistants in other Government Departments (Engineering, Justice, &c.), that assistant teachers are placed rather unfavourably. We are prepared to meet the argument that these men are highly qualified in their respective branches, but we confidently affirm that their course of study has certainly been no more arduous than has been that of fully qualified teachers. It may be said that these men are specialists, but we claim that teachers of long experience are also such. It takes long experience and very careful study of child-nature before a teacher can successfully analyse the nature and individuality of each pupil, and we hold that unless this is done very little impress is made on the child's character. There is always the danger of driving the children on mechanically and along channels unsuitable to their individual characteristics and mental ability. The moulding of the character is most important in the upper classes of the school. This process is most important to our national prosperity and integrity. It might be stated that 90 per cent. of the public servants come through the hands of the male assistants of the city schools, hence the necessity of having the very best teaching talent in these schools.

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] Supposing you spend the same amount of money in salaries as you spend now, and the general classification depended on the roll number and not on the average attendance, would it make any difference whether you took the average attendance, say, of forty-five or a roll number of fifty, the average attendance being 90 per cent. now?—I have not studied the question. I do not care to answer it.

3. Does it make any difference at all?—I am not prepared to answer the question.

4. *Mr. Hanan.*] What is the ratio as between man and woman?—I do not know what the position is at present. I am not formulating my own opinion on it, but I am stating the opinion of the assistant teachers generally, and they imagine, upon what grounds I do not know, that there will be a definite attempt to drive the males out of the service and increase the number of women teachers.

5. Is it not a fact that a number of women teachers leave before their period of training is completed?—I have not heard so.

6. Do you know what the proportion of males and females is in schools of one to fifteen?—No.

7. Do you know the maximum salaries in these schools?—No. I may say I have not read the Bill yet.

8. Have you read the report of the Education Department for 1912?—No.

9. You have not seen the figures given on pages 13 and 14?—If I have not read the report I have not read those pages.

10. I suggest that you read them?—What difference does it make? I told you I was giving you the opinions of men who fear there is going to be a greater proportion of females than males in the teaching profession in the future, and they hold that view with considerable apprehension.

ROBERT RUSSELL HUNTER, School-teacher, Dunedin, examined. (No. 27.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] You represent a body of teachers, I understand?—Yes. I am here on behalf of the male assistants of Dunedin and suburbs. I do not intend to waste your time by citing too many cases of injustice suffered under the new Bill, but only a few cases will suffice to convince you that the Bill, while benefiting many teachers, causes distress and honest dissatisfaction among other men who deserve well at your hands. The male assistants believe that it is the earnest wish of this Committee to mete out justice as far as it is humanly possible to do so, and also that you cannot satisfy everybody. Because of this faith in you we have been sent up to lay our claims before you, so that you may hear all sides of the question and judge and act accordingly. I shall now proceed to give you some cases where through mere luck teachers have been graded and paid a salary beyond their merits, while others of long and faithful and successful service have through ill fortune been practically disrated. A has nineteen years' service (D2); first assistant, Grade VII school, £290–310; was appointed seven or eight years ago to this position, when the school was built (salary, £180–£210). B has twenty-five years' service (C1); first assistant, Grade VI school; 481 average attendance (£260–£280). Inspectors' reports in this case are immeasurably above those of the first cited; in fact, they could hardly be surpassed. C has fourteen years' service (C1); first assistant, Grade VII school (£290–£310). This teacher was appointed three years ago to this position at a salary of £210–£240. His reports are good, but no better than B's, therefore why should he be treated better than B? D is second assistant, Grade VII school; twenty years' country service, total service thirty years; certificate, B1; reports excellent; salary, £230–£250. E is first assistant, Grade V school; service, eight years; entered service as an untrained teacher; C2 certificate; salary by new Bill, £230–£250. We fear that under the new Bill the merits of these gentlemen will not be considered on their length of service, but on the salary paid. In that case E receives unmerited favour in comparison with D. F has twelve years' service; B2 certificate; second assistant, Grade VI school; salary by the new Bill, £190–£220. Compare that once again with E, who has only eight years' service. G is fourth assistant, Grade VII school; appointed two months ago, and is six months out of the training college; present salary, £140–£170; salary under the new Bill, £190–£220; certificate, B4. You can imagine, gentlemen, that teachers with longer service who receive the same salary, or even less than G, feel that they have been disrated. Now I desire to deal with the roll number, and very shortly. If it is impossible—but we think it is not—to grade teachers by service and efficiency, then we would plead, for the sake of justice, that the schools be graded on the roll number. Is it any fault of a teacher that ten out of a hundred children absent themselves from school? What is the result of the absentees becoming backward in their work? Is it any ease or any relief to the teachers when these children stay away? We affirm that teachers are harassed by irregular attendance of certain children, therefore why should these teachers be still more harassed by the fact that for these children they receive no payment? As a matter of justice we recommend this to your earnest consideration. In the old scheme Grade IX school was from 451 to 600 average attendance. This being so, teachers in a school from 451 to 500 did not consider it necessary, when vacancies occurred in schools from 501 to 600, to apply for these positions, as the position and salary remained the same. This gave chances for much younger teachers to obtain these positions in schools from 501 to 600, and they now find themselves holding a higher and more lucrative position than many of their older and more experienced fellow-teachers. These gross injustices occur throughout the grades, but this is given as a sample case. We believe, from a study of the Bill, that an attempt has been made to drive assistants into the country, but it must be remembered that most of these assistants spent long years in the country before they came to the cities. We believe, and would respectfully suggest, that the positions of first and second assistants in our large schools should be held by men who have had long country experience, and whose families are at an age to require secondary, technical, and university education. Could not these positions—and there are not so many of them—be given a salary that would be a reward for long country experience, and that would encourage country teachers with families to accept these positions

so that their children could receive the benefit of city education? Now I wish to deal with the aspect presented by the raising of the first female teacher equal with the second male assistant in the larger schools. Certainly they are teachers of greater experience, but you wish to pay on work as well as on service, and as far as the responsibility of the mistress is concerned the headmaster must shoulder that responsibility. I have in my hand a sheaf of papers that a first or a second assistant must correct at night. This is a sheaf consisting of a week's work which I had in my school. I ask you how much of this kind of work has the mistress in a school to do?

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] You contend that D is badly treated as compared with E?—Yes.

3. What increase of salary does D get as regards the maximum?—£10.

4. Is not that the new one, £230 to £250?—Yes.

5. What was the old one?—£210 to £240.

6. £180 to £210, you mean?—No; in that school it was £210 to £240. It is just over the 600.

7. Is D necessarily fixed to that position?—Where is the opportunity to come from for him to receive promotion?

8. Supposing they considered him more fit than E, so long as they did not lower E's salary could they not transfer the two?—I am taking it that under the new Bill a gentleman of twenty years' service should receive a little more salary than a gentleman of eight years' service who had not been trained for the profession.

9. The Board has already considered them equal in giving them positions almost equal?—Not necessarily. D could have gone in for many country schools that are now placed high, but he had already gone through them.

10. Is it not an advantage to teachers to reduce the number of grades of schools to as few as possible?—Yes; but the putting-up of two-thirds of a grade and leaving the other third in the lower grade has caused great dissatisfaction and distress, because those teachers are practically disrated.

11. Have you ever tried to redistribute ten grades into seven?—I submit it is utterly impossible to do so justly and fairly. That is our reason for saying that our Inspectors should be given authority—and the Male Assistants' Association would be satisfied with that authority—to grade the teachers as they have found them.

12. Does not the Bill give power to grade the teachers under the Dominion system?—Yes, but what will those teachers be graded? Will they be graded 1, 2, 3? Will a man be a number, or will he be a teacher? We have four Inspectors in Otago, and they know each man and woman most intimately.

13. Would you object to their being graded on service, academic attainments, and efficiency, and promoted according to that grading?—No; but supposing it was found that G, who had been six months out of the training college, and who will receive £190 to £220, was receiving too much, could you take him down?

14. The salary of no teacher will be reduced. I am asking you to say whether all this would not be done away with by a Dominion system of grading and promotion?—Yes; but the fear is that you would grade a good deal on the salary a man would receive by the new Bill.

15. *Mr. Sidey.*] Do you suggest that the words "must be a woman" should be deleted from the Sixth Schedule with regard to one of the first two assistants in any school of Grades IV, V, VI, or VII?—Yes. The Male Assistants' Association strongly support that. The Institute, however, has passed a motion that the mistress of a school and the second male assistant should be on the same basis. I can give a reason for that motion being passed by the Institute. There is a great preponderance of female teachers over male teachers in the Institute.

16. If you are not going to have a system under which payment is based on efficiency and service, you wish it to be based on the roll number and not on the average attendance?—Yes. If we cannot have full justice at present we would like part justice.

17. *Mr. McCallum.*] Are these two teachers, E and G, who will be in better positions than F and D, particularly brilliant teachers?—E is a particularly hardworking teacher. Of G I know nothing; he is too young a teacher to have proved his ability or inability.

18. Have they not been favoured by the Board?—No. E was in charge of a two-teacher school, and he transferred for some reason with the first assistant of a Dunedin suburban school, which has since been raised a grade. When E was transferred to the suburban school as first assistant the position was £180-£210. Through a rise in average attendance the school rose a grade, and E's salary is now £210-£240. It is about eleven months since this exchange of positions took place. He is a particularly hardworking and earnest man, but there are plenty of other teachers in the same position who have not been so fortunate.

JOHN CONOLLY, Member of the Marlborough Education Board, examined. (No. 28.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] You have a statement to make, I understand?—I only want to say that I was asked to come here because I happened to be coming on other business connected with Blenheim. I have really nothing to say, except that I agree with the evidence already given by Mr. John Duncan with regard to economy, and of Mr. Sturrock, Inspector, as to what should be done with regard to teachers. I agree that there is nothing to be gained in the matter of economy by merging Marlborough into Nelson, or with regard to the teachers, because there is not a school in Nelson, excepting the College, of course, that has a roll number beyond what Marlborough has. The merging of Marlborough in Nelson would not assist the teachers at all. I fully agree with what Mr. Sturrock said, that the whole of the teachers of the Dominion should be practically in the Civil Service, and be graded by the Government and paid, of course, according to their grades and merits. I know nearly every bit of Marlborough, and I do not see how in the matter of economy there would be any saving by merging it in any other district.

ALFRED JOSEPH CHARLES HALL, Normal School, Auckland, examined. (No. 29.)

1. *The Acting-Chairman (Mr. Statham).*] Are you representing a body of teachers?—I am representing the Auckland Assistant Masters' Association. I have to convey messages from the association congratulating the Minister and the House on the Bill which has been introduced, and which is now under the consideration of the Committee. Under the Bill the increases given to male assistants are lower than those given to headmasters and first female assistants. The following table which we have prepared will be of value as showing the comparisons:—

<i>Salaries, Scale 1.</i>								
		Grade.	1908 Scale.	Bill.	Increase.	No.		
			£	£	Per Cent.			
First assistant masters:—								
321-400	Vc and D	240	250	4.1	(7)	
401-450	VIa	240	280	16.6	(5)	
451-500	VIb	270	280	3.7	(1)	
501-600	VIIa and B	270	310	14.8	(4)	
Over 600	VIIc, &c.	290	310	6.9	(19)	
Second assistant masters:—								
321-400	Vc and D	180	220	22.2		
401-450	VIa	180	220	22.2		
451-500	VIb	210	220	4.8		
501-600	VIIa and B	210	250	19.0		
Over 600	VIIc, &c.	240	250	4.1		
Headmasters:—								
321-400	Vc and D	340	360	5.8		
401-450	VIa	340	400	17.6		
451-500	VIb	370	400	8.1		
501-600	VIIa and B	370	440	18.9		
Over 600	VIIc, &c.	400	440	10.0		
First female assistant:—								
321-400	Vc and D	150	220	46.6		
401-450	VIa	150	220	46.6		
451-500	VIb	180	220	22.2		
501-600	VIIa and B	180	250	38.8		
Over 600	VIIc, &c.	210	250	19.0		

The increase provided under the Bill is not equal to the increase in the cost of living since 1908 (see report of the Cost of Living Commission). I was not able to obtain a copy of that increased cost, but I have here a letter from Dr. McIlwraith, who gives the increase in Australia at 30 per cent. Now, if the cost of living in New Zealand has been increased from 18 per cent. to 20 per cent., and the increase in salaries of the first assistant masters—the men who have the large families—was only 6.9 per cent., then I think we are not fairly treated, especially when the lady assistants, who have not families, are given 40.6 per cent. increase. We do not begrudge them the money. They earn every penny of it, but we earn a great deal more than we get—at least, we think so. More encouragement should be given to men to enter the profession by providing more liberal salaries. If you look at the graph which I hand in it will be seen that B, at the top, excludes pupil-teachers, students, and probationers. It deals with adult teachers only. Beginning with the year 1877, when the Education Act was first passed, we find that there were nearly 500 females and 650 males in the profession. That state of affairs continued until 1894. At that stage the females caught up to the males, and the increase went on until in 1912, the last available figures that we have, there were 1,550 males and 2,550 females in the profession. Graph A refers to adults, pupil-teachers, students in training since 1903, and probationers since 1909, when the probationer system was brought into vogue. Under this heading they started fairly well together in 1877. The women were about 150 behind the men, but in one year they had more than caught up on the men, and in 1912 there were 3,400 women and 1,775 men, almost double the number. Still further information regarding that is obtained from the confidential circular my association sent to members of Parliament: "That, it being essential that our teaching profession should be composed of both men and women, it is of national importance that the very best of our young men and women should be induced to enter the profession." At present this condition is not being fulfilled, as the following figures will indicate: In 1912 there were in training at the training colleges in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin 113 males and 285 females, while serving as pupil-teachers under the various Education Boards of the Dominion were 162 males and 476 females. That proves conclusively that we are not getting into the profession nearly enough men, and if the work is to be done properly, and if we are to cater for both sides, girls and boys alike, and if we are to avoid the feminizing of our boys, of which the American authorities speak so bitterly, we must do something to render the profession more attractive to men. I can quote here from a circular received some time ago that in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Omaha, West Virginia, and South Carolina male teachers average 5 per cent. of the total, and that in the case of sixty towns there are no men teachers at all. Similar conditions prevail in the majority of Canadian towns. A member of my association has just returned from Canada. He took a letter from the Auckland Education Board asking permission for him to inspect the schools of Canada, and he reports that in some of the schools in large towns of that Dominion there are no male teachers. The boys were all of an effeminate type and played no football, a little baseball, and no cricket; and the discipline in American schools, to say the least of it, was not always creditable.

2. *Mr. McCallum.*] What towns?—I cannot say, but I will supply it if you wish. To make the service more attractive to men we recognize we cannot do much under the present Bill under Schedule VI, but under Schedule VII we can do a very great deal. In dealing more particularly with the first-assistant masters I would say that the work and responsibilities of first assistants are greater than those of any other assistants. First assistants in many schools are men of long experience, up to twenty years. I have twenty-five years myself. They must be men of high efficiency and able to take the headmaster's place for an indefinite period. I am first assistant of the Auckland Normal School. I am in charge of that school for the whole of this year, and the two Inspectors who examined the school last month gave a highly satisfactory account of the state of the school. Discipline is a very strong feature in connection with the male-teacher administration of schools, and that is essential if we are to keep free from industrial turmoil in the years to come. If boys are made amenable to discipline when they are at school the effect of that will not be lost in time to come. If discipline is strongly enforced in school we shall have fewer strikes and less want of control in the streets at night. To a large extent this increasing tendency on the part of young men to give way to excess in the night-time is due to the fact that there is too much woman-managing between the ages of ten and fourteen. There are not enough male teachers to keep an eye on the boys and keep them under control. The boys get a slackness under women-control that it takes years to eradicate. At the best there are only two years that they are not under women-control and in which to overcome the discipline that has been lost. If there were a third-assistant male in schools that tendency would be done away with, and it would be much to the benefit of the State if that could be achieved. Nearly all of the first assistants are married men. There are very few who are not. I could give a list of the first assistants in Auckland, with the numbers of their families. The president of the Assistant Masters' Association, Mr. Woller, has four children. He came into town some years ago, and last year it cost him £70 a year for house-rent. That may seem a large sum, but I have here, culled from the *Auckland Herald* of the 1st August, the lists of four or five of the principal land agents of Auckland giving the house-rents of five- and six-roomed houses. There are not nearly enough avenues of promotion for these assistants, although they have proved themselves absolutely fit and worthy to occupy the position of headmasters. I have proved it myself this year. Mr. Warren and Mr. T. R. Jones, of Bayfield, have done the same. In spite of the fact that we are capable of taking these positions, men who are, as a rule, very little older than we are, and with very little longer experience, receive £180 a year more maximum salary, including house allowance, than we do, although we are to all intents and purposes their equals in most things. The first assistant must have organizing ability as well as teaching ability. We have had the control of schools. My record shows that—and I am taking myself as an illustration of many others—I am at least equal in teaching ability to 70 per cent. of the headmasters of Auckland, yet I have to stick to my maximum of £310, which I get, while the headmasters go up to £490. I think it is not fair at all. Then, again, it is often said that we assistant masters have not the responsibility the headmaster has. Granted. I have more responsibility this year than I had last, but I can do my work in five days, whilst last year, when I was in charge of a standard only, I had to work to 11 o'clock and after at night owing to the teaching of seventy pupils. Everything that is put in writing by the pupils must be corrected at home. Assistant masters are connected with all sorts of athletic organizations in regard to the schools, and have to attend meetings respecting them in the evenings, and must attend to the school-work after they come home, and it is often 11 or 12 o'clock when the school-work is completed. As acting-headmaster I have conducted the examination of the Normal School, which has five branches, and corrected all the papers except those in the secondary subjects, and with all that work I have not worked half the long hours I have worked before as assistant master. Compare that with a teacher who goes to a Grade III school under the Bill. He may be straight from the training college, as he sometimes is. He had an assistant, but his work is mere child's play compared with the work of an assistant in Auckland City. The work of a Grade IV (under the Bill Grade III) teacher cannot be compared with the work of an assistant in town, and yet the Grade IV teacher gets within £30, including house allowance, of the first assistant of the largest school. Most male assistants live in town, where living costs more than in the country, consequently they have often to take up coaching and night classes in order to make ends meet. I have had to do so. I am at present teaching in the Technical College at night, and most assistant teachers besiege Mr. George for that work. We do not expect to be able to get any alteration to Schedule VI of the Bill, but we would like to have a little consideration shown under Schedule VII in the matter of house allowance. The need for this is recognized even by the Institute. And you must remember that officers of the Institute are elected, and no man who is elected can afford to ignore the wishes of the majority of his constituents. The women teachers are largely in the majority in the Institute, and those who wish to retain their seats on the executive must support measures favoured by women. But the Institute conference, in spite of that, passed this resolution: "That the salaries provided for assistants are insufficient for married men." That was moved, I believe, by one of our one-time opponents favouring open competition, who has come to the conclusion that men are being eliminated so quickly that unless drastic action is taken there will be no men in the city schools. I have received the same information from Wellington teachers as I received from five of our own teachers in Auckland: "If you win our house-allowance scheme I will be married at Christmas."

3. *Mr. Poland.*] Have they consulted the girls?—Yes. The girls are getting £150 and £180, and they will not marry teachers unless larger salaries are given. We hear a lot about baby bonuses, but the best baby bonus the State could give would be to give house allowance to these town assistant teachers, who would marry right away. Men at present in the country districts are hesitating to go into schools in the towns because there is no house allowance. Twenty to

twenty-five per cent. of a teacher's salary in Auckland goes in house-rent. My headmaster is away touring Europe. I am first assistant of the school, and I have come here at the request of my association and, of course, with the consent of the Board. Under the proposed Bill I would have been faced with the question as to whom I should leave in charge of the school—a woman or a competent male assistant. I think you will agree that the best thing to do would be to leave the male assistant in charge. If the second male assistant is to take charge of a school in the absence of the headmaster and the first assistant, how can he claim to have authority over a lady when she is second assistant and he third? That is one very grave objection we have to clause (c). The Bill says "one of the first two assistants must be a woman." We think the wording of the Act should be followed—that one of the first three assistants must be a woman. If the second male assistants are made to rank below the first female assistant you are going to kill that for which a lot of money has been voted recently—I refer to physical instruction. The best form of physical instruction for boys is not arm-stretching, but football and athletic activities outside. This work is done almost entirely by the second assistants, and if they lose their status they will not in future have the same encouragement to take up those works. We work six days a week now and attend meetings at night, but that will not be done if the male assistants are pushed down a grade and the women promoted. I could give the names of three men in Auckland who have already gone out of the profession, and I know of five teachers and three students who are only waiting for the new Bill before they decide on their future course.

4. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you know what the average salary, excluding house allowance, of male teachers was in 1900?—£163 12s. 8d.

5. What was the average salary in 1912?—Of all schools £218 6s. 4d., and excluding schools with an average of under sixteen it was £226 11s. 5d.

6. That is an increase in the average salary of all male teachers of a little over 40 per cent., is it not?—Yes.

7. That would be a good deal more than the average increase in the cost of living?—Yes, we admit that. We are quite prepared to admit that you have done a very great deal for some grades of teachers, but it is the first male assistants, the men with the large families, who should have received consideration, and they have not received it. Headmasters have been treated more liberally than we have.

8. Do you know what the first male assistants got in 1900?—At Wellesley Street I believe he got £250, but I am open to correction on the point.

9. *Mr. Sidey.*] Do you agree that the Sixth Schedule should be amended?—I certainly do. Subclause (c) means that sole-teacher schools must be given to women.

Mr. Hogben: That should read "of Grade II or upwards."

Witness: I may tell you that has caused a great sensation in Auckland.

10. *Mr. Sidey.*] Is there any other amendment you could suggest to this Sixth Schedule?—The suggestion I was going to make in (d) was that at least one of the three assistants in any school must be a woman. Certain positions in schools should be allotted absolutely to men and other positions allotted absolutely to women, and definite salaries allotted to those positions.

11. Do you have a grading system in Auckland?—Yes.

12. Do you think it is practicable to have a similar system for the Dominion?—No. How could any one grade Mr. Blake and me if Mr. Blake is all the time under Wellington Inspectors and I am all the time under Auckland Inspectors? It could only be done by having a Dominion inspectorate—an inspectorate which is conversant with the teachers throughout the whole Dominion.

13. Then you think it would be essential to continue the education districts?—Most decidedly, but make them four or five in number at the very outside. Put good men on the inspectorial staffs by giving them £500 a year. If a man is not worth that put him into a school and promote a headmaster to the inspectorate.

14. Are you satisfied with the proposals of the Bill as to the appointment and promotion of teachers?—Absolutely.

15. Do you think it is in the interests of education in the present Auckland Education District that that district should be divided?—It should not be divided. It is totally wrong, because Waikato would be denuded of all its best teachers, who would flock into North Auckland, where all the plums are, and the Waikato would get those teachers who were not capable of holding the best appointments in Auckland City.

WEDNESDAY, 12TH AUGUST, 1914.

THOMAS MACGIBBON, M.L.C., examined. (No. 30.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—I appear on behalf of the Gore High School Board of Governors. I might mention that I was a member of the Southland Education Board for 21½ years, and ever since the initiation of the new system in Gore I have been a member of the High School Board there. I appear before the Committee solely on behalf of the Gore High School Board. The Board requested me to make representations to this Committee in regard to some of the clauses in the Bill, particularly with reference to the Tenth Schedule. They consider that the provisions there are hardly fair. The Bill proposes an equal sum of £100 allowance to all high schools. Well, high schools are variously supplied already with maintenance; some are endowed and some are not. Unfortunately for the Gore High School they are in the

position of not being endowed, and they, in common with other schools, will get only £100 a year. That seems to the Board an unfair division of the revenue, because there are fat Boards which have over the standard of £17 and up as high as £30 per pupil, and they get the £100 all the same.

2. *Mr. Hanan.*] Where is that?—Gisborne. That does not seem to us to be just, and we think the Boards should be placed on an equal footing. If one Board is well supplied they do not require to be given so much to keep them going. It looks as if it is giving to those who have and withholding from those who have not. We come within the £4 capitation given to the high schools where the amount of revenue is £17. That seems to be taken as the basis, and includes schools whose revenue amounts in some cases to as high as £25 and £30 per pupil, whilst the provision for unendowed schools is meagre and quite inadequate. The Gore High School has no endowments, and under the scale proposed is placed at a disadvantage as compared with others who have. To wit, Southland High School has very valuable endowments in the Town of Gore, which, when the leases fall in within the next few years, will be much more so owing to the increasing value of town property. The Gore High School will not profit by these increased values, although situated within the Town of Gore. These lands will let at a very much higher rate than they have, and, of course, that will materially increase the revenue to the Southland High School. It is rather unpleasant for the Gore people to see these endowments before their very eyes increasing in value and the revenue going to support another school, while we are left out in the cold without any increase in our revenue, and still have to spend considerably more in the way of salaries for the teachers. I would also point out that the Gore High School saves the Southland High School a very considerable amount of expense. Many of the pupils who are now attending the Gore High School would have to attend the Southland High School, and that would involve a considerable amount of expense to the Railway Department, because the pupils would be conveyed free by the railways if there was no school in Gore. The establishment of the Gore High School saves that expenditure, and therefore we think some consideration should be given to the unendowed schools. The whole of our revenue amounts to £2,036 3s. 4d., or about £13 13s. 3d. per pupil, and the sum proposed to be paid by the Department by way of salaries is at the rate of £12 10s. per pupil, or £1,862 altogether, leaving a balance of £174 3s. 4d. to pay all charges.

3. *Mr. Sidey.*] The Minister has agreed to strike out that clause 6 in the Bill?—Well, that might meet the grievance if it is liberal enough.

4. *The Chairman.*] It does meet the trouble?—I am very pleased to have that assurance. If that were not so it would leave a deficiency of £211 16s. 8d., and the Board of Governors wondered how they were going to carry on under those conditions. Then there is another point I wish to bring before the Committee, and that is the matter of house allowance. That is provided for in the Bill for primary-school teachers, and why should not a similar provision be made for secondary-school teachers?

5. *Mr. Hogben.*] I have already explained the matter to the representatives of the Gore High School Board, and they are now perfectly satisfied that they can finance the school?—I was not aware of that.

GEORGE JAMES ANDERSON examined. (No. 31.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You are a member of Parliament for Mataura?—Yes.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. I wish to speak in regard to the finance of the Gore High School. I have heard the explanation by Mr. Hogben, and I wish to make this point: that it is hardly fair to expect us to know of anything that is not in the Bill. We came here in all good faith with the evidence supplied to us by the Board, and we now find that it has been all explained. That cuts the whole of the ground from under our feet, and if the Board is satisfied, as Mr. Hogben says they are, they have not communicated with us, and we want to be sure that all the points before them are before the Committee. Of course you have assured us that that is so. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the reserves that were set apart in the various provincial districts by the early settlers and by the Governments that succeeded the early settlement conditions were intended for secondary education in the provincial district. They were not intended by the founders for any particular school. At the time these reserves were set apart there was no thought of more than the one school. It was never anticipated, I presume, by the Legislature that such would be the case; and the Legislature at various times has appropriated these secondary reserves to individual schools right throughout the colony—I am not referring to Southland more than anywhere else—and the consequence is that the secondary schools throughout New Zealand which have not been provided for are in a very disadvantageous financial position. I would urge, therefore, upon the Committee that when deliberating upon this matter they should take into consideration the question of whether a portion of the secondary reserves should not even now be appropriated to other schools in districts which are only now being developed. We have a number of places in the North Island where high schools will be required in a very short time, and I have no doubt that in time to come more high schools will be required in the Southland and Otago Districts. If you cannot see your way to apportion part of those reserves, then I would suggest that you place the new schools on quite as advantageous a footing financially as the present schools which have reserves. The only other way I see it can be done and ought to be done is by giving the unendowed schools a larger grant than the proposed £100.

3. That is covered?—Well, a larger grant should be given, or, better than that, you should give something in the way of town reserves. I have little faith in country reserves.

4. I would point out that the Bill does not touch the question of reserves in any shape or form?—I am basing my argument on the fact that you take into consideration the revenue that has been received from reserves. It has come very prominently before my notice, because in my electorate there is a University reserve, and this reserve is of a very inferior quality of land. At present it returns £40 per year to the revenue for University purposes, but if that land were put up to auction it would bring at least 15s. per acre. That money could be advantageously invested in suburban or town properties, or even if invested at interest it would bring more revenue, and the reserve would then be developed. Under the present conditions of tenure upon which it is held that reserve will never be developed. In Southland and Otago we are in the peculiar position that in 1904 an Act was passed which reserved to the University Council the revenue that was then being received from the University endowments in Otago and Southland, and at any time that the revenue fell short of the amount that was then being received the Consolidated Fund was to make up the difference. In connection with this one reserve, which is in my electorate, the University is at the present time receiving from the consolidated revenue every year equivalent to £200. I maintain there is no necessity for that, and that if that University endowment were sold so that it could be developed—because it will be of no use until it is developed—the State would benefit to the amount of £200 a year.

5. *Mr. J. C. Thomson.*] What is the length of the lease?—A fourteen-years lease. If my suggestion were adopted and that were done the State would benefit, education revenue would benefit, and it would be advantageous all round. The money could then be invested in town or suburban properties. As I am assured that the Gore High School Board is now satisfied in regard to the financial arrangements I will say no more about it. Having come here I thought I would mention the facts which have come under my notice as member for the district, which shows that education reserves of poor farming or grazing lands in the country are not being developed as they ought to be in the interests of the country.

6. *Mr. McCallum.*] Do you know of any secondary school in New Zealand that does not get assistance from the Government direct?—No, they get Government subsidies direct. They get £12 10s. per pupil, but that is not sufficient to carry on the work.

7. Are you not aware that Mr. Reeves in his day practically disendowed all those schools and put secondary schools on the same footing?—He may have done, but it is not so now.

8. Tell me how it is not?—£12 10s. per pupil is paid. I understand under this Bill £13 10s. is to be paid, and I understand the £100 is to be increased slightly. They have not had the £100 subsidy, but have had £12 10s. per pupil, and they have had less than £200 from the endowments, which we consider too poor to be included. That is all they get in our district.

9. Take the Marlborough High School, with an endowment of £400 a year, and Gore with nothing. Gore is a bigger town and, if you like, a more important town. Wherein are you worse off in not having a specific endowment as compared with being left to the tender mercies of the Act?—Because each school that is endowed gets a certain amount (no matter what the endowments may return) from the State. I think it is £6 a year under the Act, and they may be getting £24 in revenue from their reserves. That is why they are worse off. There is one school in the Dominion getting practically £30 per pupil.

10. Which school is that?—I understand it is Gisborne. That is my information.

Mr. Hogben: Gisborne's income from endowments last year, after spending money for buildings, was nil.

Witness: It is not so now, as I understand the reserves have been relet.

11. *Mr. Hanan.*] You spoke of the education reserves in Southland: do you advocate selling them?—Not the town properties, but all the inferior country properties I would dispose of and invest the money in town and suburban property.

12. Would you give the freehold of those to the tenants?—

The Chairman: I do not think it is right to refer to that question of freehold or leasehold in connection with this Education Bill. That has nothing to do with it.

Witness: I am prepared to answer the question.

The Chairman: I disallow the question.

Witness: I would sell the properties I referred to by public tender or public auction.

GEORGE LEIGHTON STEWART, Secretary, Wellington Education Board, made a statement and was examined. (No. 32.)

Witness: I desire to say that the following resolutions were passed at a meeting of the Wellington Education Board held to consider the provisions of the Education Bill:—

"1. The Board is of opinion that, while requiring consolidation and in some respects amendment, the existing laws relating to education are working satisfactorily, but that in respect to staffs and salaries a revision should be made this session.

"2. While the Bill possesses many excellent features it is inadvisable to pass, without allowing more time for careful and critical examination, a measure which proposes changes so many and so vital, and therefore it should not proceed this session.

"3. Council of Education: The Board disapproves of the proposed Council of Education, which would be likely to prove detrimental to what has always been a sound local-governing system under Boards and Committees. Should, however, the advisability of establishing such a body be finally affirmed, it urges that the Council should be of smaller numbers, as being more workable than the larger; that, as the people themselves are primarily and vitally concerned, their representatives, the Boards, should have a larger proportionate representation; that there should be a proportionately reduced number of officers of the Department and representatives

appointed by the Minister; that one man and one woman each should respectively represent men and women teachers primary, and one each secondary and technical school teachers; that attention be drawn to the absence of representatives of technical and secondary school managers and of Inspectors. Casual vacancies should be filled by the appointing bodies.

"4. District Councils: As a result of careful study of section 11 the Board is of opinion that the creation of District Councils is unnecessary, as the duties it is sought to impose on them can be performed with at least equal efficiency by existing administrative machinery, and at considerable saving in expense.

"5. Number of Boards (clause 13): (a.) The Board expresses approval of the proposed reduction in the number of Boards. (b.) The interests of the present Boards' staffs should be safeguarded.

"6. Urban school districts and municipal franchise: (a.) It disapproves of the creation of urban school districts as tending to reduce efficiency, and of the alternative and more costly system proposed of voting on the municipal franchise, seeing the present system is efficient, satisfactory, and inexpensive. (b.) The many duties imposed on voters in relation to the simultaneous election of Mayor, Councillors, Harbour Board, Hospital and Charitable Aid Board, School Committees, and Boards would certainly be less satisfactory than the present method. (c.) The Board draws attention to the powers of direct action in relation to secondary and technical education under clauses 84 (2) and 105 (2).

"7. Appointment of teachers; staffing and salaries: (a.) Clause 67 (3): While as a general policy approving of the proposal that an assistant in a school should not be appointed headmaster of that school, it appears to the Board that this clause in the Act would restrict the Board more than is advisable, and the same opinion is expressed regarding the advertisement of positions. (b.) Clause 67 (4): That an allowance be made to enable the Board to pay removal expenses of teachers transferred at the instance of the Board. In this connection attention is drawn to the practice obtaining in the Civil Service. (c.) That as nearly as possible the salaries of entrants to the teaching profession be brought into line with those of entrants to the Civil Service. (d.) Relieving-allowance: That the Board's relieving-allowance should be increased in order to enable it to deal adequately with the question of payment of relieving teachers' salaries. (e.) Model schools: Proposals are approved. (f.) Salaries of Inspectors: That in connection with the salaries of Inspectors the line of the Twelfth Schedule dealing with Assistant Inspectors be deleted, and that no Inspector should receive salary lower than that received by the headmaster of any school inspected. (g.) Termination of engagement (clause 78 (1)): It is suggested that the notice should be two months on either side.

"8. Inspection (clauses 127-133): (a.) Control of Inspectors: (i) Believing that the efficiency of public schools depends greatly on the intimate and local knowledge of the schools and their teachers acquired by the Inspectors appointed by the Boards, it considers the removal of the Inspectors from the control of the Boards and placing them under a central body would be most unwise. (ii) The inspection of schools, whether secondary or technical, can, it thinks, be advantageously and economically carried out by the present Education Boards. (b.) Registered schools (clause 129 (3)): The Board is of opinion that registration of schools should be compulsory, but that no school should be classed as efficient which does not comply with reasonable requirements in regard to class-room and sanitary accommodation and to playground area.

"9. Technical schools; controlling authorities: It is suggested that the relation of controlling authorities and technical Managers should be defined by statute."

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] In clause 6 (c) of the memorandum you have read. "The Board draws attention to the powers of direct action in relation to secondary and technical education." Does not clause 84 of the Bill require the advice of the Council?—Yes, I think it does, but it empowers a Committee of the education district to submit such a proposal without any consultation with the Board of the district.

2. It makes the proposal to the Minister, to be brought before the Council?—Yes.

3. You know the cases where there is overlapping—say, the Christchurch West District High School—when there are at the same time five other places at which secondary education can be got in Christchurch? Do you know that that was done on the application of the Board?—No, I was not aware of that.

4. Do you think it is likely that the Board would apply for any change in regard to that school? Though there may be overlapping, might not overlapping go on till the end of time?—Of course, my Board was considering the circumstances of this district in this matter. It considers that any change in relation to the schools within the district should have the approval of the Board before going on.

5. Do you think that the North Canterbury Board would approve of the disestablishment of a school, if it was necessary, for the establishment of which it had applied?—I can hardly answer for the North Canterbury Board.

6. The matter has got to come before the Council, has it not?—That is so.

7. With regard to technical education, clause 105 (2) is referred to, I think: "Any controlling authority and any urban School Committee," &c. You know what the present Act does in regard to that—the establishment of technical schools?—The suggestion of my Board is that while it is the controlling authority in relation to technical education all proposals in connection with technical education should be presented to the Board first.

8. Is that the case now under section 179 (1), paragraph (c), of the Act?—Yes, that is so.

9. The Bill limits the power of the local Committee, because it only gives the power to urban school districts, whereas every School Committee has it now: is not that the case?—Yes, that is so.

10. The Board wants to limit it still further: is that so?—Why should not the Committee make its proposal through the Board of the district?

11. Coming again to the North Canterbury District, are you aware that the establishment of technical schools in Christchurch would have been postponed several years if it had been left to the Board? Are you aware that the Board there in 1901 wanted to have nothing to do with technical education?—I do not think that could apply to the Wellington Board.

12. Are you aware of the fact?—No, I was not aware of it.

13. Do you think that would make a difference to the opinion of the Board?—Possibly it might.

14. Would it meet the case of your Board if in each of these instances—secondary and technical education—there was a proviso that the Education Board must be consulted?—Yes, I think it would.

15. With regard to section 7 of the Board's resolutions, dealing with clause 67 (3), is there anything to prevent the Board from appointing an assistant teacher as head teacher?—The Board so read that proviso at the top of page 28 of the Bill—"Provided further that no appointment of an assistant teacher to the position of head teacher in the same school shall be made under this subsection."

16. But does not that subsection relate entirely to transfer?—Truly, it does.

17. So it merely means that an appointment cannot be made by transfer; the Board must throw it open?—That is the case. It is not proposed to limit the right of the Board in regard to advertised positions.

18. Does it limit it?—No, that does not.

19. Section 7 (g) of your statement—"Termination of engagement"—clause 78 (1) of the Bill: does the Bill make any alteration in the law as it is at present?—No, but the Board suggests that the present law is not easily workable, in this way: a teacher may leave after a month's notice, but it very seldom happens that it can have his successor to enter on the duties within a month. That means a constant succession or a large number of temporary appointments. If the longer time, two months—or, what would equally satisfy my Board, three months—notice from either side might be required, that would permit of the appointee to a vacancy following immediately after the outgoing teacher, and would so reduce administrative cost and promote efficiency.

20. You say in section 8 of the Board's resolutions, "The inspection of schools, whether secondary or technical, can, the Board thinks, be advantageously and economically carried out by the present Education Boards." Have all the Education Boards Inspectors who are qualified to inspect secondary schools?—I am not aware whether they have, nor am I intimately enough acquainted with the qualifications of the present Inspectors in all the districts to express an opinion regarding all. The idea of my Board, however, is that, as under the Bill the education districts would be much larger, the inspectorate of the larger districts would be so strengthened as to enable such additional work to be efficiently undertaken. This evidently was the idea of the Commission of 1912, which recommended that secondary or technical schools should be placed under the control of the Boards. Looking at our district, we have established during the last ten years a district-high-school system which our Inspectors have inspected and developed with the sanction of the Board and of the Department.

21. Is the work of district high schools as high, in certain directions, as that of secondary schools?—Of course, it does not proceed so far. Your questions in regard to expert knowledge could perhaps with greater satisfaction be addressed to our Chief Inspector, who is present.

22. *Mr. Sidey.* Your Board disapproves of the creation of urban school districts: is that so?—Yes.

23. What is the chief reason why the Board disapproves?—We do not think that the various schools would get the keen personal attention that we know they at present receive from the Committees as they exist now. That is, a large school is managed by a Committee of nine members. We know that these members are elected by the parents, because they have a keen interest in the school. We have excellent Committees; they exert themselves to advance the interests of the school. Under the proposal in the Bill, if an urban area were created, instead of having seventeen Committees each containing seven to nine members and each watching the interests of the individual school, we should have one Committee which could not have to any school the personal relation and the personal interest which exist at present.

24. Have you considered the desirability of the introduction in an urban district of schools which would, for example, include only pupils of, say, the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—The Board has not considered that.

25. Might it not be an advantage to have a central school dealing only with the higher standards?—Quite possibly it might. That is a matter which we have not considered as a Board.

26. If it were considered desirable to do that, would it not then be necessary to combine some of the present school districts together? Would it not be necessary to unite some of the districts to carry out such a scheme?—Could not the Committee of the district in which the school is established manage the school? The Act does not restrict the area from which the pupils may be drawn; they may come from anywhere.

27. Would it not be necessary for adjoining school districts to unite if a central school were established which would take the higher standards?—I do not see that it would be necessary. We had in Wellington City some years ago two district high schools. It was unnecessary in the case of these to alter the school districts. The pupils came from all directions, from many different districts. That fact did not cause any trouble. In relation to the question of the union of districts, perhaps you are aware that many years ago the combined Committee district was tried in Dunedin and was abandoned.

28. I quite understand the advantage, from the point of view of preserving the local interest in the schools, of each school having its Committee; but I am asking you whether, if an alteration

were suggested in the interests of the children of having a central school, that would not necessarily mean that the various districts from which the children were drawn would have to be united?—I do not see that it would be necessary. I think that my Board could confer quite well with the Committee of the district in relation to that as well as to other matters, and if it were deemed desirable to do that it could be done.

29. You think it could be done, leaving the school districts as they are?—I do.

30. You give that, at any rate, as your own opinion—that there is no necessity for the union of districts in order to have a central school?—I do not see that there is.

31. Your Board is aware that the power to form urban school districts is one which rests in the hands of the Committees?—Yes.

32. That is not an obligatory thing at all?—That is so; —

33. You think they should not have the power even if they wished?—We think that it would be a retrograde step; that it would prejudicially affect the schools. We know that our Committees are good Committees.

34. You object to the majority of the Committees having power to do that?—The Board does, yes. I may say also that the question of franchise comes in. My Board is satisfied that in the householder it has a man who is keenly interested in the school, and that by widening the franchise you introduce a class of voter who has only an incidental interest in the school.

35. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Do I understand that in spite of what you say in your memorandum, paragraph (g) of section 7, you have no wish to curtail the three months' notice of termination of engagement to which a teacher is at present entitled?—The Board has no objection to that.

36. *Mr. McCallum.*] You say that the present system of election of School Committees is satisfactory. Does your Board work harmoniously with all the Committees?—Very.

37. You have no trouble at all?—We have not had any serious trouble in the ten years since I came here. In relation to interest in the schools, if I may make a remark concerning this year's election of members of the Education Board, I should like to mention that we had yesterday at the count of votes 106 votes cast out of 111 voters—106 recorded votes out of 111 in the City Ward, the ward that would be affected. That is an extraordinary record.

38. It was a keenly contested election?—It was contested; but in previous years I find that we have had from 83 per cent. to 93 per cent. recorded, and always more than the lower figure in the city.

39. I have a grievance against your Board. Under Mr. Lee it refused to allow any Bible-teaching in schools?—I do not think that is quite correct.

40. Is your Board still of the same opinion?—We have not blocked the Nelson system.

41. But you refused to allow it?—We refused to allow Bible-teaching within the recognized school hours. That is the point that was decided.

42. You refused to allow half an hour at the beginning of a day to be given up to Bible-teaching?—No. The Board refused to recognize the first half-hour of the school day as the time when Bible-reading should be given.

43. Within the school hours?—Yes.

44. Quite right, too; but that is not the point?—The Board refused that.

45. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Would it be this: that the Board refused to surrender the first half-hour outside the school hours?—No. Speaking from memory, the Board was asked to reduce the hours and refused.

46. *The Chairman.*] Your Board considers it unwise that there should be centralization of Inspectors?—Yes.

47. Do you think that full provision is made in clause 127 by which the Inspectors would take just as much interest in their districts as they do now?—We do not think so. We have considered it very carefully.

48. Subclause (2) of clause 127 says "there shall be resident in each education district one Senior Inspector and such other Inspectors as the Minister shall direct"; and subclause (3) makes provision for the saving of the existing appointment?—We think it will involve a change undoubtedly. We regard the relationship of the Inspector to the Board as a very delicate and personal matter. That relationship would in a sense come to an end if the Inspector ceased to be a member of the Board staff. The Inspector would come in as an officer of the Department and not as an officer of the Board. The Chief Inspector attends our Board meeting and advises the Board on many matters relating to staffing, school-building, and administration generally.

49. Is there anything in this Bill which would still prevent that being carried out?—If one looks at the general question I think it will be seen that the relation could not remain as it now is. For instance, in one respect the Board would cease to have the right of direction of Inspectors.

50. Surely not?—If the Inspectors are Inspectors of the Department the Board has no right of direction.

51. Well, is there anything in the Bill that would prevent that? Would not the Inspectors be practically handed over to the Board by the central Department?—If that is the case what is the purpose in centralizing?

52. Because would it not then be possible sometimes to change an Inspector from one district to another if considered advisable?—I suppose it would, but in that case we should not have the same continuity of policy or quite the same fullness of knowledge of individual schools or individual teachers continuing from year to year. The Board could not make any allowance in cases where in former inspections it has known absolutely all the circumstances contributing to perhaps a lower average condition in the schools. The reports of the Inspectors would be mere official reports and in writing.

53. I do not think there is anything in the Bill which would prevent an Inspector occupying the same position?—There is in the absolute relationship. That is firmly the opinion of our Board.

54. Would it not be in the interests of the whole of the Dominion that the teachers should have a wider knowledge of the whole of the teaching profession, and that they would gain this by a centralized inspectorate?—I understood it was proposed that Inspectors should live in definite areas.

55. That is so?—And that therefore they would be confined to those areas, and would have less opportunities of intercommunication than they have at the present time.

56. The Bill does not say that?—No, the Bill does not say that.

57. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to clause 8 of your memorandum in regard to registered schools, have you looked at subclause (3) of clause 129, the definition of "efficient"?—Yes.

58. Does not that cover what you have said?—Well, I suppose really it does. Premises would include the playground and sanitary accommodation. My Board is aware of certain private schools where there may be sufficient class-room accommodation and not sufficient playground accommodation.

59. But is not that covered by that subclause?—Yes, it seems to be, but what the Board wants to emphasize is compulsory registration.

THOMAS REED FLEMING further examined. (No. 33.)

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to inspection, do you think there should be secondary Inspectors associated with every Education Board?—The Boards have an idea that all schools in the district, both secondary and technical, should come under a Board, and then the inspectorate would be strengthened to meet any inspection in such schools.

2. How many Inspectors would be required to inspect an ordinary secondary school in all subjects—I mean in regard to their different kinds of work?—I think you would require about three—at least, three generally to take languages, mathematics, and science. Perhaps two might do it.

3. And do you think we could afford something between eighteen and twenty-seven Inspectors devoting themselves to that?—I do not think it means that, not at all. You took one of our headmasters and made him a secondary Inspector.

4. And how many years did he practically go to all the large schools in company with the Senior Inspector of secondary schools?—That is a matter you know of yourself.

5. I want to ask you about the possibility of such a thing. Should the Education Boards have eighteen or twenty-seven men selected who were capable of inspecting secondary schools?—I do not quite see there is the possibility of such a position. Take our Board: we have only two secondary schools in this district, Wellington College and the Girls' High School, besides the technical schools, and they can surely be inspected by the inspectorial staff of the Board. Our Board has four Inspectors.

6. Have you Inspectors to examine in higher mathematics?—Yes, we have one who could do that.

7. Do you think that every district should be bound to appoint one man who can examine, say, in that subject for the higher leaving certificate which we are bound to give now?—I might say that all the Inspectors under our Board have got higher certificates, and if every Board could get a similar staff they could do the work. There should be special provision for art.

8. You think that from eighteen to twenty-seven Inspectors in New Zealand should be appointed, one of the reasons in their appointment being that they should be capable of examining the higher work in secondary schools?—Do you mean for the whole Dominion?

9. There are nine districts under the Bill, and you would require eighteen or twenty-seven who would be capable of doing that work?—Yes.

10. Are there eighteen or twenty-seven at present?—You are asking me to comment on the Inspectors. I do not think that with nine Education Boards twenty-seven would be necessary. I think the nine Boards could eventually get eighteen men to do that work.

11. Amongst their present Inspectors?—I will not answer for the junior Inspectors in smaller districts.

12. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I understand you are speaking with a close knowledge of your own education district. Are you quite satisfied that the Inspectors at present employed by the Board could carry out the inspection of the secondary schools in the district?—I have done the work myself. Most of the work of the districts will be primary. We are not interfering with the Department's inspection of secondary schools as arranged at present.

13. Are you of opinion that if the whole of the inspection were left to the Board's officers that they could carry out the inspection of all the schools, including the secondary and technical?—I think *Mr. Hogben* will understand me when I say that probably in time there would need to be a slight adjustment of appointments to the inspectorate to meet that view. The appointments at present do not meet that view, and there is no doubt something in what *Mr. Hogben* has said about it.

14. Do you think the Boards, in making future appointments, could make them to meet that view?—Yes, I think so, to some extent.

15. You say there are only two purely secondary schools in Wellington?—Yes.

16. Do you know the Inspectors of other districts?—Yes, some of them.

17. Are not the Inspectors of the larger Boards well qualified to inspect secondary schools?—Yes.

18. *Mr. McCallum.*] Is this a very big matter of all Boards providing Inspectors of sufficient capacity to examine high schools—would there be any great saving in it?—No, I do not think there would be under the present arrangement.

19. Will there be any substantial gain from an educational standpoint?—Economically I do not think there would be very much difference, but educationally I think each Board could manage the institutions in its district.

20. But you would not suggest that the Inspector of Marlborough should be allowed to inspect the secondary school there?—But we are assuming that Marlborough is likely to be obliterated.

21. Well, take Nelson, with Marlborough included?—Yes, I think a large Board like that could arrange it.

22. It would be a matter of chance if they had the Inspectors?—Yes, under present arrangements.

23. Not every Inspector could?—No.

24. You are aware, too, that the principals of our high schools resent very much being inspected by Board Inspectors?—Yes, but in this request of the Board you have to look at future arrangements. If this is done we can make an adjustment afterwards. If this position were arrived at then the Inspector who was appointed would be able to do it. *

25. *Mr. Sidey.*] Are you in favour of Education Boards taking over the control of secondary schools altogether?—Yes, I am in favour of that. I would like to say that my own opinion is that the Boards could do it, but at the same time I think, without centralizing the Inspectors, the Department should have a little control, and, say, by consultation with the Boards have some say in the appointment. That would meet the adverse views held at the present time. The Department is trying to get the Boards to work more in touch with themselves. There I think the Department is right, but the method of doing it means that you are taking so much away from the Boards. I should like to support Mr. Stewart in what he said, and I feel certain that if I as Senior Inspector came into the Board meeting as an officer of the Department that relationship between the Board and myself would not be the same. I have had over twenty years' experience as an Inspector, and I attend the Board meetings. I know the members would not listen so much to my advice if I were an officer under any Department as if I were an officer of the Board. I think also that the Department's view is fairly right, too. The Department should be a little more in touch with the work of Inspectors in our district than they are at present. I believe that can be done without centralizing the Inspectors. If the Department had a say in the appointment by means of consultation, and all the Inspectors' reports were forwarded straight to the Department without centralizing the Inspectors, that would give the Board an interest in the appointment which would meet the case. That is my own opinion.

WILLIAM ALLEN examined. (No. 34.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A member of the Wellington Education Board.

2. Have you anything to say to the Committee in regard to the Education Bill?—Yes. Clause 2 of our statement reads, "While the Bill possesses many excellent features it is not desirable to pass, without allowing more time for careful and critical examination, a measure which proposes changes so many and so vital, and therefore it should not proceed this session." I should like to emphasize that particular clause. This Bill has come upon us as rather a surprise, although we have been in a way expecting it. It has given us very little time for consideration, and as there are such vital points I do not think it should be proceeded with this session, and I am voicing very largely the opinion of our Board. To be a valuable Bill it ought to be popular, and the people ought to have some idea of what is going to be done. As it is the Committees have had nothing to say yet in regard to the various proposals, and without the Committees you are going to strike a very serious blow at education in New Zealand.

3. *Mr. Sidey.*] What have you to say in regard to that portion of the Bill dealing with increases in salaries?—I have nothing to say in regard to that. I approve of all you have done in the way of helping the teachers.

4. You only refer to the general alterations in the method of government?—Yes.

5. *Mr. McCallum.*] How many of the nine members of your Board take an intelligent interest in the working of the Education Act in Wellington?—100 per cent. The whole of them are qualified to administer the affairs, even myself.

6. *The Chairman.*] Do you not think that those interested in educational matters have already had before them the report of the Education Commission of 1912 and the report of the Education Committee of the House of last session, and could see the drift of the educational tendency?—I have no doubt a very large number have—those who are in official touch with the Department—but they are only a very small proportion of the people.

7. I say "those interested in educational matters": did they not have an opportunity of seeing the drift of proposed legislation?—Only those people to whom I refer—those who are in official touch with the Department, such as the School Committees, Education Boards, &c. The general public had no knowledge of it to speak of.

8. Does the general public take an intelligent interest in this matter?—Had you been here at the last election of School Committees and been at the Willis Street schoolroom, where there were about three hundred and fifty to four hundred householders at the election, you would have been convinced that the people do take an interest in such matters. That meeting lasted till about a quarter past 12 o'clock.

9. *Mr. McCallum.*] Perhaps they were fighting about some local matter?—No.

10. *The Chairman.*] I merely wanted to know whether you think that those who are interested in the general education question have not had ample opportunity for finding out the drift in the past?—I do not think they have.

FREDERICK MARTYN RENNER, M.A., Senior English Master, Wellington College, and Hon. Secretary New Zealand Secondary Schools Assistants' Association, made a statement and was examined. (No. 35.)

Witness: I have here a statement which the executive of the New Zealand Secondary Schools Assistants' Association have prepared, and I will read it. It is as follows: The executive of the New Zealand Secondary Schools Assistants' Association begs to bring under the notice of the Education Committee and of members of Parliament the views and opinions of this association on the proposed Education Bill of 1914. While we admit that the Bill will be of some advantage to the male assistants of the smaller secondary schools, and to many of the female assistants in secondary schools for girls, we regret that no Dominion scale of salaries has been introduced. We regret still more that our association's salary scheme was not adopted by the Minister of Education. How necessary for us secondary teachers a Dominion scale is may be briefly illustrated as follows: (a.) Without a Dominion scale the secondary teacher has before him or her no definite promotion ladder. (b.) Even with £200 or £150 as the minimum salary for appointment, no inducement is under the present system offered to men and women to remain in the service. Again and again we have before us cases of men who find the chance of rising upwards so slight that they seek some other profession. We venture to say that fully three-quarters of the secondary-school teachers, particularly men with families, are forced to supplement their meagre incomes by taking outside work after school hours. Teachers claim to be professional men and women, but even senior teachers are paid salaries that are absurd remuneration for services rendered and ridiculous as professional remuneration, and yet we have heard it said that it is worth while paying almost any price for a good education. In secondary schools a young teacher (male) is usually appointed at £200 per annum. He can rise (if he remains) to £330 or perhaps to £350 at the outside, but in how many years? There are senior assistants with the highest qualifications who have taken twenty-five, thirty-three, and thirty-eight years to advance from £200 to £330. Contrast this with what obtains in primary schools. There a junior teacher commences at £100; by the new Bill he may possibly rise to £310 in a definite number of years. He more than trebles his initial salary, and reaches this maximum by definite annual increments within a stated time. We secondary teachers with a four-years university training behind us start later, rise by haphazard increases of now £5, now £10, with no definite promotion ladder before us, and when we reach the "sere and yellow leaf" have gained an average increment of £3 or £4 per year. Even then we do not get £330 or £350. We, say, have £20 towards superannuation, and, in addition, income-tax too. (c.) Again, there are some twenty-two secondary schools in New Zealand, and there are some 240 graduated assistants. What chance has a senior assistant of obtaining the position of principal even supposing the principal is chosen from among the 240? The cure for these unsatisfactory conditions above enumerated would be a Dominion scale. Such a scale as we advocated in our scheme would have meant an increased expenditure of £17,000 on secondary education—a little enough price to pay. Failing the introduction of that scheme, which we still hope will be considered—failing the introduction of a Dominion scale, then we would respectfully ask that the general average salary to be paid to male assistants—viz., £250—be raised to at least £300, and the general average of £175 in the case of female assistants be raised to at least £200. A comparison of what the cost would be (1) on the basis of £250 for males and £175 for females, (2) on the basis of £300 for males and £200 for females, is appended: Male assistants, 173; female assistants, 126. Under (1), total cost £66,300; under (2), total cost £77,100; increase, £10,800. This increase is only some £4,100 more than the estimated increase under the proposed Act, which is given as £6,677. We would, however, point out that even this increase—viz., £10,800—would hardly suffice to pay us on a professional basis. If it is not intended that we are to be classed as professional men and women then no more need be said.

There is a second way of looking at the cost of the respective schemes: (1.) In 1911 there were 4,021 free-place pupils, involving a total expenditure of £43,630: in other words, the cost to the Government per head was £10 17s. (2.) In 1914 there would be, say, 4,800 free-place pupils. If the proposed Bill were in operation the total expenditure would be £66,300. The cost to the Government per head would be £13 16s. (Note.—This amount of £66,300 will include the sum of £50,199 for 1912, the normal increase for the years 1913 and 1914, and the contemplated extra expenditure of £6,677.) (3.) In 1915 there would be, say, 5,200 free-place pupils. If our scheme were adopted—viz., £300 for males and £200 for females—it would cost £77,000. The cost to the Government per head would be £14 10s. I desire to mention, parenthetically, that Mr. Mahan, of the Auckland Grammar School, in giving evidence before the Education Commission, emphasized the fact that English experts declared in their reports that secondary-school education could not be adequately given unless the Government were prepared to spend £15 per head.

In any case we fail to see how the scale of payments in Schedule X will prove adequate enough for certain schools to pay salaries provided by the Bill. For example, a certain school, A, is in this position: Boys on roll as at 1st March, 1914, 454; salaries to be paid according to Bill, £5,675; salaries (total) as now paid, £5,275; increase in salaries demanded by Bill, £400. But the increase in grant yields only £385 from 385 free-place pupils at £1 per head. The Board must therefore find £15.

Another school (girls'), B, is in this position: Number on roll as at 1st March, 1914, 327; salaries to be paid according to Bill, £4,087 10s.; salaries (total) now paid, £3,170; increase in salaries demanded by Bill, £917 10s. Increase of grant yields £270 from 270 free-place pupils at £1 per head. The Board must find £647 10s.

In a third school, C, which is one of the smaller secondary schools, the improvement is to this effect: £200 divided among nine teachers.

In a fourth school, D, it is estimated that £1,600 will have to be spent where under the new Act only £700 is provided.

In the fifth school, F (girls'), which is practically unendowed, the capitation grant will be £13 10s. The number on the roll is 300, of which about 5 per cent. are paying pupils. If £12 10s. per head is to be paid in salaries it will leave about £1 per head for general expenses, including the interest on money raised some time back to put up new buildings. The margin, £1 per head, is clearly insufficient. Again, there are four mistresses who receive salaries below £150; by the time these are raised what chance have the senior teachers of having their salaries improved?

It seems to us that special grants must be made directly to such schools, or the capitation grant must be raised to an amount greater than it is at present. If the latter course is adopted—and we earnestly hope it will—let the capitation be raised not merely to cover the extra sums needed by separate schools such as A, B, C, &c., but raised sufficiently to provide at least the additional amount, £4,100. This sum would be adequately provided by the following alterations in Schedule X: Subsection (b), change “one-fourth” to “one-half”; subsection (c), change “£6” to “£8”; subsection (d), change “£9” to “£11.” And again—Subsection (iii), change “£250” to “£300”; subsection (iv), change “£175” to “£200”; subsection (vi), change “£12 10s.” to “£14 10s.”

We now append by way of illustration and comparison a total which gives clearly the conditions that will obtain when the proposed Bill is in force, and the conditions that would obtain were our proposals adopted:—

Net Annual Income from Endowments.	According to Bill.		Our Proposal.	
	Grant.	Total Funds available per Pupil.	Grant.	Total Funds available per Pupil.
£	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
17	4 0	21 0	4 0	21 0
16	4 5	20 5	4 10	20 10
15	4 10	19 10	5 0	20 0
14	4 15	18 5	5 10	19 10
13	5 0	18 0	6 0	19 0
12	5 5	17 5	6 10	18 10
11	5 10	16 10	7 0	18 0
10	5 15	15 15	7 10	17 10
9	6 0	15 0	8 0	17 0
8	6 15	14 15	8 15	16 15
7	7 10	14 10	9 10	16 10
6	8 5	14 5	10 5	16 5
5	9 0	14 0	11 0	16 0
4	9 18	13 18	11 18	15 18
3	10 16	13 16	12 16	15 16
2	11 14	13 14	13 14	15 14
1	12 12	13 12	14 12	15 12
0	13 10	13 10	15 10	15 10

The executive regrets that the question of superannuation is not dealt with in the proposed Bill. Teachers in both primary and secondary schools are in a position which compares most unfavourably with men and women in the Government service. Teachers count their retiring-allowance on the last three years of service; Civil servants count theirs on the best three consecutive years. It is surely unfair that such a distinction should be made. The secondary teacher, be it noted, is even worse off than the primary teacher; the latter counts his service from the time he commences as a pupil-teacher; the former, after spending some years in university or some equivalent training, and thus, as he fondly believes, better fitting himself to take a higher position in the educational world, finds himself penalized in that he cannot count his years of service until he actually commences teaching in a secondary school. Again, the primary teacher has a much better security of tenure under the proposed Bill. The secondary teacher has none. He has the Appeal Board, certainly, but even if he is not dismissed he may be starved into dismissal by having his salary reduced. This, in the absence of a Dominion scale, is quite possible in the case of secondary-school teachers, but it is not possible in the case of primary-school teachers who do have a Dominion scale. Obviously the last three years of a secondary-school teacher's service are frequently not his best years. It is the invidious distinction between teachers and Civil servants that we wish to have removed.

The executive wishes to draw the attention of the Education Committee and members of Parliament to that portion of Schedule X which states that the amount expended in salaries in secondary schools shall be £12 10s. per head of all pupils attending the school (exclusive of pupils in the lower department). This places male and female assistants exactly on the same footing as regards remuneration, which, for reasons given later, seems undesirable.

Finally the executive wishes to make it clear that, while Schedule X stipulates that unless payments to teachers are made as set forth the governing body will have to forfeit one-quarter of all capitation grants made, it might be considered better finance by some governing bodies to forfeit one-quarter of the grants and pay lower salaries. We therefore consider that secondary teachers would be more adequately protected if the penalty for non-compliance with the regulations were made the forfeiture of half all capitation and other grants.

In regard to the motions set forth below, we wish to affirm that they embody the opinion of not only the executive as a whole but of all branches of our association throughout New Zealand. The last motion, though affecting one centre only, has the support of the executive also.

Motion I.—That the Minister of Education be thanked by the executive of the N.Z.S.S.A.A. for the Education Bill of 1914 in so far as it benefits the smaller secondary schools and the assistant mistresses of most secondary schools.

Motion II.—That this executive regrets that no Dominion scale for secondary schools has been introduced.

Motion III.—That, while the Bill makes the teaching profession more attractive to those teachers appointed for the first time to secondary schools, it holds out no inducement for men and women to remain in the profession in that it makes no provision for the payment of senior teachers on a professional basis.

Motion IV.—That, failing the introduction of a Dominion scale, the average salary paid to male teachers in secondary schools should be at least £300, and the average salary for female teachers at least £200.

Motion V.—That whereas according to the present Bill the amount available for salaries is the same for girls' and boys' secondary schools, and whereas, as the salaries proposed may be adequate for girls' schools where the teachers are young and unmarried, these salaries are totally inadequate to enable senior men to support their families in a manner worthy of their profession, we therefore ask that the capitation grants to the secondary boys' schools shall be materially increased, and suggest that the amount paid in salaries per pupil be at least £14 10s.

Motion VI.—That in order to meet the additional expense involved in motions IV and V the Government be asked to amend Schedule X of the proposed Bill as follows: Subsection (b), the words "together with one-fourth" to be changed to "together with one-half"; subsection (c), the amount "£6" be changed to "£8"; subsection (d), the amount "£9" be changed to "£11"; subsection (iii), the words "not less than £250 per annum" to be changed to "not less than £300 per annum"; subsection (iv), the words "not less than £175 per annum" be changed to "not less than £200 per annum"; subsection (vi), the words "shall not be less than £12 10s. per head," &c., to "shall not be less than £14 10s. per head," &c.

Motion VII.—That the Government be asked to amend the Superannuation Act so as to enable teachers to have the same privileges as Civil servants—namely, to have their retiring-allowance computed on the best three consecutive years.

Motion VIII.—That in view of the fact that the Board of Governors of schools, where conditions affecting school and staffing approach least closely to those provided by Schedule X in the Education Bill, may elect to retain existing conditions and so exclude the staffs of such schools from benefits acquired by those schools where the new conditions are accepted, this association respectfully urges the Hon. the Minister of Education to amend the words in Schedule X following upon subsection (e) to read, "Provided that the capitation payment on each free pupil shall be one-half of the rates named above, unless the following conditions are complied with."

Motion IX.—That in the event of the Board of Governors of the Auckland Grammar School not being able to make provision during the year 1915 for the extra class-rooms necessary for the increased staffs required by the provisions of the Education Bill (clause (vii), Schedule X), the Hon. the Minister of Education be respectfully requested to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to the members of the staff of the Auckland Grammar School from 1st January, 1915, the increases in salaries to which they would be entitled under clause (vi), Schedule X.

1. *Mr. Hogben.* [Do you see how you can make a Dominion scale of salaries without pooling the school reserves throughout the Dominion—putting them all into one fund and distributing them equally to all schools?—I think that if a Dominion scale of salaries were introduced there should be at least some method adopted whereby the anomaly might be removed of one Board paying secondary teachers on a certain basis and another Board paying them on a different basis.]

2. That is not my question. My question is, Can you get a Dominion scale without pooling?—Yes, I think so.

3. One Board has considerable endowments, and another Board has none. How would you enable them to pay salaries on the same Dominion scale?—I think that the Government ought to come to the aid of such Boards. If they want to pay salaries on a definite Dominion scale I think it would be a fair thing to ask the Government to so increase the funds of that Board as to enable it to pay on a Dominion scale.

4. Is not that the same thing as pooling the reserves? If you make up the deficiency is not that the same thing?—Not quite. I do not see that it is the same. By "pooling the reserves" I take it you mean lumping the whole lot together and dividing the total sum of money by the number of Boards.

5. Supposing we take Mr. Mahan's figure—£15 per head—as that required for secondary education. Supposing one Board has an endowment amounting to £10 per pupil, and it has 200 pupils; it then has £2,000 to start with. The other Board, we will say, has nothing to start with. The amount required for 200 pupils is £3,000. Would you give the one Board £1,000 and the other the whole £3,000?—Yes.

6. Is not that the same thing in effect as pooling the reserves?—Yes, I suppose it comes to the same thing.

7. What exactly do you mean when you say that a primary-school teacher who begins at £100 a year in salary rises to £310 in a definite number of years?—I mean that when a primary teacher starts his teaching career he has a definite promotion ladder to go up.

8. Do you mean to say that every teacher in a definite number of years rises from £100 to £310?—No. That is how the printed statement read, but I qualified that when I read it. I said it would be quite possible for a man to rise from £100 to £310.

9. May not a secondary-school teacher rise to various positions by promotion in the same way as this primary teacher does?—Yes, he may quite possibly rise. What we object to is that there is no definite path for him to advance. If we felt quite sure, for example, that if we did our duty faithfully and conscientiously one year we would get a definite rise, and the year after that a definite rise, we would have something to work for.

10. Your objection is that there are not a definite number of higher positions to which assistants could rise in the profession within New Zealand?—That is so. And the other great objection that we have is that we spend four years, most of us, in a university career; we spend exactly the same number of years and have just as hard work to do as a lawyer or a medical man; yet when we come to enter what we term a profession we are not paid according to professional rates. The lawyer and the medical man in a few years' time earn nearly double the salary that we earn.

11. Take school B in the instances that you give in your statement: do you know how many of the 327 pupils are lower-department pupils?—No.

12. That vitiates the figures to start with, does it not?—Those facts and figures were got by a member of the executive from the secretary of that school. Both the executive member and I assumed that 327 was the total exclusive of any in the lower department. We were quite under that impression.

13. Does the £3,170 include the salary of the teacher who teaches the lower department in that school?—All I can say is that we were given to understand that £3,170 would cover the salaries of all teachers in the school, and that none of the teachers were occupied exclusively in teaching children in the lower department.

14. Where is account taken of the fees paid by the paying pupils there: are they not left out of account altogether? According to your figures there are fifty-seven paying pupils?—Yes.

15. What about their fees? You have not gone into this matter yourself?—No.

16. Fifty-seven paying pupils, I suppose, would pay a fair amount of money, would they not?—£12 or £13 a year each.

17. Not at this school, but they would at yours?—Yes.

18. *The Chairman.*] That would cover your difference, then?—No, nowhere near it. It would still leave £300.

19. *Mr. Hogben.*] About the Appeal Board: supposing that a reduction of salary was made definitely the ground of appeal for secondary teachers, as it certainly is in the case of primary teachers, would not that meet one point?—Yes, I certainly think it would; but we have nothing of that sort at present.

20. You think there is some doubt about it?—Considerable doubt.

21. May I ask if your association has taken a legal opinion about that?—No, but certain members of the executive have gone very closely into the matter, and they have come to the conclusion that the only thing we can appeal on is the question of dismissal.

22. If that were placed beyond question it would clear up that point?—Yes, very considerably.

23. With regard to motion 5, you are aware that most of the boys' and girls' schools are managed by the same governing body, are you not?—Yes.

24. And that the funds of the two schools under the law are one?—Yes.

25. Does not that give the Board the opportunity of differentiating, if it thinks it wise, between the salaries of the boys' school and the salaries of the girls' school?—Yes, it certainly does; but we as a body would like to have it made clear to us by the Government whether or not the Board could, if they wished, pay equal salaries to men and women. We as a body hold that there should not be the same salary paid to men and women.

26. Do you know of any Government that ever dared to face the question of equal pay for equal work for women quite irrespective of party?—No, I have never known any Government that has, and I do not ask the Government to dare to face it. What I would like the Government to do is to put forward some definite example. Supposing £12 10s. were put down as the definite basis, where a Board managed two schools we should like to see it allocated something like this: £13 10s. for boys and £11 10s. for girls.

27. You see it involves that question?—Yes, certainly; but unless there is some definite statement made in the Bill there is nothing to prevent mistresses in girls' schools getting the same as a male assistant.

28. What about the average salary?—That does not altogether cover it. The average salary may work out to that, but it is quite possible for some senior mistresses to get the same salary as some senior male assistants.

FRIDAY, 14TH AUGUST, 1914.

HENRY AINSLIE PARKINSON examined. (No. 36.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am secretary of the New Zealand Educational Institute.

2. What position do you occupy otherwise?—I am head teacher of the Newtown School.

3. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—I will begin with the first resolution—namely, the Council of Education. I think the resolution as put down pretty accurately represents the opinions of the teachers. It is a pleasure to us to see the Council in any form, and it was hoped that the Council would have been given the power of carrying on the general administration of education within the country. It was hoped thereby that all the different kinds of schools would be combined under the one guiding authority. However, that has not been provided for, and perhaps it was too much to expect in one instalment, but the Institute is inclined to welcome the Council as suggested, especially seeing that some part of the wishes of the Institute have been agreed to in the way of giving it a certain measure of administrative power in one or two directions, particularly the power of combining secondary-school courses with primary-school courses. The Institute sees the possibility of great benefit from that. As to the constitution of the Council, the Institute offers no comment except to suggest that in line (c) the additional member of the Council appointed by the Minister should be one of the Department's Inspectors. I do not know that the resolution in regard to Inspectors expressly states it, but I am not going outside my brief when I say that the teachers from one end of the Dominion to the other hail with delight the centralization of the inspectorate, and they see from that many advantages in the future. Nothing has been said about it explicitly, but it is understood it is accepted wholly and gratefully. In regard to casual vacancies, the Institute recommends that all casual vacancies be filled by the electing bodies. The reason given by members in supporting the proposal was that, except where a casual vacancy might occur late in the term of office, there was no sufficient reason why the electing bodies should be deprived of its right to its own representation. The reason urged against it was that it was causing unnecessary expense, but it was held that the expense could not in any case be very great, and that the rights of representation should be conserved. Probably both ideas might be met by a compromise by simply putting in a period after which no election should be held. The District Councils are welcomed by the Institute. They consider they will lead to opportunities for doing a good deal in the way of stimulating local interests and meeting local needs in education. As to Education Boards, it is not too much to say that the proposal in the Bill to retain the nine Boards is one of the principal disappointments. The division of the country into small districts has many disadvantages. Of course, the smallest districts will be obliterated, but still it will have the effect of preserving the aspect of parochialism in the service. It will still not be a national service, and will not therefore be subject to a national outlook either from its administrative heads or from the executive officers, the teachers. I am instructed to urge most strongly that the number of Boards should be still further reduced, either to five, as the Education Commission of two years ago recommended, or preferably to four, with the boundaries conterminous with the University districts. That would in all points in the teachers' belief be a better division. It would amount practically to a recasting of the district system. That is quite understood, but the teachers' belief is that the cost would be fully met by the benefits that would be gained by a wider outlook within the limits of the district. As to the franchise, I am requested to represent that in "urban areas" as well as in "urban districts," which are provided for in the Bill, the municipal franchise should be introduced. I know quite well the question that will be put to me on that point, and I am not quite prepared to suggest on my own behalf the answer to it; but it has been felt by members of the Institute for a long time, especially in certain districts, that the Education Boards ought to be more representative of the general body of the people, and therefore the wider franchise should be instituted. It is therefore hoped that in the urban areas at least the municipal franchise will be instituted, and a further extension of the franchise in rural areas as soon as convenient. I mentioned that the teachers welcome the centralization of the inspectorate. They further welcome the increased support that is to be given to school libraries. An old standing grievance among teachers is the fact that they are not treated as other members of the Public Service. Just now the point is the removal expenses of teachers. In every other branch of the Service, when for the benefit of the Service a servant is removed—and it is to be supposed that it is for the benefit of the Service that a servant is removed—then the expenses of his removal should be paid. The teachers ask that they be put on the same footing as other public servants in that respect. Of course, the reply is that teachers are not servants of the Government, but whether they are or not they are servants of the community. It is not their fault they are not servants of the Government, and in any case it is not proper that the teachers should be punished for that. There is the reply also that on account of the very great number of changes in the services of the teachers it would be very expensive. There are two rejoinders to that: one is that that is no reason why the Department should be relieved of it, and another is that by this Bill the number of transfers would be very much reduced. That is one of the great benefits that this Bill will bring about—the reduction in the number of steps in promotion, and therefore a reduction in the number of transfers. It will be an enormous gain to teachers and schools. On those grounds we consider that what the Institute asks is a fair thing. Then, as to the appointments, the teachers are very delighted with the improvement in the system of appointment, but they would like it to go a little further. In the case of appointment, where a number of candidates are of equal merit, the Board is allowed in cases of not more than three candidates between whom they cannot differentiate to hand over the duty to the Committee. We submit that is imposing upon the Committee a duty that they least of all are capable of performing. If the Board assisted by its expert advisers cannot

possibly decide between the candidates, how can a totally inexperienced and in some cases unfit Committee judge between the candidates? It leads once more to the oft-repeated declaration of the teachers that nothing will give satisfaction to them until their appointments are decided by a system of grading—grading as to efficiency and service. It comes in at every turn of a discussion on educational matters. Salaries or sick-leave or removal expenses, the growth of a school or decline of a school—every aspect of the service brings this same point into view. For that reason we ask that that provision that not more than three names be sent to a Committee be deleted, and that the Board be called upon to make the appointments. Further, that a step forward towards a Dominion scheme of appointments should be made in this way. Portion of the paragraph with regard to appointments in our resolutions reads, "The Institute urges that all appointments of teachers be made from a Dominion graded list, to be drawn up on the basis of efficiency and service, and supplied to Boards for the purpose of determining appointments." The meaning of that is that when we look at the section of the Bill dealing with general powers there is power for grading teachers, and apparently the first grading-list is to be compiled by next June. I would like to ask if that is the correct reading of that clause.

Mr. Hogben: It could not be a Dominion grading-list by next year.

Witness: Well, there is an ambiguity.

Mr. Hogben: There is no inconsistency. The grading-list next June would have to be drawn up as far as it was possible, and it could not possibly be finished by next June. It means that eventually it will be a Dominion graded list. It will be possible to issue a grading-list, say, for districts such as Auckland.

Witness: We were in doubt about the matter. What we are asking for is that this graded list shall be supplied to the Boards, and the Boards shall make their appointments from that list—that is to say, we are asking to have the optional powers of Boards largely reduced, and the system that is in force in Wanganui, Auckland, and Taranaki adopted for the rest of the country. Then, in regard to transfers, the Institute suggests that the following be added to section 67: "(d.) In any case where an alteration of the grading of a position would result in the promotion of any teacher above another senior to him and equally efficient." That is, the promotion should be made according to the graded list for the district, and not in accordance with the existing staff at any school. It is claimed that because the school grows the teacher ought not necessarily to have to grow with it, but that other teachers within the district have as much claim to consideration as any one who happened to be in a fortunately situated school. We hope that they will be treated equally according to their value as teachers. Then, in regard to dismissals, the Institute urges that subsection (1) of section 68 should be deleted. That section gives the Committees the right to recommend to Boards dismissal, suspension, or transfer of a teacher. We enter a strong protest against that. We feel that a teacher should not be subjected to possible animus. There may not be one case in a thousand where local animus may be said to act in the removal of a teacher who has failed to make himself agreeable to certain people. It does not apply to others. The local Postmaster or the local policeman is not subjected to it, and we ask that that be deleted. The argument was raised that you must give to the community the right to protect itself against the fortunately rare cases of the thoroughly bad man or woman getting among the children. That is a reasonable enough objection, but we hold that it can be met in other ways. I think the clause in the Act is not needed. If a bad man gets there he will be marked and disposed of in the same way as he would if he were the local policeman or local postman. The Public Service is too well organized and too well administered to need that clause. It is a kind of threat. It places in the hands of possibly maliciously-minded persons a power which we think they ought not to possess, and seeing that it has a very limited application we think it might very well be cast aside. With reference to manual instructors, the Institute suggests that instructors employed solely in the manual training of primary-school pupils should be classified as primary-school teachers for the purposes of salary, to be rated as teachers, and paid accordingly. Now, in regard to Inspectors, the Institute considers the salaries offered for Inspectors are insufficient. It holds that the office of Inspector should be one to which the highest rank of teacher should be able to aspire—that is to say, those who are best placed presumably because of their past service in teaching should be available to be drawn upon for Inspectors when required, and therefore the Institute recommends that the salary of an Inspector should be not less than the combined salary and house allowance of head teachers. The Bill provides £490, and the Institute recommends that not less than £500 be provided for Inspectors, and that they rise by regular increments up to £650. It also recommends that the line in the clause dealing with Assistant Inspectors be omitted, and that no Assistant Inspectors be appointed. I took upon myself to quote to the Institute the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Allen in introducing the Bill explaining what that line meant, but it was felt that the retention of it might leave the Board open to possibly inadvisable practices and acts, and it was decided to ask that it be omitted altogether. Further, we suggest that there should be an Inspector for every fifty schools. I have taken the trouble to work out the number existing at present. There are now, I think, thirty-nine Inspectors. This proposal will require forty-four Inspectors. The present inspectorial staff is most unevenly worked. These figures will show the need for the centralization of the inspectorate. In Auckland there is one Inspector for sixty-seven schools, in Taranaki one for forty-seven, Wanganui one for fifty-one, Wellington one for forty-two, Hawke's Bay one for sixty-six, Marlborough one for ninety-three, Nelson one for sixty-two, Grey one for thirty-three, Westland one for thirty-four, North Canterbury one for fifty-five, South Canterbury one for forty-two, Otago one for sixty-one, and Southland one for sixty. That shows the great unevenness of the work of the Inspectors. With forty-four Inspectors, and paid at the rate suggested, the cost for inspection would be about £10,000 more than at present. The Inspectors are

now receiving £16,000 per year. Averaging them at £600, because the promotions will not be very frequent in future, that will make a bill of £26,000, and it will not reach that for probably five or seven years. Now, with regard to the question of dental and medical treatment. The Institute considers that section 131 is too drastic: that is, the provision that if a man fails to act upon the advice of a Medical Inspector he shall render himself liable to prosecution for cruelty. The Institute proposes, instead of that, that provision should be made by the Public Health Department for free dental and medical treatment for the children of parents in poor circumstances. The line of argument which prompted the Institute to make this suggestion is simply that it is the State's business to care for the development of its citizens. The Education Department deals mainly with the intellectual and moral development. It has lately taken a considerable hand in the physical development, but the State's duty is equally as much concerned with the health of the community, and the Institute believes that it is the Health Department's proper function to do what it can to safeguard the health of the young citizens so that in time to come they shall be sound and healthy adult citizens. I think that is putting it briefly without saying any more in the way of amplification or explanation. I come now to a point on which it is my pleasure, as well as duty, to express the unqualified gratification of the Institute and all its members at what is believed to be a very valuable provision, and one that will lead to exceedingly valuable developments in the future—that is to say, the subsidies on local contributions. The Institute feels that this is an acknowledgment of the right of the people to be interested in their own schools, and their right to be encouraged to assist in the development of their own schools. It will have, we believe, a great effect in bringing education home to the minds of the members of the community in such a way as has been very largely neglected in the past, and is only now coming to be partially acknowledged. For that reason the Institute heartily welcomes this proposal. It would like to go a little further and suggest that local bodies should be allowed to make contributions to primary schools. It is being done in this city in an indirect way now—in a small way: that is to say, the city is supplying the schools with libraries. There is no good reason that the Institute can see why a Borough Council should not be allowed, not to levy an education rate, but to make a contribution out of its funds to assist any local movement in connection with a school—such, for instance, as building a swimming-bath or a public gymnasium—which would be of benefit to the school and would bring school life into touch with social life. The Institute thinks that that might very well be done, and thinks that it would be a very wise, and proper, and good thing to do. Further, it recommends that the limit in the Bill of £250 for subsidies should be raised to at least £350. I have to mention now a matter which is not specifically mentioned in the Education Bill, but we take the opportunity of mentioning it here. I refer to superannuation. "The Institute requests that the Superannuation Act be amended so that retiring-allowances be calculated on the best three years of service, and that house allowances be taken into consideration in the computation." In this, as in other matters, teachers are only asking that they be treated as other public servants are treated. All the other branches of the Public Service have their superannuation allowance calculated on the best three years. If for the benefit of the Service a man, towards his retirement, is obliged to take a lower position and a lower salary, his pension is not thereby prejudiced; he takes his superannuation on the three highest consecutive years. Teachers are not treated in that way. If for any reason they are required to take a declining salary at the end of the period of service, their superannuation is affected for the rest of their lives. We have very good warrant for asking for this. I will mention only two points: One is that other public servants are so treated; the other is that the Actuary has recommended that this alteration be made. He considers—and experience is rather tending to prove it to us—that if it were done it would save the fund rather than injure it, by the fact that some people would not go out on superannuation so soon if they had not any reason to fear that their pensions would suffer. With regard to house allowances, so far as I know, there is only one other service that has a considerable number of houses for its servants—the Mental Hospital service—and it was announced the other day that they are to have their house allowance computed as salary for the purposes of superannuation. I am instructed to ask that teachers be treated in the same way. It is quite true to say that the house allowance is a part of the conditions of the teachers' service. It is part of the inducement that is offered for a teacher to take up the work, and therefore it is to all intents and purposes a part of his salary. Now I come to deal with probationers: There is no need to tell this Committee that there is a shortage of teachers, and it is an increasing shortage. The ideal way of supplying it is by training more young people. The only young people that you can get to train are probationers—assuming that pupil-teachers will, in the moderately near future, be discarded. The Institute then recommends that in order to increase the supply of teachers the number of probationers be considerably increased, and that with a view of making the teaching profession more attractive to young people the salaries of probationers and allowances to training-college students be materially increased. I wish to point out that these probationers are to a large extent young people of pretty good quality, who have not been successful in getting a place in the Public Service. Most people prefer the Public Service to the teaching service—quite naturally—and the probationers are to a large extent those who have not been able to get into the Public Service. I believe the nation does not want the refuse for teachers: it wants the best, and in order to get them it is necessary to improve the inducements. Therefore we ask that they be paid larger salaries. One must consider the arduous nature of a probationer's life. They are usually young people of fifteen or sixteen. They go to school for a few hours' duty each day. They are not called upon to teach very long. Some of them are called upon to do a full day's work very often, and they do a very great deal of work. Then they have as many hours as you like of study, beginning their duties at 9 o'clock in the morning, we will suppose, and finishing at anything you like after midnight. It is perhaps not so long as that in all cases, but we know from practical experience that they are engaged in very arduous

studies, and the salary paid is not commensurate. It is true they are fitting themselves for promotion, but they are also fitting themselves for the State's work. The State wants their assistance; and if the State is to develop, as every good citizen hopes it will develop, the State must have their assistance, and to get it it will have to pay for it. I think that when you consider the unattractiveness of a good many years of a young teacher's life you will see that what I have said is not too much. They have to seek for employment. They have no guarantee of employment when they come out of their training-college course. It is true they are almost sure to get a place, but it is also true that they have—a great proportion of them—to take very unattractive places at first in order to prove their worth for promotion to better. There is one other paragraph I have to deal with—a paragraph at the end of our statement. It is a kind of general summarizing of the reasons that the Institute has for asking for a more national point of view in regard to education. It asks that education be looked upon as a part of national development—as much as land-settlement and railway-construction—and contends that it is just as worthy of the investment of the nation's capital as any of those other avenues of national activity.

4. *Mr. Hanan (Acting-Chairman).*] It is reproductive?—Reproductive in the highest sense—more reproductive, we are taught by the wisest men we have, than any other investment the State can make.

5. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to appointments, dealt with on page 2 of your memorandum: do you notice that in clause 67, subclause (5), it is provided that the Board shall, before making an appointment, consult with the Senior Inspector?—Yes.

6. What would you say would be the basis on which the Senior Inspector would found his advice in regard to the teachers—I mean the teachers not only from that district, but from other districts?—We are like birds that sing the same song—we always come back to a grading system.

7. Never mind a grading system. I refer to the Bill. Would it not be a graded list that the Senior Inspector would have to be guided by almost entirely?—We are assuming that the Inspector knows his duty. We are not prescribing his duty to him. We are assuming that he knows his duty, and that he will have a graded list.

8. He will be an officer of the Department under the Bill?—Yes.

9. And the Department naturally will expect him to be guided by the Dominion roll, so to speak?—Exactly. We are assuming so. Beyond the possibility of sending three names to a Committee the appointment rules proposed in the Bill are absolutely satisfactory to teachers.

10. Is that subclause (7)?—Yes.

11. You propose to delete subclause (7) and not allow a Committee any voice, even where there might be some local considerations of which the Committee might know, possibly, better than the Board?—It is the local consideration that we fear. I can give you a fearful instance from Wellington City—quite a recent instance.

12. You think there is danger in that subclause (7)?—Certainly.

13. Supposing that a teacher does miss an appointment in one case, do you think it is likely there would continue to be three candidates? Do you not think that in the next case he probably would be the only candidate?—I do not think there is any likelihood of there being three candidates at all, with a wise inspectorate to do the grading.

14. You think that subclause (7), then, would not really have much effect?—I do not think it would have any effect, except that it might leave the way open to abuse on occasion.

15. Do you not think that by leaving it in the Committees would feel that they still had something?—Nearly all the best members of Committees that I know say they should have nothing to do with the appointments. It is not nearly so highly prized a privilege among members of Committees as I used to think, and as a good many people still think.

16. You say they should have no voice, but you would still consult them—that is to say, inform them of the appointment the Board intended to make?—I do not see any objection to that.

17. Now, with regard to clause 68 (1), which you say should disappear, does it not sometimes save time if the Committee, knowing of the impending resignation of a teacher, informs the Board, at the same time as it informs it of the resignation, that in its opinion another teacher is fitted for promotion, and makes a recommendation accordingly? Would not that save a good deal of time? The Board would not have to go through the whole process of consulting the Committee?—It might save some time, but it might be at the expense of some teacher who is perhaps equally qualified for that place, and perhaps has a better right, or some family or personal need.

18. The Board is not obliged to follow the recommendation of the Committee, is it?—No, but it might do so, because sometimes a Board wants to make itself amiable to members of Committees.

19. You are aware that some of the Inspectors are receiving considerably less than £500 a year now?—Yes.

20. There is one Inspector receiving £325 now?—I heard of worse than that some time ago.

21. This is two weeks ago—£325. There will be, at all events, an improvement of £25. Assuming that the benefits the Inspectors will get from examinations will be £30 that will make £355. Under the Bill the Inspectors become servants of the Department. Would you raise them from £355 to £500 at once?—I should look at the man. If the man is worthy and fit and qualified for an Inspector in every sense, yes; if not, put him back to teaching again.

22. The Department could not do that. The Bill secures to the Inspectors—at all events, at the outset—their places as Inspectors, does it not?—Yes.

23. Is it not conceivable that useful work might be found for them, and that they might learn their work in company with Inspectors of more experience as well as by going back into the schools?—I agree. I see the point. You mean some of the Inspectors who might be called junior Inspectors?

24. Yes?—Yes, I think that is quite probable. I think it is quite proper. I think the desire of the Institute might be met by putting in a proviso that in future no Inspector shall be appointed of the rank of an assistant.

25. Your suggestion is that after a certain date—after the passing of the Bill—no future appointment should be made?—Yes.

26. With regard to dental and medical treatment, you say that the Institute thinks that that clause 131 is too drastic. Are you aware that it is not more drastic than the present English law?—Yes, personally I was aware of it, but I am not sure that the Institute was.

27. You notice the word “serious” there—“that such child is suffering from a serious disease or a serious bodily defect”?—Yes.

28. It only applies in those cases?—“Serious” is rather an ill-defined term, is it not?

29. I suppose that in construing the word “serious” a New Zealand Court would be guided by decisions in English Courts, would it not?—I presume so. The Chairman could tell you better.

Mr. Hanan (Acting-Chairman): Yes, if it is the same statute and the same expressions are used.

30. *Mr. Hogben.*] Would you be prepared to acknowledge that it reduces it to cases that are really serious in a very strict reading of the term?—May I ask whether it means immediately serious or prospectively serious—I mean, threatening seriously the future development of the physique of the patient?

31. Now you are asking me for a legal opinion. We need not define it too closely, because there have been cases in England. In such cases has not the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board already a duty cast upon it to deal with cases of the kind?—I am not able to answer that.

32. Are you not aware that there is a duty cast upon the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board to deal with all really serious cases, and, if so, does not the Government already contribute?—I am quite aware that, at all events in the towns, the hospitals are available for parents who will make what one may call reasonable efforts on behalf of their children.

33. Did you see a case reported in one of the English educational journals where a child suffering from severe hip-disease was brought under this law?—I have not noticed that case.

34. Is it not within your knowledge that a hospital would have to deal with a case like that if the parents took the child to the hospital?—I have not much knowledge of hospitals, except the Wellington one, and I know they deal with any one who likes to go to them.

35. Do you think there is any hardship about this under those circumstances?—Speaking for myself, I am not able to say that I think there is; and, what is more, I think the matter in the minds of those who supported the proposal was the conditions in the country districts, where, generally speaking, attention is not so easily got.

36. This deals with serious cases?—Yes.

37. The Hospital Boards deal with country cases as well as town cases if they are serious, do they not?—I think so, but I could not say.

38. *Mr. Sidey.*] Were these resolutions carried with anything like unanimity?—Yes, I think practically all were carried unanimously except one or two. That one deals with the excision of clause 68 (1), dealing with the power of a Committee to recommend dismissal. That was not carried by a great majority—a majority of about seven or eight, I think.

39. The others were unanimous?—Yes, practically.

40. I gather from your remarks that you think the Committees should have nothing whatever to do with either the appointment or the removal of teachers?—Practically that is it.

41. You think they should not even be consulted?—So long as Committees are existent I do not see why they should not be consulted. I do not think it is a matter of great importance.

42. The sending of only one name down is practically taking away any power of consultation from them, is it not? It amounts to that?—Except this, that it allows an opportunity for a Committee which might know something to the decisive detriment of a candidate to say so—to give information; and if it has important information, and can back it up, it would be the Board's duty to take notice thereof.

43. But, speaking generally, you think, and the Institute thinks, that the Committee should have nothing to do with the appointment of teachers?—That is so.

44. Is not that also your opinion practically with regard to the Boards? Do you not suggest that a Dominion scheme of grading should be introduced?—That is so.

45. And that the Boards should be bound to take the teacher who is at the top of the grade for a suitable vacancy: is not that so?—Yes.

46. That would really be taking the power out of the hands of the Board, too, would it not?—Yes. Practically what we are working for is that our system be administered as a national system and not as a district system.

47. What you are working for is practically the wiping-out of Committees and Boards so far as the appointment of teachers is concerned: is that so?—Yes.

48. You would have them all appointed from Wellington?—Well, yes.

49. We have been told by a witness that in his opinion—and he was speaking from his experience in Auckland—that it would not be possible to have a satisfactory Dominion scheme. You do not agree with that?—No. You will not find many teachers who do.

50. I think the objection he raised was that it would not be possible for all the Inspectors to have a knowledge of the individual teachers throughout the whole of New Zealand sufficient to enable them to satisfactorily grade the teachers as against one another?—The reply that we make to that is that it is not found impossible to grade other services. The Railway service is a much larger service than ours, and it is graded. The Post and Telegraph service, I should think, is pretty nearly as large as ours, and it is graded. I do not see that it is necessary for every Inspector to know every teacher in the

country. I believe that when the Inspectors are under one control and meet periodically and compare notes they will develop a national standard of inspection. The Inspectors will all be men of considerably more than average ability as teachers, we hope, and it will work satisfactorily.

51. You think it will be quite possible?—I am quite sure of it.

52. With regard to the size of districts, what is your chief reason for advocating large districts?—We desire as nearly as possible an approach to a national system—to the making of the whole country one district.

53. It is with a view of getting rid of the Boards altogether, is it not?—With a view to widening the area of operations.

54. Is it not entirely in the interests of the teachers?—No, certainly not. The teachers regard themselves as servants of the public, assisting in the development of the future citizenship of the nation.

55. What is your reason for urging that the districts be made larger than they are in the Bill?—Fortunately, I have just been fortified by a resolution from Auckland this morning. The reasons are these, that the circumscribed area leads to circumscribed views.

56. On the part of whom?—On the part of every one, both Boards and teachers and everybody else. The teachers have naturally their district only to look to. They shape their course to meet the requirements of their own particular district. It may be that in some cases that is not the wisest course to pursue. However, I think that is a fair way of putting it. The best teachers are selected by other districts where there is a better opportunity for promotion, and thereby the pupils resident in the small districts lose the services of the best teachers.

57. The arguments you have given me are arguments which almost all relate to the scope of the teachers. The benefit of the pupils is only interfered with because of the opportunity of appointing teachers?—That is not all. Of course, you cannot have schools without teachers.

58. Apparently the main reason is that there may be a wider field for the teachers for promotion, transfer, and appointment?—Also there is a wider field for the selection of teachers for pupils.

59. Supposing the appointment, transfer, and promotion of teachers was taken out of the hands of the Committees and Boards altogether and done at Wellington, would there then be any occasion or necessity for the enlargement of the education districts?—I think so. Take a most extreme case for example. You have Westland and Grey: you are going to wipe them out, fortunately. There there is a difference even across the river: on one side of the river there is a different educational ideal at work, as compared with the other; and it is to avoid that that we are urging the enlarging of those boundaries.

60. Do you think there would be sufficient work for the Boards and Committees to do if the whole of the appointment of teachers were done from Wellington?—Well, I cannot give you the Institute opinion on that—I can only give my own opinion. I do not know that we have discussed the amount of work that the Boards have to do.

61. What is your own opinion?—My own opinion is that there is not sufficient work now for the Boards to do as they are constituted. Most of the Boards' duties consist of minor matters of business which could be much more expeditiously and economically handled by local bodies.

62. Your personal view would be to wipe the Boards out?—As at present constituted, yes.

63. That would be logical, would it not?—It is the kind of logic that appeals to my mind.

64. It is the logical conclusion from the size of the districts. If it is necessary to reduce them to four, why is it not logical to wipe them out?—I used that argument in addressing the Institute, and I believe it was that consideration which caused them to carry the resolution. I am only expressing my own opinion.

65. Your Institute recommended striking out subclause (1) of clause 28?—Yes.

66. In regard to transfers, you are aware that is the existing law?—Yes.

67. Do you know of any case where that power of recommending dismissal, suspension, or transfer was abused?—No.

68. Was there any before the Institute when they made this recommendation?—No; at all events, no specific case was mentioned.

69. You suggest the inclusion of an additional clause in connection with the transfer of teachers where a school rises in grade: that is to say, where a school rises in grade, instead of the teachers in the school receiving promotion, the teachers at a distance who may be senior to them, if efficient, should receive priority. Would not that mean that quite a number of transfers would have to be made to give effect to that?—I think not necessarily so. It is only asking that the service be administered analogously with the other branches of the service. Take the Post Office: when a new servant is wanted, in grading the Post Office they do not always promote the staff on the spot at the time.

70. Clause 67 (b) reads, "In any case where the efficient conduct of the school appears in the opinion of the Board to require such transfer." Do you think that would be sufficient to meet the case you refer to?—I think it would be if the Board were alert enough to use its powers; but I think it should be expressly stated that the fact of one teacher being on the spot does not give him a claim to promotion. That is the point the Institute wishes to make.

71. *Mr. McCallum.*] What does the Institute say as to the centralization of the appointment of Inspectors?—It welcomes it whole-heartedly.

72. You believe in enlarging the school districts until you enlarge them out of existence?—I am not speaking for the Institute in saying that. The Institute has asked for larger districts than at present, even to reducing the number to four.

73. What are you going to leave the Committees to do finally? Supposing we enlarged the Boards out of existence, should their work be done by the central Department?—I can give you two opinions. The teachers are divided. A good many teachers say, "What is the good of Committees?"

Let us get rid of them." I do not say that myself. I say that this provision for local Committees is of great use, and there are splendid opportunities for Committees of the right kind. The only thing is that I am not quite sure that they ought to be rigidly limited to five, or seven, or nine in number. Sometimes three would do, and sometimes thirteen would be better. I myself can see a splendid opportunity for local enthusiasm and local assistance under that provision of the Bill.

74. But what would be their functions?—To generally foster and encourage social life, especially in the small communities, the building-up of the local libraries, correlating school life with social life, and making especially village and small-town schools a centre of social activity.

75. Do you think they are at all likely to take up those duties if they have no direct say in the appointment of the teacher or in the control of the school?—I think, for the working-out of that ideal, one of the essential points is that the teacher must be a free member of the community and not subject to the domination of any body in the community.

76. How long have you been a teacher?—I have nearly finished thirty-five years.

77. Are not your views and those of the Institute warped from the teachers' point of view? You know we have had many abuses of School Committees, and are not your views warped by a few bad cases you have had of School Committee work?—No, there is too much made of that. There are not many bad Committees, but the fact remains that there are not many that do anything effective. What I would like to see is a voluntary Committee of real enthusiasts in the cause of school-work, and thus give us an opportunity of educating the public to the value of education.

78. Do you think they will be educated without there is some inducement?—I think you have allowed the inducement by this proposal. That looks to me as an opportunity for great advance.

79. You object to allow Committees to recommend dismissal, &c., and you say you think there may be only one case of animus in a thousand?—That is so. I know of no special case.

80. Surely that goes in support of subclause (1) of clause 68?—Negatively, yes. But what we come back to is this: why should teachers be treated differently from any other public servant? Nobody has the right to recommend the local policeman for dismissal, or the Postmaster or Station-master.

81. Yes, the public have the right, and frequently use it?—They have got to go the proper way about it and to the proper authorities. The Public Service is guarded.

82. Do you object to the Committee being in the position of employer?—Yes, that is really the point. No other public servant but the teacher is the servant of any local body.

83. How can you say the teacher is a servant of the Committee—he is the servant of the Board?—But you know when you place a Committee in authority—

84. You do not want these Committees to push their chests out?—No.

85. You still want the Committees?—We have no reason to ask for their abolition. A good many of our members, of course, would like to see them abolished, but most of us would not, and I myself would most certainly not. I have had nearly thirty-five years' experience of teaching, and the whole of my experience with regard to Committees has been wholly satisfactory.

86. *Mr. Poland.*] Do you think that School Committees, without having the power of appointment or recommending the suspension of teachers, can do very useful work in any district?—I do.

87. And do you believe their work might be even more useful if this semi-control they have over the teachers was done away with altogether?—I think so.

88. Do you think it might create a little discontent for a little while amongst the Committees?—Yes.

89. But that it would die away when they had other duties?—Yes.

90. And you believe that the power which is given in this Bill of subsidizing local contributions would tend in that direction?—I believe so.

91. With regard to dental and medical treatment, your Institute believes that provision should be made by the Public Health Department for free dental and medical treatment for the children of parents in poor circumstances?—Yes.

92. Do you not believe that parents of children do a great deal of good to the State by rearing children, and that they have a great responsibility in this country as compared with those who have no children to bring up?—Yes, that is so.

93. When in addition to that they have a child with a serious bodily defect or with serious disease, do you believe it is the duty of the State, in the rearing of that asset to the State, to put that child into a state of healthy bodily condition?—Yes, I believe that. My own opinion is that if citizens are worth rearing at all they are worth rearing as well as possible.

94. And if parents have the misfortune to have a child with a serious bodily defect you think the State is not doing too much in putting that child into good bodily health?—I think the State is only doing its duty.

95. But at present that can only be done by the parents going to the Charitable Aid Board, and having it done as a matter of charity and not as a matter of right. Do you think it should be done as a matter of right?—I do not think I am inclined to quibble over the terms so long as it gets done.

96. With regard to the appointment of teachers, you do not agree that Committees should have the power of appointment, and you think appointments should be regulated by a Dominion scheme of grading. Is it not a fact that some Boards have given up the power of appointment practically?—Yes.

97. That is, they have put it into the hands of Inspectors?—Yes.

98. Has the position taken up by those Boards resulted well or ill for the teachers—has it given satisfaction or otherwise to the teachers?—I cannot say they are absolutely unanimous about it, because there was one vote against it. I was informed in Auckland last January that they have an

Appeal Board to revise the grading system, and the Appeal Board had sent only one case back to the Inspectors. It may be described in Auckland and Wanganui as an absolute success. In Taranaki it is not so pronounced a success, as the district is small, but they would not abandon it.

99. In regard to small districts, I understood you to say that one argument in favour of the large education district was that it gave a wider scope to the teachers in that particular district, and that a Dominion system would give the widest possible scope. You spoke of teachers with alert minds getting into good districts, and the poor teacher having to go somewhere else?—Yes.

100. A poor teacher must go somewhere even under the Dominion system of appointment?—But they should not all be drafted into one district.

101. You think the effect at present is that all the poor teachers go into one district?—There would be a natural tendency that way. I think even that tendency is visible in certain parts of the country; but what we want to get at is the national point of view, so that no district shall be subjected to the injurious effect of being reckoned a small district where there is no scope. I would like to mention that I have been requested especially this morning to bring before your Committee a very emphatic protest from Auckland against the proposed subdivision of the Auckland District, and I am asked to point out that it will have an injurious effect on the education in that district, because that district has been used as a kind of half-way house for the promotion of the best teachers. They create three second-sized schools in the Waikato compared with seventeen of the largest-sized schools in Auckland, and now the new district will cut off the supply of good schools in the Waikato, and the good teachers will not come down.

102. Is that a protest from the Auckland Educational Institute?—Yes.

103. The Committee has, I believe, petitions from every teacher in the proposed Waikato District against the proposal?—Then there is no need for me to say any more.

104. In regard to the alteration which you desire in reference to superannuation, does the present affect many of the teachers?—Not a great many, and under the new rules probably less; but it does affect some. I would like to point out that it hampers the Education Boards. They will not transfer a teacher who ought to be transferred.

105. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You approve of local government by Committees?—Yes.

106. And is it not a fact that in regard to the objection taken that Committees would not continue in office if they had no power of appointment, that there are very many Committee-men who have served for years, and yet have never had the opportunity of making an appointment?—I could not say as to that—I have no knowledge.

107. That is probable?—Yes, quite probable.

108. You know there are schools in which the same staff has been for many years?—Yes. I did not understand your question. That is so, and the more cases there are the better.

109. And yet we find those Committees quite agreeable to continue in office. You do not approve of the higher stage of local government by Boards?—Well, to say I do not approve of it is rather saying too much. I think that a more economical adjustment could be made. I am not commissioned to say that as representing the Institute. The Institute has not demanded the abolition of the Boards, but a reduction in the number.

110. Do I understand you to say that the Institute approves of centralization?—The appointment of teachers and Inspectors, decidedly.

111. And general administration?—Yes, they are asking for that in the Administrative Council.

112. You recognize the dangers of centralization owing to the fact that the administration gets out of touch and out of sympathy with the teachers and localities, and that it becomes hidebound and autocratic?—It has been mentioned and considered, but the reply to that is that the Council consisting of various heads and the members not too permanently in office will prevent that.

113. Have you any knowledge of the Australian or Victorian system of education?—Yes, but not very precise.

114. Probably you know that centralization was in vogue there?—Yes.

115. Was it not a fact that teachers in particular and education authorities generally considered our system very much superior because of its use of local government?—I am aware that there is an overestimate of the benefits of the Committee system—that is to say, the local interest as evidenced by the Committees. The local interest as evidenced by the Committees in very many cases is practically nil, because the Committees are limited in powers and finance, and sometimes limited in intelligence. We have no reason to believe that the Victorian system of education is to any decisive degree inferior to our own. We know there have been complaints among some of the teachers, but we also have reason to believe that the vast body of the teachers are quite satisfied, and certainly it is so in New South Wales. The New South Wales people strongly advise us to copy their system if we can.

116. Do you know of any unrest among teachers or injury to education through the control by the Boards except in regard to the district and the field for promotion?—Yes, I do.

117. In what way?—Especially some complaints of unjust promotions—that is, the promotions are not regulated justly. I think that is not too strong a word to use. That is the origin of the whole complaint.

118. You think that would be remedied if provision were made for appointments according to efficiency and service?—Yes.

119. And do you consider that so long as the present system is in vogue the administration from a central Department would remedy the defects you speak of?—Yes.

120. You believe a central Department would cease to use favouritism?—Yes, to all practical intents and purposes. There might be an occasional case, but certainly the cases would be divided by, say, thirteen at least of those that at present occur.

121. Do you think a central Department would have a better knowledge of the abilities of teachers, and be able to promote them more justly?—We depend absolutely on a wisely chosen inspectorate. The central Department, having control of the best men in its service as Inspectors, ought to be able to gauge its servants accurately, as other services do. I may say that I have inquired among other services under the centralized system, and all those that I have been able to question are entirely satisfied with the conditions of their service and with the treatment they receive.

122. Is not one result of the Board having control of the Inspectors, and keeping them, therefore, within the one district, an intimate knowledge by the Inspectors of the worth of all the teachers under them?—That is so.

123. With regard to the paragraph in your resolutions concerning Inspectors, do I understand you to recommend that Inspectors should be drawn solely from the ranks of the highest-graded headmasters?—Not necessarily so. That is just one of the points that we wish to press—that a man should be graded according to his value at the time of grading.

124. In regard to the appointment of Inspectors, do you recommend that they should be drawn only from the highest-graded headmasters?—I do not think we make any recommendation. After a few years in practice it would naturally occur so; but I do not think there is any reason why it should invariably. We try to cultivate the point of view that the Inspectors are a part of the teaching service, and are not a separate caste from teachers.

125. How long have you been a headmaster?—Counting small schools and large, some twenty-one years.

126. You recognize that the work of controlling a small school in which the work is chiefly done by the headmaster is very different from the work of controlling a large one?—Exactly.

127. You recognize that a man can only reach the headmastership of a large school when he is fairly advanced in age?—That is so, as a rule.

128. Do you not believe that in inspecting the schools, say, in a backblocks district, energy and driving-power count for a very great deal?—Yes.

129. Are not energy and driving-power more likely to be found in a young man than in an old man?—It depends so much upon the man. You cannot lay down a rule.

130. But as a general thing?—Yes, you would say it should be so.

131. Would it not therefore be an advantage to secure for the inspection of our smaller and backblocks schools men with actual experience of them, and men who have the necessary energy and driving-power?—What is more, I could only say that a man should be selected for an inspectorship because of his proved fitness for it.

132. Would not his experience of these schools and his youthful energy make him fit?—It ought to; but *per contra* I should not like to say anything that would lend support to the idea that there should be one kind of Inspector for the country school and another for the town school.

133. An Inspector who would be drawn from the ranks of the teachers at the smaller schools—would he not be likely to gain experience that would entitle him to inspect the larger schools?—I think the kind of man that would naturally be chosen for inspectorship would have a comprehensive kind of mind that would qualify him to gain all by experience.

134. In regard to subsidies on local contributions, do you see a danger here that the system would advance the interests of districts where the people were well-to-do, as against the interests of districts where the people were not well-to-do?—What I see in it is that every kind of district will be able to avail itself of assistance to the limit of its own will.

135. Would you not say to the limit of its own resources?—I do not suppose that any district is likely to go to the full limit of its resources. A poor district can put in a five-pound note to get some apparatus for its school, and the Government will give it £5 more, and a small school will be well equipped. A well-to-do district, where the squatters have their motor-cars and so forth, might easily put in £100. Plenty of schools will get in £100, and they will have a good gymnasium, or perhaps an agricultural experimental plot or something of that kind.

136. Then there is another school of exactly the same size and grade, say, in a backblocks district where the people are fighting for existence, and it could not raise £10, far less £100?—Perhaps they could raise £1, and that would give them a start.

137. Is not the danger this: that the rich district that does not deserve assistance will get £100, while the poor district can only get £10?—The distinction does not apply, to my mind. All the schools are treated alike as a general basis. Beyond that it is heaven helping those who help themselves. I cannot see any danger or objection.

138. Are all schools able to the same extent to help themselves?—Certainly not.

139. *Mr. Guthrie.*] I gather from your evidence that you are absolutely in favour of the abolition of Boards?—I personally, yes—that is to say, the duties that the Boards now perform are so relatively small and cost so much money that they could be more economically and not less efficiently performed by making use of the Borough Councils and County Councils. I have a note here of the relative cost of the administration of the Board. Twenty-nine per cent. of the funds that the Board has at its discretionary disposal are used up in official salaries. If you count the Inspectors as being at the Board's discretion it is nearly 45 per cent.

140. Have you looked up the education return for last year in this matter? I think it shows a very different figure?—I have taken the figures from the 1912 report.

141. *Mr. Hogben.*] The return shows the whole expenditure?—I have abstracted those funds which the Board disposes of at its discretion, not those which are appropriated by Act.

142. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You say that the duties of the Board are of a very trivial nature?—I would not say "very trivial."

143. You said something of the kind—"the Boards have very slight duties to perform." Have you ever been on an Education Board?—No, sir.

144. Have you ever attended the meetings of an Education Board?—No.

145. Have you ever seen the minutes of an ordinary meeting?—Yes.

146. And you say that the record of the work performed at that meeting showed it to be of such a trivial nature that we could abolish the administering Board and do it by some other means?—I did not say that. I said the record of business done is such that it might just as well be done by a local body already existing; that the somewhat expensively managed Boards are not needed for the kind of duties they have to perform, such as ordering small repairs, and so forth. In any important matter the Board has to appeal to the Department. Its hands are tied in all important matters.

147. I think you would change your mind if you sat on a Board?—As a rule I go by the published reports of the Board meetings.

148. You are in favour of the centralization of the inspectorate?—Yes.

149. With a view to leading up to the centralization of the teachers?—With a view to the nationalization of the education system.

150. You see no difficulty in the way of transferring teachers more than is experienced in the other Departments of State—the Post and Telegraph or the Railway: I think you said that?—Yes, that is so.

151. That teachers could be transferred just as easily?—Yes.

152. Is it not a fact that the work in the Railway Department or the Post and Telegraph Department is of such a technical character, and is so conducted on the same lines all through the service, that there is no great difficulty in sending a man from one station to another—his work would be practically the same?—I presume that is to a large extent true, but I am not acquainted with the conditions of those services.

153. Would you say that of the teaching profession?—Yes, or it ought to be so.

154. You say that a man in a Grade IV school in a town would be quite capable of taking up the duties in a Grade V country school in which he has had no experience whatever?—We have all got to learn experience of our new places. If he is a qualified teacher, and has been given the necessary grading by his Inspectors, that ought to be the evidence of his fitness.

155. Is there not a demand for special qualifications in special schools?—That is becoming more pronounced as time goes on. That is so.

156. Would not national classification tend to destroy that altogether?—We hope not.

157. You are not afraid that that will be the tendency?—No; I think it will lead to a vitalizing of the whole system.

158. Supposing that the Boards still exist and are not wiped out, why do you ask for the municipal franchise for the Board elections?—To tell you the truth, I presented to you a resolution passed by a meeting, but I fail to see the reason myself. I can only say that it is hoped thereby there will be a more representative membership on the Board than is at present the case.

159. With regard to appointments, you say that the Institute suggests the addition of the following to clause 67: "In any case where the alteration of the grading of a position would result in the promotion of any teacher above another senior to him and equally efficient"—that is, you would not give any teacher in any school a prior right to promotion in that school over others?—That is so.

160. Even though it might be his due?—If it is his due another has not a prior right.

161. He may have a prior right from seniority?—We want as little weight attached to seniority as possible. In the scheme that we submitted to the Department recently we asked that the relative values attached to efficiency and service should be as 7 to 1, so that efficiency should "rule the roost" almost wholly. And that 7 to 1 was the considered estimate of the whole Institute—that is to say, it was suggested as a basis by the executive, and was referred to the District Institutes and approved by them all.

162. Are you not aware of the fact that under the administration of affairs by some Boards assistant masters cannot get the headmastership of their own school?—I think it is a rule here. I am aware that it is so under some Boards.

Mr. Hogben: It is in the present Act—unless the position is thrown open.

Witness: And it is provided in the present Bill that the assistant shall not be transferred to the position.

163. *Mr. Guthrie*.] Has your Institute considered that aspect of affairs—that a first assistant is debarred from being an applicant for the headmastership?—He is not debarred from becoming an applicant.

Mr. Hogben: It must be thrown open. He cannot be transferred unless it is thrown open.

Witness: The question was raised at our special meeting, but it was pointed out that it is not intended to bar the first assistant from applying; it is intended to prevent him from being transferred without competition. That is the point. That is all we ask for. We ask that all be treated alike.

164. *Mr. Guthrie*.] Are you not aware that in the interests of the schools and the pupils the supervision of Committees is absolutely necessary?—No, I am not.

165. Is it not for the good of the school?—I am aware that the assistance of a good Committee is a great help to a school.

166. Would you take from those Committees the power of suggestion to the Board that something is wrong with the teaching in the school? Would you leave the Board to find out for themselves?—I think the Board has its own officers to find out such things.

167. Are you aware that cases have occurred where the Committee have, by bringing under the Board's notice the action of teachers, done a great deal of good?—Yes, I know that such cases have occurred.

168. Do you know of your own personal knowledge that there have been such cases?—Yes, I think I can say that of my personal knowledge there have been such cases.

169. *Mr. Sidey.*] You stated that there was just one resolution that was not carried with unanimity: did that remark apply to the franchise?—No; it applied to the resolution regarding the power of Committees to recommend dismissal.

170. Are we to understand that the Institute was almost unanimous in recommending that the franchise should be altered on which the Boards are elected?—Yes, practically so. Speaking from memory I do not think there was a division on it.

171. Do you think it is desirable that one portion of the Board should be elected on one franchise and one on another?—I cannot say that I see any objection to it; in fact, we are asking that one other franchise be instituted. You will notice a paragraph where we ask that one representative be elected by the teachers to each Board.

172. You recognize that under the Bill there is no intention to alter the franchise upon which the Board is elected unless School Committees are amalgamated, when the present system would not be applicable?—That is so. I take it that the provision is intended to meet a request for a wider franchise for Boards, and that it has been done as far as it could be done at reasonable cost.

173. Is not this the reason for the alteration proposed in the Bill: several school districts are amalgamated; there will only be one Committee to elect in that district; there will only be one perhaps where there is a very large number of schools; so the object is not necessarily to widen the basis of the franchise upon which the Boards are elected at present, but to meet a difficulty which will arise if school districts are amalgamated: is not that the reason for it?—It did not appeal to me in that way.

174. Do you not think that while the existing system continues—while the system of Boards and Committees continues as at present—it is desirable to have the Boards and the Committees brought into touch with one another by a system of election such as we have at present?—I have not any very decided opinion on the matter. It is too big a question.

175. Would you say that the Institute has not considered it very carefully?—Yes.

176. *Mr. Hogben.*] Is your suggestion with regard to the powers of municipal authorities an extension of section 303 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1908 [Act shown to witness]?—Yes.

177. You wish that to extend to primary schools?—Yes.

ALBERT ERSKINE examined. (No. 37.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am president of the New Zealand Educational Institute, and first assistant at the Terrace School, Wellington.

2. Are you speaking on behalf of the Institute?—Yes. We desire to place before the Committee a number of resolutions dealing with the Bill from beginning to end. I might say that these resolutions are the outcome of meetings of the District Institutes, and also of a special meeting of the New Zealand Educational Institute held about a fortnight ago, and they may be taken as the actual opinions of the great bulk of the teachers of the Dominion. We are really speaking for the whole service. Mr. Parkinson will deal with all the subjects with the exception of salaries, which matter I shall refer to. The resolutions are as follows:—

Education Bill, 1914.—Notes of Representations made to the Education Committee of the House of Representatives by the Executive of the New Zealand Educational Institute.

Council of Education.—The Institute welcomes the proposal to set up a Council of Education with the measure of administrative powers bestowed upon the Council, and hopes that experience of its working will warrant its being entrusted with the general administration of the education system.

Inspectors.—In the opinion of the Institute the Inspectors, who are actually in touch with the inspection and examination of the schools, should be directly represented on the General Council of Education, and to secure this representation clause (c) should be altered to read, "One other officer of the Education Department, who shall be an Inspector, shall be appointed by the Minister."

Casual Vacancies.—The Institute recommends that all casual vacancies be filled by the electing bodies.

District Councils.—The Institute endorses the proposal to establish District Councils, but requests that the member who represents the primary teachers on the District Council be appointed by the District Institute.

Education Boards.—The Institute urges most strongly on the Minister that there should be not more than five, but preferably only four, education districts.

Franchise.—The Institute strongly urges that in urban areas as well as in urban districts the members of Education Boards be elected on the municipal franchise, and that as early as possible some wider franchise than at present in force be introduced in rural areas. In addition to the members already designated, one member should be elected by the certificated teachers within the district.

School Libraries.—The Institute notes with pleasure the provision for affording assistance to school libraries.

Removal Expenses of Teachers.—The Institute requests that the words "removal expenses of teachers" be added to clause (e) of section 34 of the Bill.

Appointments.—Pending the establishment of a Dominion scheme of grading and appointment of teachers, in no case shall the name of more than one teacher be submitted to a School Committee for consideration. The Institute urges that all appointments of teachers be made from a Dominion graded list, to be drawn up on the basis of efficiency and service, and supplied to Boards for the purpose of determining appointments. The Institute further suggests that the following be added

to section 67, relating to transfers: "(d.) In any case where an alteration of the grading of a position would result in the promotion of any teacher above another senior to him and equally efficient." (Note.—It is considered that when a school rises in grade automatic promotion of the present teacher or teachers should not be made if there are other teachers more entitled to promotion. This is to be subject to the proviso that no teacher be reduced in salary through the rearrangement of the staff.)

Dismissal.—The Institute urges that subsection (1) of section 68 should be deleted.

Manual Instructors.—The Institute suggests that instructors employed solely in the manual training of primary-school pupils should be classified as primary-school teachers for the purposes of salary.

Inspectors.—The Institute is of opinion that in Part I of the Twelfth Schedule the line "Assistant Inspectors" should be struck out, and that the minimum salary for an Inspector should be £500, rising by annual increments to at least £650. Further, that there should be an Inspector for every fifty schools.

Dental and Medical Treatment.—The Institute considers that section 131 is too drastic, and that provision should be made by the Public Health Department for free dental and medical treatment for the children of parents in poor circumstances.

Subsidies on Local Contributions.—The Institute heartily welcomes the provision in the Bill for subsidizing local contributions, believing that this will lead to a greatly increased appreciation of the value of education, and would recommend a further provision that local governing bodies be permitted to make grants to primary schools. The Institute recommends that the limit in proviso (c) of section 155 be £350 instead of £250.

Superannuation.—The Institute requests that the Superannuation Act be amended so that retiring-allowances be calculated on the three best years of service, and that house allowances be taken into consideration in the computation.

Probationers.—The Institute recommends that in order to hasten the date when column 6 of Part I of the Sixth Schedule will be operative the number of probationers be considerably increased; and that, with a view of making the teaching profession more attractive to young people, the salaries of probationers and allowances of training-college students be materially increased.

Staffs and Salaries.—Whilst fully recognizing the honest effort of the Minister to improve the rate of teachers' salaries, the Institute regrets that the Minister has not fully realized the inadequacy of the present scale, and provided a more liberal scale of salaries in the new Education Bill. The Institute views with keen disappointment the fact that the old basis for the computation of salaries has been retained, whereas teachers unanimously desire a scheme of salary and promotion based on efficiency and service.

The improved staffing for schools of 321–330 and 451–480 in average attendance is noted with appreciation, but, on the other hand, it is necessary to draw attention to a decrease in staff proposed for schools of over 600. Even with the improvements noted the scale of staffing is still inferior to those of other countries, as shown in the following table:—

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PUPILS PER TEACHER.

London County Council	40.0
England (Board schools)	33.2
Wales (Board schools)	29.4
Scotland	37.7
New York State	26.3
Switzerland	42.7
Switzerland (Canton of Geneva)	25.0
United States	25.0
New Zealand	47.6

Before leaving the matter of staffing, the Institute recommends that when a school has had for any four successive quarters an attendance above the maximum of its grade the additional staff should be provided without further delay.

The Institute strongly urges upon Parliament that the minimum salary for a trained and certificated teacher should be £130 a year, and the maximum not less than £450. The following reasons are urged in support of the claim for the minimum named:—

- (1.) The scarcity of teachers, particularly male teachers. The supply at the price offering is not equal to the demand.
- (2.) Most of those concerned are engaged in small country schools; and pupils in those schools have as much right to the services of efficient teachers as those in larger centres. The inefficient rural school is a very real detriment to life in remote districts.
- (3.) The commencing salary proposed in the Bill is not sufficient to induce either parents or candidates to make the sacrifices that are demanded by the lean years of training.
- (4.) The expenses of living in country districts are much greater than in towns, and this tends to check the supply of applicants.
- (5.) Even with the proposed scale amended as asked for the salary of many teachers would be less than the wages of journeymen in trades, letter-carriers, railway porters, policemen, &c.

The Institute recommends that the schedule for separate boys' schools should be made to apply to separate girls' and separate infants' schools.

The Institute considers that the salaries proposed for assistants are not sufficient for married men. Most of those concerned live in the areas of high rents, and the general rise in the cost of living has reduced the value of their salaries below original amount. A very large proportion of these teachers have to add to their incomes by private teaching to the detriment of their school-work. The Institute proposes, for salaries only, the following amendment of the schedule :—

GRADES PROPOSED—FOR SALARIES ONLY.

Grade.	In Bill.			By Institute.		
	Attendance.	Schools.	Salary.	Attendance.	Schools.	Salary.
			£ £			£ £
I 	9-20	643	100-140	9-20	643	130-140
II 	21-35	456	140-190	21-30	360	140-190
III 	36-80	508	200-250	31-80	604	200-250
IV _A	81-120	115	200-250	81-120	201	260-310
IV _B , c 	121-240	122	260-310
V 	241-400	66	320-360	201-400	102	320-360

The Institute asks that in schools of Grade VB no second assistant should receive less than a Grade IV salary. Those concerned (there are not many) are mostly women teachers of proved efficiency, who, besides taking charge of the infants' department, exercise a general supervision of the girls of the school, and direct their instruction in sewing.

The Institute considers that the salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers are totally inadequate. They should be paid at least as well as cadets appointed to other branches of the Public Service.

The Institute proposes that Part V of the Sixth Schedule should read as follows :—

SECONDARY DEPARTMENTS OF DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOLS.							
Average Attendance.				Grades of Salaries of Assistants.			
12-20	..	4					
21-30	..	5					
31-55	..	6	4				
56-90	..	6	4	3			
91-130	..	7	5	3	3		
131-165	..	7	5	4	3	3	
166-200	..	7	5	4	4	3	3

The Institute points out that from the point of view of the community, perhaps the greatest reform of recent years has been the institution of the free-place system. Outside the larger towns the success of the system depends on the quality of the teaching staff of the secondary departments. The salaries hitherto paid have been so low that the best of teachers have abandoned this part of the work, or are trying to do so. The result is that the work tends to fall into the hands of inexperienced and ill-equipped juniors, who are by no means qualified to carry on the work as it should be carried on. Experience has shown that the work demands, and will repay, the best efforts of the most skilled and enthusiastic teachers, and the Institute strongly urges that such salaries will be offered as will secure to this part of the education system the right kind of assistance. It is not too much to say that on the use made of the free places in district high schools depends the future of very many of the best of the young people of the country districts and smaller towns.

The Institute commends to the consideration of Parliament the necessity of providing what may be called picked staffs for normal schools and training colleges. The suggested scale of staffs and salaries appended to these notes is submitted for most favourable consideration.

The Institute requests that, in the matter of the introduction of the increased scale of salaries, the teaching service be treated in the same way as is customary with other public servants—that is to say, that the scale be dated back to the beginning of the financial year.

Finally, the Institute takes upon itself the responsibility of asserting that all the increases of salary and additional staffing that have been asked for are justified by the importance that is to be attached to education in the life of the nation. The Institute urges that the cost of education should be looked at not so much as money spent, but as capital invested. Economists and educationists alike declare that capital so invested yields a better dividend in increased national output than any other investment. This country has invested large sums in railways, land-settlement, and other measures for increasing the total national efficiency. The Institute presses the consideration of the importance of education, both intellectual and physical, as the greatest of all means of fostering that part of the national life which, while not itself reducible to financial terms, is yet the moulding-force of the character and intellect that will eventually decide the economic and financial position of the nation. Rich as New Zealand is per head of population, it cannot be said that it is spending as much in proportion on the education and training of its own citizens as some other countries.

The private wealth of the people of New Zealand is given as £245 per head of the population, excluding Maoris. It cannot therefore be maintained that the country is unable to afford proper support of its education system. In fact, it is doing less in this direction than London, although the conditions of this Dominion necessitate a greater relative expenditure for the same services,

SUGGESTED STAFFS AND SALARIES FOR NORMAL SCHOOLS AND TRAINING COLLEGES.

(a.) Principal of the training college, £600 a year, or £700 if he be also Professor or Lecturer on Education at the University college.

(b.) Headmaster of the normal school, salary of £450 to £500, together with house allowance as for head teacher of a public school of Grade 7.

(c.) First assistant, head teacher of model school, first secondary assistant, kindergarten mistress, science master, each with a salary of Grade 5 head teacher (£320–£360).

(d.) Other assistants, lecturers, and instructors appointed by the Minister as follows: One with salary of Grade 6 (£260–£280); two with salary of Grade 5 (£230–£250); one with salary of Grade 4 (£190–£220); two with salary of Grade 3 (£150–£180).

(e.) If there be a second model school, the maximum staff named above may, with the approval of the Minister, be increased as follows:—

(i.) For school of type 3 (c) (i), one teacher of Grade 5 (£320–£360), and one assistant, Grade 3 (£150–£180).

(ii.) For school of type 3 (c) (ii), one assistant, Grade 4 (£190–£220).

(iii.) For school of type 3 (c) (iii), one teacher, Grade 5 (£320–£360).

(f.) If there be a junior kindergarten class or classes, one assistant with a salary of Grade 4 (£190–£220).

3. *Mr. Hanan (Acting-Chairman).*] Will you proceed now with your comments on the resolutions, mentioning at the time the paragraph on which you comment?—The first paragraph I wish to deal with is that relating to staffs and salaries. The Institute regrets that the Minister has not fully realized the inadequacy of the present scale. I will not say anything further about that at present; it will come out as I proceed to put the various points. With regard to the present basis of the computation of salaries, we have to express our keen regret that the Minister has not been able to formulate a scheme for the grading of teachers. The Institute desires that teachers should be graded, and that a minimum and a maximum salary should be attached to each grade. It feels that in a salary scheme based on average attendance there must always be anomalies. Even in the proposed scale, which is a vast improvement on previous scales, and has given great relief to various sections of teachers—even there there are still some anomalies, which I will endeavour to point out as I go along. With regard to staffing, we are pleased to note that an improvement has been made in the staffing of schools, especially in schools between 321 and 350 in attendance and between 451 and 480. We also are pleased that whereas the Act provides a teacher for every forty up to 200 children, and thereafter one for every fifty, the Bill provides one for every forty up to 400, and thereafter one for every fifty. The Institute regrets that that has not been carried right through so as to apply to all the schools in the country. I have to urge strongly that the staffing should not be reduced for schools over 600. A reference to the scale will show that there will be one assistant less for schools of over 600.

Mr. Hogben: That is a misprint.

Witness: We were hoping it was.

Mr. Hogben: There is one added.

Witness: Then I need not say any more about that. We should also like to point out that with the improvements noted the scale of staffing is still inferior to the scales of other countries, as is shown in the above table of our statement. This statement is really taken from the Education Report, and is put in our statement to show that the staffing is not quite so good yet as in other countries. The 47.6 shown is the number per teacher for schools of over 200 according to the Education Report for 1912. We have not the latest report. Then, the Institute recommends that when a school has had for any four successive quarters an attendance above the maximum of its grade, the additional staff should be provided without further delay. At present the addition to the staff is made at the beginning of the year, though a school may for four successive quarters—ending, say, in March or June—have had an attendance big enough to warrant an addition to the staff. The Institute thinks that the addition should be made at the end of the four successive quarters, instead of at the end of the year. Now I come to the matter of salaries proper. “The Institute strongly urges upon Parliament that the minimum salary for a trained and certificated teacher should be £130 a year.” At present the minimum salary under the Bill is £100, and under the Act of last session £100. We offer various reasons in our recommendations for our contention that the minimum salary should be £130. First of all, it is admitted that there is a scarcity of teachers at the present salary. I am speaking of men now, rather than of women. The supply of women is equal to the demand, I think, but in the case of men it is not so. I have only to refer to the returns for the training colleges to show that. In the case of the Wellington Training College for 1910 there were twenty-seven men in training and seventy-three women; or of the whole of the teachers in training the men were 27 per cent. In 1911 there were thirty-one men and sixty-six women, or 31 per cent. were men. In 1912 there were only twenty-five men, while there were seventy-nine women, or 24 per cent. of men. In 1913 there were twenty-two men and eighty-six women, or only 20 per cent. of men. These figures show that there has been a gradual decrease in men at the Wellington Training College in those years. In the training colleges for the Dominion there were in 1911 131 men and 258 women, of the whole number the men being 34 per cent. In 1912 there were 113 men and 285 women, or only 28 per cent. of men. So that the experience of the Wellington Training College is really the experience of all the training colleges of the Dominion.

4. *Mr. Sidey.*] Have you got the figures for 1913?—No; the report for 1913 is not out yet. These figures tend to show that there are fewer men offering for the profession year by year; and we must regard this as caused in great measure by the conditions offering in the service, especially with regard to salary. Then, again, we are competing with the Civil Service all along the line. Since the Civil

Service Commissioners took charge they have evidently made the conditions much better in the Civil Service. I can instance one case. The Commissioner, in advertising for telegraph runners, stated that if a youth paid a certain amount of attention to telegraphy he would get an increase in salary; and if he passed the Junior Civil Service Examination at a later date he could go on advancing, and by the age of twenty-eight receive £220 a year. We are in competition with such conditions as those, and the result is that men are not entering the teaching profession as they should. We think that we might attract men into the profession if we gave them a better starting salary. Now, many of those concerned in this £130 a year are engaged in small country schools, and it must be admitted, of course, that a percentage of those teachers are perhaps earning as much as they are entitled to; but we wish to look at the matter from the point of view of the child, too. Should not a child in a country district receive as great benefits from the education system as a child in a town district? I think he should; and consequently a better class of teacher should be provided for those schools. Another reason why a minimum of £130 should be granted is this: training-college students are those who have to take these lower positions. They have spent five years at least in training—two or three years as a pupil-teacher, and then two years at least in a training college. They have strenuous work, having to pass various examinations, and their allowance is at the rate of £30 a year during their time of training. Of course, they are getting their training at the cost of the State, but if they had not parents who could afford to support them during that time we should not even get the number of men in the training colleges that we have at the present time. We think that on leaving the training college they should receive a salary of something like £130 a year, so as to make up for those lean years of training. In this way the child of the country school would benefit as well as the teacher. Then, again, the expense of living in the country districts is very great—quite as great as in town. In the country food products are very expensive. I was told of a case only the other day where in one of the backblock districts kerosene is twice the price that it is in town. Then if a teacher wishes to go into the nearest township or town the expense of travelling is very great. And there are other items. I should now like to draw your attention to page 6. The Institute proposes, for salaries only, certain amendments of the schedule to the Bill. The Bill provides for three grades—the first 9–20, the second 21–35, and the third grade 36–80. The Institute suggests that the first grade be 9–20, as in the Bill; the second grade 21–30, instead of 21–35; and the third grade 31–80. These suggested grades are for salaries only, and not for staffing. The point here is that we wish to place schools of average attendance 31–35 in the third grade, so reducing the number of schools in Grade II, and adding ninety-six schools in Grade III at the higher salary. It is admitted on all hands that schools between 31–35 are very difficult schools to teach. There is only one teacher, and he is generally in charge of all the standards. It was felt that a man in that position is doing practically as much work and as good work as the man in Grade III who has a school of, say, forty, for the man in Grade III with a school of forty has an assistant, and consequently the work of the headmaster is cut down to a great extent. These schools also are the very small country schools; and here again, if those schools are placed in the new Grade III suggested by the Institute for salaries alone, the people of those districts will secure a better-paid man, and consequently a man who ought to be more experienced. Then the cry from the backblocks that the children of the pioneering settlers are not receiving the education that they ought to receive would not be heard so much. It seems to me that in a scheme where the salaries depend upon the average attendance there must always be blocks in the scale. There is a block between Grade III and Grade IV, and then again between Grade IV and Grade V—a sort of dead wall. I might explain it in this way: In Grade III under the Bill there are 508 headmasters; in Grade IVa there are 115; and what I mean by the block is that those 508 head teachers have very little chance of promotion, for there are only 115 positions open for them in the various schools throughout the Dominion. 508 head teachers are waiting for 115 positions.

5. *Mr. Hogben.*] IVA is misquoted. IVA has 121 to 160. Those 115 schools are all in the same grade as the 508?—From IIIA, 26–80, there are 508. Yes, I see there is a misprint. I am referring to IIIB grade, to those schools of from 36 to 80, and the schools of 121–180. What I mean by the block is this that there are 508 headmasters in schools of Grade IIIA and 115 in schools of Grade IIIB, which is 81–120. The block occurs between IIIB and IVA.

6. In IIIB there are 118 schools, and in IVA there are 89 schools?—Yes. Well, the suggestion of the Institute is that at present there are 508 headmasters in 36–80 and 115 in 81–120, and all to receive the same salary under the Bill. The proposal is to delete Grade IIIB and place the 115 schools in the grade above, making in all 165 schools in that grade, instead of 50 as I have here, or instead of 89 as Mr. Hogben has just pointed out. The Institute suggests that the Grade V, at present 240–400, should be 201–400. That will include schools between 201 to 240, which are marked IVc. The desire is to put those into Grade VA, and give them the higher salary. The effect would be to take thirty-six schools out of Grade IVc and place them in Grade VA. It will be seen that in the Grade VB the headmasters of those schools only get a rise of £10 on their maximum under the Bill, while the assistants get no increases at all.

FRIDAY, 28TH AUGUST, 1914.

ALBERT ERSKINE continued his statement and was examined. (No. 38.)

Witness: Just before the Committee adjourned at their last meeting I was discussing the table on page 6 of our statement setting out the grades of schools in the Bill and the grades of schools suggested by the Institute as far as salaries are concerned. The table was not set out in the detail that

we have since thought was necessary, and I ask permission to put in another table, which explains the whole matter in detail. There was a little confusion between Grades III and IV in the statement that we put in, and I wish to clear that up. [Table handed in by witness, as follows] :—

Grades proposed—For Salaries only.

In Bill.				By Institute.			
Attendance.	Grade.	Schools.	Salary.	Attendance.	Grade.	Schools.	Salary.
9-20	I	643	£ £ 100-140	9-20	I	643	£ £ 130-140
21-35	II	456	140-190	21-30	II	360	140-190
36-80	IIIA	508	200-250	31-80	III	604	200-250
81-120	IIIB	115	200-250	81-160	IVA	165	260-310
121-160	IVA	50	260-310
161-200	IVB	36	260-310	161-200	IVB	36	260-310
201-240	IVC	36	260-310	201-280	VA	58	320-360
241-280	VA	22	320-360
281-320	VB	18	320-360	281-320	VB	18	320-360

I wish that detailed table to go in in place of the one appearing on page 6 of our statement. I desire now to explain the suggestions that we make with regard to the alterations in the scale. In the Bill there are seven grades of schools instead of ten, and therefore seven grades of salary instead of ten. The Institute is specially pleased with the larger range given in the case of salaries in that particular, but it has certain suggestions to offer which it considers would make an improvement in the scale. I wish to refer, first of all, to Grade III. In the Bill Grade III is in two sections—A and B—in which there are 623 teachers, all earning a salary of £200 to £250. I may say that the figures we give in regard to schools are the nearest we have at our disposal; they are not the latest, but they will be quite satisfactory as far as what we wish to illustrate is concerned. In Grade IV there are three sections of schools, numbering altogether 122, and all headmasters of these schools are paid from £260 to £310. In Grade V there are four sections—A, B, C, and D—sixty-six schools, all the headmasters of which are paid under the Bill £320 to £360. Of the 623 schools in Grade III, 115 are in Grade IIIB, and the headmasters get an increase of £10 on the maximum, while the 230 assistants engaged in those schools get no increase whatever. Of the 122 schools in Grade IV thirty-six are in IVC. The headmasters of these schools do not get an increase at all under the Bill—in fact, they start with a £10 lower minimum—and the seventy-two assistants in those schools do not get an increase. We fully appreciate the difficulties involved in drawing up a scale where the schools are graded for the purposes of salary as well as of staffing; and in a scale such as this there must be boundaries to the grades, and the men in the schools on the boundaries of the grades are the men who suffer under the Bill, as I have tried to show. Again, there are 623 men in Grade III who are waiting for 122 positions in Grade IV. Then there are 122 men in Grade IV who are waiting for sixty-six positions in Grade V. Under such conditions it must be admitted that promotion will be very slow indeed. Now, taking those things into consideration, the Institute has the following suggestions to make. It suggests that the 115 schools in Grade IIIB should be placed in Grade IVA, and that the thirty-six schools in Grade IVC should be placed in Grade VA. Then you would have the position which is shown in the figures on the opposite side of the table. There would then be in Grade III 604 teachers, in Grade IVA there would be 165 teachers, and in IVB thirty-six teachers, so you would have 604 teachers in Grade III waiting for 201 positions in Grade IV. The Institute further suggests that the thirty-six schools in Grade IVC should be placed in Grade VA, and the position would then be that instead of the sixty-six schools in the latter grade there would be 102. Instead of there being 623 men in Grade III waiting for 122 positions you would have under the Institute's proposal 604 men waiting for 201 positions—that is, there would be three times as many men to positions under the Institute's suggestion as against five times as many under the Bill. Then there is an improvement between Grade IV and Grade V in the same way. The effect of this change would be to give a certain number of teachers increases in salary who get little or no increase under the Bill, and at the same time it seems to us that it would make promotion from one grade to another easier. There would not be such a block between Grade III and Grade IV and between Grade IV and Grade V as there would be under the Bill. With regard to the higher grades, I have to say on behalf of the Institute that it is delighted at the action of the Minister and the Government in placing all schools over 501 in the higher grade. That means a very great gain indeed to the service, for where originally there were only about thirty-one what we might call "plums" in the profession there are now fifty-nine, and not only do the headmasters benefit by this but the assistants in those schools as well. That is the explanation of the figures I have submitted. I wish now to draw the attention of the Committee to a statement at the top of page 6 of our statement, "The Institute considers that the salaries proposed for assistants are not sufficient for married men. Most of those concerned live in the areas of high rents, and the general rise in the cost of living has reduced the value of their salaries below the original amount. A very large proportion of these teachers have to add to their incomes by private teaching, to the detriment of their school-work." This resolution specially applies to the male assistants in the large city schools—both the first and the second assistants. In the majority of cases these men are married; they are living in expensive areas where rents are

very high; and they find it very difficult to get along comfortably on the salary which is at present paid and which is proposed to be paid, and they think they will not be able to do much better under the proposal in the Bill. Many of these men, in order to improve their financial position, have to do extra work. They are engaged occasionally as often as three or four times a week in the evenings on extra work—coaching—and that must interfere with the work for which the State pays them. The Institute is strongly of opinion that these teachers should receive a larger increase than is proposed under the Bill. I understand that an assistant from the Wellington District is to give evidence before the Committee, and the New Zealand Educational Institute desires to support the claim of these teachers for more consideration. It is just possible that it may be said that these men—first assistants—might go into the country and take country schools. I have looked through the scale, and I find that only about sixty-six places would be vacant which they would be inclined to apply for or would be eligible for. These would be headmasterships of schools in Grade V, and there they would come into competition with the 122 headmasters of Grade IV schools, so there is not very much chance of promotion in that direction. We ask for the very favourable consideration of the Committee with regard to the claim of these assistant masters. At the foot of page 5 there is the following resolution: “The Institute recommends that the schedule for separate boys’ schools be made to apply to separate girls’ and separate infants’ schools.” At present there is a different schedule for each class of school. At our meeting it was agreed fairly unanimously that the salaries for the girls’ and the infants’ should be the same as for the boys’ schools. There are very few of these schools in the Dominion; I think there are only about nine, five being infants’, two boys’, and two girls’. The women teachers in those schools consider that they are doing exactly the same work as the men in the boys’ schools, and that they should get the same pay. Those were two points that I left in order to go on with the scale. The next resolution to which I have to draw your attention is on page 6, at the foot of the table: “The Institute asks that in schools of Grade VB no second assistant should receive less than a Grade IV salary. Those concerned (there are not many) are mostly women teachers of proved efficiency, who, besides taking charge of the infants’ department, exercise a general supervision of the girls of the school and direct their instruction in sewing.” There are only eighteen of those women teachers. It can be admitted that they are all experienced teachers. They are responsible for a good deal of the work of the school, and it is felt that in that particular instance an increase to a Grade IV salary would be an improvement. Then there is this resolution: “The Institute considers that the salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers are totally inadequate. They should be paid at least as well as cadets appointed to other branches of the Public Service.” This has been brought under public notice frequently for a number of years now, and the Institute is still of opinion that it would be a splendid thing for the service if the pupil-teacher could be paid as well as the cadet in the Post Office, or in the Railways, or one of the other public Departments.

1. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] What do you mean in the previous paragraph where you say “less than a Grade IV salary”: do you mean a Grade IV salary of an assistant teacher in the schedule?—Yes.

Mr. Hogben: That ought to be an arabic figure 4.

Witness: I am very sorry. With regard to pupil-teachers, we consider that it would be a good thing for the service if pupil-teachers were to receive salaries equal to those paid in other public Departments. It is only necessary to compare the salaries paid to cadets with those paid to the pupil-teachers to show that the latter do not get the same treatment at all. For instance, in the Post Office, Clerical Division, in the first year the cadet receives £50, while in his first year the pupil-teacher gets only £35. In the second year the Post Office cadet receives £65, the pupil-teacher £45. In the third year £80 as against £55. In the fourth year the cadet receives £96. The pupil-teacher is then in the training college and is receiving £30, and he continues to receive £30 for the second year he is there, while the Post Office official receives £100. In the Professional Branch of the Post Office the pay is very much larger still. In the Railways the cadet receives in the first year £50, in the second £65, the third £80, the fourth £95, and the fifth £110. From this comparison it will be seen that the pupil-teacher certainly does not receive pay equal to that in other Departments. It is the intention of the Department to eliminate the pupil-teacher altogether, and that is gradually being done, but in 1911 we still had 707 pupil-teachers, and 638 in 1912. I cannot give you the number for this year, but we still have a large number with us, and it will be some considerable time before we see the last of the pupil-teachers and have assistants in their places. As that is the case, and as the pupil-teachership is practically the door to the service, we consider that the pupil-teacher should receive a very much better salary, because in this particular the teaching service is in direct competition with the Civil Service, and the consequence is that suitable material for the making of good teachers, which the country certainly requires, is not coming to us at all, but is going in other directions where the pay is better. I will now ask the Committee to turn to page 7. The Institute proposes that Part V of the Sixth Schedule, with regard to secondary departments of district high schools, should be amended. It proposes to alter the grades of schools slightly and to alter the grades of salaries. The first two grades in the scale in our statement are exactly the same as the two grades in the Bill, but we suggest that the next grade should be from 31 to 55—that a new assistant should be appointed at 31 and another one at 56, instead of, as in the Bill, one at 31 and another at 71. The proposal also is to improve the salaries of assistants in the direction set out in the scale. It means an increase to all the assistants in those schools.

2. *Mr. Hogben.*] Only to the first and second assistants?—Yes, first and second assistants. I understand that there are only three district high schools in the Dominion having an average attendance of over 70. Under the proposal of the Institute the average salary in the 31-to-55 school would be £225. Under the Bill it is £210. In the next group—56 to 90—the average salary would be £200, while under the Bill it is £190. The Institute considers that these men and women engaged in this work—mostly university men and women—should receive salaries equal to those paid to the assistants

in high schools. Under the Bill the male assistants in the high schools are to receive an average salary of £250 a year. Under the suggestion of the Institute the assistants will receive only £225, but that would be an improvement on the proposal in the Bill. For some considerable time it has been felt by the service that the salaries paid in the secondary departments of these public schools are not sufficient to obtain the kind of teacher that will make a success of this system of district high schools. The institution of the free-place system is perhaps one of the greatest reforms of recent years, and it is in the country districts where this reform should be of the greatest advantage; but the difficulty is that, the salaries being low, the more experienced teacher will not go into the secondary department of the district high school, and those who have taken positions are anxious to get out and go back to the primary department. The first assistant of a secondary department, say of fifty-six children, has very important duties to perform. He is responsible practically for the working of the whole of that secondary department. The headmaster of the primary school is supposed to give a certain amount of supervision, but he is told that he must not neglect his primary department for the sake of the secondary. Therefore the assistants in these secondary departments are engaged in very important and responsible work, and with the small salaries we can only get inexperienced and perhaps ill-equipped junior teachers, who are not giving what the State should receive and what is necessary in order to make the free-place system the success it ought to be in the country. We therefore have to ask the Committee to give the proposal very favourable consideration. There is one other resolution that I wish to refer to, at the top of page 8. It was passed by the Institute. In our resolutions we state, "The Institute requests that, in the matter of the introduction of the increased scale of salaries, the teaching service be treated in the same way as is customary with other public servants—that is to say, that the scale be dated back to the beginning of the financial year." Then we have put forward the suggested staffs and salaries for normal schools and training colleges. I do not intend to go into this matter at all. We have simply been asked by the training-college people to submit this suggestion along with our own resolutions, and we ask the Committee to give it consideration. That completes the remarks I wish to make on the salaries question. In conclusion I should like to say that we feel that in asking for increases of salaries that we are justified by the important work that we are expected to carry out. The whole trend of educational matters is different from what it was a number of years ago. We are expected now to be engaged in producing high-class citizens, mentally, morally, and physically sound. Great changes have taken place, and we feel that the country is making no mistake if it is lavish with regard to its expenditure in education. Other countries have largely increased their expenditure in this direction. The United States in a few years has increased its expenditure from £4 4s. 2d. to £6 10s. 4d. per head. England in a few years doubled its expenditure on education, and we feel that New Zealand will not be making any mistake if it largely increases its expenditure, and I am sure the public will support anything that is done in that way.

3. The Institute wants the member who represents the primary teachers on the District Council to be appointed by the District Institute. Supposing that a District Institute did not contain the bulk of the teachers, would you disfranchise the rest of the teachers of that district?—Certainly not; but the Institutes do contain the bulk of the teachers.

4. Every one of them?—Not all of them, but the bulk of them.

5. Taking the whole of the Dominion it may be true, but it may not be true that every District Institute contains the bulk of the teachers in the district?—It might possibly arise, but at the present time every Institute has a majority of the teachers in its district as members.

6. That has not been for long the case with every district?—I think so, for some years.

7. Is that the case with the Thames Institute?—That is only a branch Institute.

8. Why should not you give the vote to all the teachers—why give it to the Institute and leave out any teachers?—Of course, the Teachers' Institute is the representative of the district. If they wish for the vote it is an easy matter for them to join the Institute.

9. You compel them practically to join the Institute?—We think they ought to.

10. How do you propose to have the members of Education Boards in urban areas elected on the municipal franchise if there are several Committees?—That is a question that Mr. Parkinson dealt with. I am only dealing with the question of salaries.

11. You ask that the schedule for separate boys' schools should be made to apply to separate girls' schools and separate infants' schools: is that following out the idea that there should be equal pay for equal work for men and women?—I think not. We have not of late years discussed that matter at all.

12. What other purposes can you have?—In this particular instance it was considered that the women teachers in the girls' schools were doing practically the same work amongst the girls that the men teachers were doing in the boys' schools amongst the boys, and we think it reasonable to ask that the better salaries should be paid to the women teachers in those schools.

13. In other words, you thought it better to ask for equal pay for equal work?—Of course, in the particular instance it amounts to that.

14. Can you defend it and not ask for it in other cases too if they do equal work?—We have not been asked to do that.

15. What is your own personal opinion about it?—My own opinion is that there should be different schedules for men and women.

16. With regard to the disposal of the grades for the whole range of schools, your new proposal is an expansion to some extent or a correction of the other one?—It is simply putting it more in detail.

17. Do you think that there comes a stage at which a large number of teachers cannot reasonably hope for promotion?—I think so. There is a stage in the scale to which a certain percentage or a majority of the teachers can reach, but after that there are not places in the higher grades for them to fill.

18. Could there be under any scale?—Oh, no, not under a scale drawn up on average attendances.
19. But even if you draw it up on any other principle the number of teachers available for large schools must be according to the number of large schools?—That is so.
20. And if the number of large schools is small the number of places will be small whatever way you draw it up?—Yes.
21. What will those in Grade III get in six years' time if they remain there?—They will be receiving £250 in the sixth year.
22. And house allowance or a house?—Yes, there will be a house allowance of £30 a year, I think.
23. Generally those schools are in the country?—Yes.
24. Do you think it is dearer to live in the country than in the town?—Well, I did not think so until a few weeks ago, and a number of men who lived in the country set out to convince me that it was quite as expensive and probably more so.
25. You were convinced that it was so?—They have to travel from their schools into the village, and so on, where they get their food-supplies from. They must travel sometimes. Then the cost of supplies in the backblocks is greater.
26. Would they not get their food-supplies in the village where they live?—Not necessarily.
27. What size do the schools of Grade III go to?—Up to 120.
28. What population would you expect with a school of 120?—You would have a village there. I thought you were referring to the smaller schools.
29. There would be 700 people possibly?—Yes.
30. Would you not expect that in a place where there were 700 people there would be a store where they could get their supplies?—Certainly.
31. What would be the necessity to travel?—I was referring to the smaller schools. When I discussed that in my evidence I was referring to schools of Grades I and II.
32. But you do not propose to increase schools of Grade IIIA?—Yes, we do. I explained that in my evidence last time. I thought I would be only wasting time by repeating it. We proposed that schools between 31 and 35 should be placed in Grade III. That is the suggestion I made last time. There are ninety-six schools there that we propose to put up into Grade III. That makes the 604 schools.
33. Just some of them?—There are ninety-six of them.
34. What about the others?—The ones between 21 and 30—there will be 360 of those, and they will be left in Grade II.
35. I am speaking of the schools from 31 to 35?—We propose that Grade II shall be 21 to 30, and that the remainder of those schools of 31 to 35 shall be placed in Grade III.
36. Have you worked out what that would cost?—Yes. To place the ninety-six schools of an average attendance of 31 to 35 in Grade III as suggested would cost £5,760.
37. What about the other schools?—To place 115 schools of 81 to 120 in Grade IV as we suggest would cost, for headmasters £6,900, for 115 assistants £3,450, and for 150 junior assistants £2,300, a total of £12,650.
38. Have you made similar calculations as to what the rest of the proposal would cost?—Yes. To put thirty-six schools of Grade IVc in Grade V would cost £3,960. That would be thirty-six headmasters £2,160, thirty-six assistants £1,080, and thirty-six junior assistants £720.
39. Then there are the first assistants?—I have not worked out the cost for first assistants, because we have suggested no salary for them. We have simply asked that they be given an increase.
40. Have you no idea of what the increase would amount to? If you criticize a particular salary you must have some idea?—The idea of the assistants, I believe, is that they should be given an amount equal to half the house allowance paid to the headmasters of schools in which they are engaged.
41. But there are no houses for them now?—No.
42. It is simply another way of asking for an increase of salary?—It has been suggested, I believe, by the assistants that if they are married men they should receive house allowance equal to half the amount of the house allowance given to headmasters.
43. That is in addition to salary?—Yes.
44. Why do you distinguish between married men and unmarried men: is that an educational question or an economic question?—It looks like an economic question. I suppose the married men find it more difficult to live on the salaries than single men.
45. Do you know what the great mass of the public servants reach in the ordinary course of things?—I have no figures with regard to that.
46. Is it anything more than £220 a year?—Speaking from memory, the Civil Service Commissioners guarantee that a young man entering the Telegraph or Post Office Departments will reach £240 at the age of twenty-eight if he passes the Junior Civil Service Examination.
47. You are speaking of the Post Office, not the whole of the Public Service?—I am not taking the whole of the Service. I could not give you the figures for that, but in the Government Insurance Department I do not think there is a clerk receiving less than £220 a year in a certain division.
48. Which division is that?—Of course, there are junior clerks. I am speaking of the clerks with experience equal to the experience of a teacher.
49. Have you looked through the Classification List to see the salaries?—Not the whole list.
50. With regard to the secondary departments, are not most of the District High Schools taking up in one form or another the rural course?—I understand so.
51. Do you know how much is paid per head per pupil who takes up the rural course, besides the salaries in the Act—do you know it is £5 10s. per head?—I thought it was a little more.
52. You know that is in addition to the salaries?—I was not aware of that.
53. You know that it may be paid to those teachers if they are doing the special rural work?—No.

54. Do you know that at the Stratford District High School and at other schools it is paid?—No.

55. Does not that modify a good deal of what you say?—Yes, it does to a certain extent, but at the same time the assistant teachers in those schools are not as well equipped as they should be to carry out the work of those schools at the present time. When I say that I mean that they are not perhaps as experienced as they should be.

56. In Stratford?—I am not referring to Stratford particularly, but I am speaking generally. That is the expression of opinion of men who are headmasters with district high schools attached.

57. Where they are not paying the amount?—It said nothing about that.

58. Does not that make a great deal of difference?—Yes, of course, if they are paid the extra amount.

59. Do you not think it better to have masters at the schools teaching these rural subjects who are capable of taking them instead of having visiting teachers who are paid the £5 10s.?—Yes, I do.

60. *The Chairman.*] In your list of resolutions you state, "A very large proportion of these teachers have to add to their incomes by private teaching, to the detriment of their school-work." Do you seriously consider it is to the detriment of the school-work that the teachers should go in for private teaching and coaching?—I think so. In the case of a man who is engaged in doing that kind of work for several hours a night and several nights a week it must have an effect, and he must feel the strain in time.

61. If he does too much?—Well, I know personally there is a very large amount of work being done by those men, and we think it must affect their work during the day.

62. As a matter of fact is it not a good thing for many teachers to keep up special branches of work by teaching and coaching at night?—Yes, it may be.

63. I speak as an old teacher when I say that?—Yes, it no doubt keeps them up to date.

64. Do you not think the old-time teachers were just as desirous of developing every side of their pupils' characters and abilities as they are at the present day: do you think there is any special improvement in the calibre of the teacher of to-day as compared with the average teacher of, say, thirty years ago?—Of course, there are exceptions to every rule.

65. I am asking a general question?—I knew very many fine teachers in my young days, but I also knew many men who were not teachers at all, and they were in the service because they could not get anything else to do.

66. Do you not know some of that class to-day?—Yes, in every service we find that.

67. The system may have improved, but do you think the calibre of the teachers has improved?—Generally I think there is an improvement, and we are anxious to bring about a greater improvement in the calibre of the teacher, and this improvement in the salaries is one way of doing it.

ROBERT JAMES POPE, Headmaster, Kaiwarra School, made a statement and was examined. (No. 39.)

Witness: I wish to give evidence in the interests of the average teacher of New Zealand, with special reference to the position of head teachers in present Grade V. The bulk of our children are taught by the average teacher; this fact I wish to emphasize. That it is a platitude I am willing to admit, but just because it is a platitude its vital importance is being largely lost sight of. I wish now to brush away the dust, so to speak, that has been allowed to accumulate upon it, and to make its significance appear as clearly as it should. To have a strong middle class in the profession is as vital to its well-being as is a strong middle class to the well-being of a nation. Because the bulk of our children are taught by the average teacher, therefore it is of the highest importance to have the average teacher as efficient as possible. To attract enough capable men and women into the service to ensure your average teacher being thoroughly efficient you must make it worth their while. By this I mean you must make it possible for a fairly large proportion of these teachers to earn, without doing outside work, such a salary as will enable them, after twenty or twenty-five years' service, to live in decent comfort and free from financial worry. This is certainly not possible now; I know it by bitter experience. A teacher has, like other Government servants, a certain amount of appearance to keep up, more especially if he happens to be located in or near a town, for the public is apt to judge of a man's merits by the coat he wears. His wife and family, too, must endeavour to make a presentable appearance in the eyes of the public, and in endeavouring to do this on the meagre salaries that so many teachers are paid they are kept in a continual state of financial worry and anxiety. To the average teacher it is a monetary worry if his child requires a new pair of boots, and a doctor's bill for even a moderate amount is, for such a teacher, little short of a financial disaster. This is not the language of exaggeration; it is cold fact. A few highly paid positions at the top of the service, unattainable by all except the specially gifted or specially fortunate teacher, will never, I maintain, make the profession attractive. In the Bill new Grade III (£200 to £250, plus £30 house allowance) is the Ultima Thule of the average teacher. Positions carrying £400 or over are so few and are removed so far out of reach that only an exceptionally able or particularly fortunate teacher will ever succeed in crossing the wide desert of impecuniosity that lies between him and the promised land. All others must perish in the stony wastes. Does £280 a year (including house allowance) seem to be a sufficient reward for a lifetime of faithful service in a profession that is admittedly an arduous and exacting one? But, it may be asked, cannot teachers in new Grade III better themselves by passing into new Grade IV after a reasonable time? Let us see. In new Grade III there will be 623 schools; in new Grade IV there will be 122 schools; consequently there will be at least 623 teachers waiting for promotion to those 122 schools. Nor is this the worst of it, for many of the town assistants also will be competitors for the new Grade IV schools, though not for those of new Grade III. I ask, what chance of promotion has the average teacher who is below Grade IV? Coming to another point—efficient teachers for country

schools—I ask, will the Bill induce town assistants—the class of teacher most favourably situated for making himself efficient—will the Bill induce such to go into the country? I say it will not. It will not pay a senior town assistant to take a new Grade III school in the country at a salary of £200 to £250, and the ordinary two-teacher country schools are all in this grade; nor, owing to the keen competition for new Grade IV schools, will his chance of getting into a school of this grade be other than remote. I say the Bill will not induce town assistants to seek service in the country. First assistants (Grade VII), £290 to £310; second assistants (Grade VI), £260 to £280: clearly these will not seek positions in the country worth £250 plus a house. Third assistants (Grade V), £230 to £250: I do not believe that the undeniable charms of a country schoolhouse will have sufficient attractions for even the Grade V town assistant to make him forsake the pleasures of city life, especially when it is remembered that he is probably improving himself by attending a university, or adding to his income by coaching or other work for which there is no demand in the country. With regard to the position of teachers in present Grade V, head teachers in present Grade V are very hardly dealt with in the Bill, for not only do we get less than others under the Bill, but I believe I am correct in saying we get less than others in 1908. (1.) The average salary in present Grade V schools is unaltered by the Bill, for though the maximum salary is raised £10 the minimum is lowered £10. Of course, the lowering of the minimum does not affect the present teachers in the grade. (2.) There are 118 present Grade V schools. Half the head teachers in this grade are now at the top of their grade—many of them have been so for years. In the Bill these receive one increment of £10, and are then again at the top of their grade, new Grade III. They have plodded up to their present position by annual increments of £5; there they will remain, for the most part, and watch the lower-grade men overhaul them by annual increments of £10. Thus, in effect, they are disgraced. (3.) It may be objected that this same state of things obtains in the higher grades also. This is quite true; but there is this great point of difference: the new Grade III teacher is marooned on a barren coast and sees penury staring him in the face; the new Grade IV teacher is settled on a comparatively fertile spot, where he can make shift to live in decent comfort. The one exists; the other can get a reasonable amount of enjoyment out of life. New Grade III head teachers have, as I showed before, practically no chance of further promotion; they are stranded at £280 (including house allowance), with no incentive whatever to further effort other than a sense of duty. Here I may be met with the objection that by improving his certificate a teacher may fit himself for a position in any of the grades above him. There are two practical difficulties that operate against a teacher in present Grade V doing this: first, the majority—I think I may say the great majority—of men in this grade are men well up in years and consequently unfitted for a course of study; and, second, their duties are such that, even if they were of an age to study, they could not devote the necessary time to it without neglecting their work in their schools. (4.) The average increase provided for in the new Bill is £23 9s. The head teachers of present Grade V will not receive half this amount. With regard to a remedy, the remedy I suggest will not cure the complaint from which the profession is suffering—namely, malnutrition, as I think the Medical Inspectors put it—but it will bring much-needed relief to a considerable number. New Grade III is a very large grade, with 623 schools. New Grade IV, with 122 schools, is a small grade. Take present Grade V of 118 schools out of new Grade III and include it in new Grade IVa, making a total of 240. But perhaps it will be asked, will not this add materially to the cost of the scheme? Undoubtedly it will, but it will give you a much more efficient average teacher to teach the bulk of your children, and that is what I am here to advocate. It will enable about a hundred head teachers to receive a maximum of £310 who without this change would have practically no hope of ever advancing beyond £250. When one considers the salaries paid in, say, the Post and Telegraph service, surely this is no extravagant demand for us teachers to make. In the true interests of education in New Zealand the salary of the average teacher must be raised, and the alteration I propose would be a decided step in that direction. Professor Findlay, who lately visited this city, said it was a matter to be regretted that women are gradually ousting men from the teaching profession because we will not pay men sufficient salaries. This was the position in the United States, he said, and it was a most deplorable one. I need not tell you that this is rapidly becoming the position in New Zealand. I notice in the Press report of Professor Findlay's lecture that the Minister of Education expressed the hope that some of the reforms advocated by the distinguished lecturer would be effected during the present session. Would it be presumption on my part to express the hope that the payment of a better salary to the average teacher may be one of these reforms? I have here, and should like to place before the Committee, extracts from a large number of letters that I have received from all over New Zealand in connection with this matter—letters that show how widespread is the dissatisfaction with the salaries proposed in the Bill so far as they affect present Grade V. A West Coast headmaster writes, "I taught a Grade IV school for seventeen years, and now that I am hoping for something better it seems that I am to remain as a Grade IV. I have a wife and three children to support." A Nelson headmaster says, "Our Institute carried a motion to have Grade V (present) placed in Grade IV: the Nelson Education Board also forwarded a similar resolution to the Government." The head teacher of a Wanganui school writes, "I have been twenty-eight years in my present position, and have self, wife, and five children to keep." A Manawatu headmaster says, "Here am I after twenty-nine years of service, eleven spent here, to get a rise of £10 and then can get no further, as promotion from Grade III (new) will be worse than difficult. On £250 I am to keep a wife and four children in a manner befitting my supposed position." A Taranaki headmaster puts his case succinctly, "I have twenty-seven years' service—thirteen years in my present position—and no chance of promotion." A West Coast headmaster writes, "I have been for thirty-three years headmaster of this school, and my present salary is at least £50 less than when I first took charge. Being a small district there was no chance of promotion." A Canterbury headmaster writes, "The miserable treatment meted out to Grade V is the outstanding feature of the whole salary question." An Otago headmaster says, "Our grade is certainly

shabbily treated in the amending Bill." A Southland headmaster writes, "The local Institute has passed a resolution embodying your proposal." It will be observed that these letters cover a wide range; they are typical of scores received. Another headmaster writes, "There are grave defects in the schedule of salaries. I have had thirty-one years' service, and am in present Grade V (81-120)—£210-£240; new grade, £200-£250. Here is a drop of £10 at the start, and five years to reach the maximum, whereas some assistants start at £230 and reach the maximum in two years. I have to teach four standards—III, IV, V, VI—maybe, say, thirty-five to fifty children; have a large measure of responsibility for the other classes in teaching, clerical work, schemes of work, and examinations; oversight of all the interests of the school, besides all efforts for school funds; yet my grade is worse off than that of all first assistants of Grade Vb and of some second assistants. They start at £230, as against our £200. Most of them are simply class teachers, and with the new staffing will have a great advantage as compared with headmasters of Grade IIIb. In four grades or subgrades three extra assistants are provided, so these get a rise in salary and less work, while assistants in Grade IIIb do not get a rise of a penny on this year's salary; the headmaster gets £10 above present maximum after five years' service, but with no relief from the drudgery of attempting to do justice to four standards. The scale proposed by the New Zealand Educational Institute is nearer to the point of justice; or, better still, join Grades IIIb and IVa. Under the proposed grading no first assistants will ever seek appointments in country schools."

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to the increasing number of female teachers in New Zealand, do you think there is anything alarming about that—about the number that we have in New Zealand?—I think it is a great mistake to have women teaching boys over the age of ten or eleven.

2. Would you have no mixed schools at all, then?—I do not say that.

3. In that case how would you organize matters so that the men taught boys and the women taught girls? How could you organize matters?—I am not prepared to answer that question off-hand.

4. What proportion of the children are under ten years of age?—That also I could not say off-hand.

5. Would you be surprised to hear that half are under ten years of age?—No, I should not be surprised.

6. For those children would not women be generally the most suitable?—I would not say the "most" suitable.

7. But generally?—I believe in men teaching boys as far as possible.

8. Right down to tender age?—Yes.

9. Do you think most people are of the same opinion?—I could not say. That is my opinion.

10. You think it would be dangerous for women as a general rule to teach boys under ten?—I do not say it would be dangerous, but inadvisable.

11. For women to teach boys under ten?—Under ten or eleven, yes.

12. With regard to those over ten, should not women teach the girls if men teach the boys over ten?—Yes.

13. What proportion would that be, then?—I could not say offhand.

14. How many will there be over ten if there are half under ten: half, will there not?—Yes.

15. Supposing you allowed the children under ten to be taught by women, and you provided that girls above ten should be taught by women, what proportion would that give you of women to men in the profession?—I am afraid I cannot answer.

16. Would not half the number of teachers be women for those under ten, and half the remainder be women for girls over ten?—Yes.

17. That would be three to one, then, would it not?—Yes.

18. Is not that about the proportion in Great Britain? Do you know what that is?—No, I do not know.

19. That is the proportion in Great Britain—303 to 100; I mean, adult primary teachers. Do you know what the proportion of adult primary women teachers in New Zealand is to adult men?—No, I have not those figures.

20. Will you look at this table, please [document shown to witness]: it shows 151 to 100. You will not question it, I suppose? It shows three to two. Is it not the case, according to that table, that we have half the proportion of women that they have in Great Britain?—(No answer.)

21. What I want to ask you is this: do you think there is anything really alarming when we have twice as many men in proportion to women that they have in Great Britain?—I do not say that it is alarming, but I do not think it is in the best interests of education that it should be so.

22. That we have one and a half times as many women as men in the profession is not in the interests of education?—I think you are getting away from what I said. I think it is advisable as far as possible to have boys taught by men and girls taught by women.

23. Even young boys?—I should not go so far as to say very young boys, but, where possible, boys of from ten or eleven upwards. We have at present a large number of boys over ten and eleven being taught by women.

24. Then I come back to the first question: would you do away with mixed schools?—I would if I could.

25. How would you run it in the country?—I am not going into that question.

26. You spoke about the increasing number of women teachers. Do you know how many men and women it requires to enter as pupil-teachers or probationers in order to get an equal number of women to men: have you worked that out?—No.

27. Do you know how many women it requires to enter at the stage of certificated teachers to get the number of women equal to the number of men?—No, I have not gone into that.

28. Is not that an essential factor in determining how many men and how many women remain in the profession?—Certainly.

HENRY AINSLIE PARKINSON made a further statement. (No. 40.)

Witness: I wish to say, on behalf of the New Zealand Educational Institute, that the relative salaries paid to men and to women under the Bill, and the positions that are arranged for women, especially those amongst the assistants, have the support of the Institute.

WELLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS ASSISTANT MASTERS' ASSOCIATION: STATEMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES IT STANDS FOR, WITH SUPPORTING EVIDENCE SHOWING THE ANOMALIES EXISTING UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS AND UNDER MANY WHICH THE NEW BILL FORESHADOWS. (No. 41.)

While recognizing and duly appreciating the reforms which the new Education Bill now before Parliament proposes, such as a Council of Education, centralization of Inspectors, the election of Boards on a wider franchise, larger fields of promotion, and in some cases a more liberal scale of salaries, this association still strongly affirms the following principles, and trusts that the Minister of Education will generously and justly embody some of them, if not all of them, in the new Bill:—

1. Payment of all Teachers on the Bases of Efficiency and Service.

(i.) The injustice due to the present basis of payment—viz., average attendance—is not only creating a very bitter feeling in our ranks, but it is also deleting from our profession the very best of its male material. We are told that it is the intention of the Government to pay on a just basis later, but that at present the educational organization will not permit of the classification of teachers for such a scheme of payment. We reply that every teacher in the Dominion is at present classified. Presumably such classification is for the purpose of marking their efficiency to their employers. Why are they not paid accordingly? If the State places no value on this elaborate classification, in which the Inspectors (the very same men who will classify later) give marks for efficiency, we ask, what is its use? If the State does place value on its classification of teachers, why does it not pay in accordance with such a classification? Even if the State intends to alter the system of classification later, the present one would be far more just on which to base a temporary schedule of payment than the basis of average attendance.

(ii.) Under the old basis and under the new Bill we have the following terrible anomalies:—

Case A: A married male teacher left the primary department to take up secondary high-school work in 1905 at a salary which rose to £270, while the first and second assistants in the primary department were getting £240 and £155 respectively. Since then he has been classified as a B1 and has secured a B.A. degree. The first and second assistants will secure, under the new Bill, £270-£290 and £210-£240 respectively, while his position falls into the £180-210 grade. Is this a just way to reward increased efficiency?

Case B: In 1910 a married male teacher was receiving £195 and a house valued at £25 a year rental; total, £220. He came to Wellington to increase his efficiency by taking a course of education at a University college. He is now a B.A. and is classified as B1. He is also first assistant in a city school. Yet his salary is now £210, and he has a rentage of £55 a year to pay—an encouraging state of affairs after three years' severe study! This teacher has had six years' country service and ten years' city service. These cases might be multiplied, but they will suffice as types. We strongly urge that the Minister make some effort to have these anomalies removed, not by special consideration of individual cases, but by payment on a just basis.

2. Separate Grading of Male and Female Teachers.

(i.) Nature fitted men and women for different functions in life. Their work in the school is often of a different context, and always different in influence, necessarily and valuably different in different cases.

(ii.) Men can better stand the severe strain of the teacher's life than women. The State recognizes this, for it requires the man to work forty years compared with the woman's thirty years before granting retiring-allowance.

(iii.) Men ask for far less leave of absence than women.

We therefore urge, in justice to both sexes, that they be separately graded, and therefore that there be—

3. Separate Positions for Male and Female Teachers.

(i.) The State not only places men on the same basis for payment as women, thereby driving men from the service by cheapening labour and robbing the service of its necessary virility, but it specially favours the cheaper labour by protecting it. (*Vide* new Bill, Sixth Schedule, clauses (c), (d), (e).)

(ii.) Hence we urge that a protective clause for male teachers be inserted in the new Bill—viz., "That in schools of Grade Vc and upwards the first two assistants shall be males."

4. House Allowance to all Married Teachers.

This scarcely needs stressing, but we may note—

(i.) The married man represents to the State the invaluable service of his wife as well as of himself. This the State should and must recognize.

(ii.) The State is encouraging celibacy by not paying house allowance. There are only 40 per cent. of male assistants of marrying age in the service of the Wellington Education Board who are married.

(iii.) The State recognizes the justice of this claim by paying head teachers house allowance.

(iv.) Consider the married male as compared with headmasters, and incidentally the female assistants, in the following :—

Position.	Male or Female.	Condition.	Maximum Salary under New Bill.	Remarks.
A. 750-800.				
Headmaster ..	Male ..	Married ..	£ 440	£50 house allowance.
First assistant ..	" ..	" ..	310	£78 rent to pay.
Second assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	250	
Third assistant ..	" ..	" ..	250	
Fourth assistant ..	" ..	" ..	220	
Fifth assistant ..	Male ..	" ..	180	
B.				
Headmaster ..	Male ..	Married ..	440	£50 house allowance.
First assistant ..	" ..	" ..	310	£57 4s. rent to pay.
Second assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	250	
Third assistant ..	Male ..	Married ..	250	£65 rent to pay.
Fourth assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	220	
Fifth assistant ..	Male ..	" ..	180	
C.				
Headmaster ..	Male ..	Married ..	360	House.
First assistant ..	" ..	" ..	250	£60 rent to pay.
Second assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	220	
Third assistant ..	" ..	" ..	220	
Fourth assistant ..	Male ..	" ..	140	
D.				
Headmaster ..	Male ..	Married ..	360	£40 house allowance.
First assistant ..	" ..	" ..	220	Rent to pay.
Second assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	180	
Third assistant ..	" ..	" ..	180	
Fourth assistant ..	" ..	" ..	140	
Fifth assistant ..	" ..	" ..	120	
E.				
Headmaster ..	Male ..	Married ..	440	£50 house allowance.
First assistant ..	" ..	Single ..	310	
Second assistant ..	" ..	Married ..	250	Rent to pay.
Third assistant ..	Female ..	Single ..	250	
Fourth assistant ..	" ..	" ..	220	

5. Better Payment of Juniors.

(i.) If the State wishes to keep the fittest types in the service it must pay its juniors more liberally. We urge that there should be a junior grade of £130-£180, into which will be placed all teachers who have served five years inclusive of training.

(ii.) Pupil-teachers and probationers are paid less than Public Service cadets. It is no argument to say that the former work less time. They are compelled to study for far more severe examinations. In addition our service is rendered less attractive, and we are losing the necessary male recruits.

Finally, sir, we would point out that the State is usurping more and more the place of the parent in education, and if the State is to secure the best citizens it must also secure the best educators of those citizens. As an important step in the direction of maintaining the progressiveness and virility of our State, especially at a time when we most need them, we would respectfully urge you to consider the above statement, and to recommend the embodiment of some, if not all, of the principles affirmed in the new Bill.

STATEMENT OF MR. G. HOGBEN, INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF SCHOOLS, WITH RESPECT TO THE EFFECT OF THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY VARIOUS WITNESSES ON THE EDUCATION BILL. (No. 42.)

I propose to go through the various clauses of the Bill seriatim, noting the amendments that it seems advisable to make, and giving reasons why certain other amendments proposed should not be made.

Clause 2.—Delete definition of "Council." Definition of "General Council": Insert after the words "General Council" the words "or Council." This will remove the ambiguity pointed out in

clause 51 (4). Definition of "Director": Omit the word "appointed" in both places. Under the Public Service Act, 1912, the Director and the Assistant Director would both be appointed by the Public Service Commissioner. Definition of "Inspector": Delete the words "person appointed to be an"; Inspectors of the Department are also appointed by the Public Service Commissioner. Definition of "registered": Delete, and substitute the following definition: "'Registered school' means a school registered under this Act, whether such school is a public school, secondary school, technical high school, endowed school, or a school under the Education Department, or a school registered in accordance with section 129 thereof." This for the sake of clearness. Definition of "secondary school": Omit the words "District high school or technical high school," which were inserted here in error.

Clause 6.—The effect of this would be to interfere with the mode of payment of salaries of officers of the Department, which is now regulated by the Public Service Act, 1912, and by the Public Revenues Amendment Act, 1913. Some such amendment as the following is required at the beginning of the clause:—New subclause (1), as follows: "(1.) The salaries of the officers of the Department shall be paid as provided by law." The present subclause (1) will then become subclause (2); and in line 13, after the word "moneys," should be inserted the words "other than the salaries of the officers of the Department"; and in line 17, paragraph (a), the words "salaries and" should be deleted. I propose to consult the Crown Law Draftsman as to whether this provides the effect desired.

Paragraph (b): It was pointed out with some justice by Mr. Bell, Secretary to the Southland Education Board, and Mr. Crawshaw, representing the Hawke's Bay Education Board, that the effect of taking away a fixed sum of £250 and of giving a general grant of 11s. per annum on the average attendance would be that in districts containing a large number of small schools the Boards, although not absolutely in a worse financial position than before, would be in a comparatively worse position than the Boards in districts having a smaller proportion of small schools and a larger proportion of large schools. I therefore suggest that subparagraph (iii) be amended by changing the words "eleven shillings" to "five shillings," and by inserting after the word "district" the following words: "and, in addition thereto, of a sum calculated for all the public schools in the district in accordance with the

Schedule hereto"; also by deleting the word "quarterly" in both places.

There would be a consequential amendment in clause 34, paragraph (b), to the following effect: By deleting all the words after the word "calculating," and substituting the following words: "for all the public schools in the district in accordance with the Schedule hereto." The schedule will be a new schedule to follow the present Eighth Schedule in the Bill.

SCHEDULE.

Scale on which, for all the Schools in each Education District, the Minimum Aggregate Amount of Grants to School Committees for Incidental Expenses is to be calculated.

Average Attendance.	Rate per School.
1-20	10s. per head of the average attendance.
21-35	£10, together with 8s. per head of the average attendance over 20.
36-120	£16, together with 5s. per head of the average attendance over 35.
121-400	£38, together with 4s. per head of the average attendance over 120.
Over 400.. ..	£94, together with 3s. per head of the average attendance over 400.

The aggregate amount calculated on this scale for all the districts on last year's attendance is £45,529. The aggregate amount in the Bill for the minimum total of the grants to School Committees at 6s. per head is £45,174, so that the new proposal gives an increase of £355, and the corresponding grants to the Boards with the 5s. per head added gives the same increase of £355 over the amount proposed in the Bill of 11s. per head. The deletion of the words "quarterly" removes the objection made by the Wanganui Board to the additional work entailed by using the quarterly instead of the yearly average attendance for estimating the amounts due to Boards, although it may be said that the amount of additional work involved would be very small and would fall entirely on the Department.

Clause 8.—Paragraph (c): To meet the objection made by several witnesses that the representation of the Inspectors on the Council is overlooked, although this was not intended, the following words after the word "Department" might be inserted: "who shall be an Inspector."

Clause 9.—Subclauses (3) and (4): Subclause (3) was to avoid necessary expense of elections to fill casual vacancies. That, however, would not be very great, and the subclauses might be replaced by the following:—

"(3.) Every casual vacancy shall be filled by the person or body by whom the retiring member was appointed or elected.

"(4.) In case any appointing or electing body fails to appoint or elect within sixty days after the vacancy has occurred the vacancy shall be filled by the Minister."

Clause 11.—Subclause (2), Paragraph (b): It was objected that the Education Board of the district might have no representative on the District Council. Accordingly I suggest that the words "of the General Council of Education" should be deleted.

Clause 12.—The Public Service Act and Regulations already provide a scale of travelling-expenses for officers of the Public Service, and this clause seems to conflict therewith. Accordingly it should

be amended by inserting after the word "Minister" the words "not being officers of the Public Service," and by adding the following new subclause (2): "The members who are officers of the Public Service shall be paid such allowances as are in accordance with law."

Clause 14.—Subclause (3): It was represented by the Wanganui Education Board that the minimum of two members for each urban area would lead to the over-representation of the smaller boroughs. There is some weight in this objection, which could be met by deleting all the words after the words "shall be" and substituting therefor the words "one member for each thirty thousand or part of thirty thousand of the population of such urban area: Provided that the total number of members for any urban area shall in no case exceed three." If this amendment were made, however, the number of members for many of the education districts would be odd, and accordingly it would not be possible to retain the provision for the retirement of half the members of the Education Board at each biennial election. That difficulty could be overcome by making all the members retire at every election. A consequential amendment would be required in the Third Schedule to the Bill.

Clause 23.—In my opinion clause 23 (2) provides for the proper transfer of all property, credits and debits, to the new Boards constituted under the Bill.

Clause 24.—Add at the end of the clause the following words: "and the education service of any such officer as defined in the Public Service Classification and Superannuation Act, 1908, and completed at the commencement of this Act, shall be deemed to have been public service."

Clause 27.—Subclause (1): It was suggested by the Otago Education Board that a quorum at any Board meeting should be at least half the members of the Board. Under the present Act three out of nine members constitute a quorum, and this appears to have worked well.

Clause 31.—Subclause (5): It would be better to omit as unnecessary the words "without the authority of the Minister or of Parliament," and to insert after the words "special fund," in line 15, the words "to any other special fund or to," and to delete the word "into."

Subclause (6): Omit all the words after the words "another special fund."

Clause 34.—Paragraph (b): Already dealt with under clause 6, paragraph (iii).

Clause 36.—To amend as follows: To insert, after subclause (1), the following new subclause:—

"(1A.) The Board shall cause its accounts for the preceding calendar year to be balanced, and a true statement and account to be prepared, in the prescribed form, of the receipts and expenditure of the Board and of its assets and liabilities."

To omit subclause (2), and substitute the following new subclause:—

"(2.) All such accounts shall be audited by the Audit Office, which for that purpose shall have and may exercise all such powers as it has under the Public Revenues Act, 1910, in respect of public moneys."

Clause 37.—Subclause (2): To omit the words "by law," and substitute the words "in the last preceding section."

Clause 38 (4).—In accordance with the suggestion made by several witnesses, insert after the word "effect" the following words: "on a date to be fixed by the Board, being not later than," and omit the words "on and after."

Clause 40.—Paragraph (a): To insert after the words "or School Committee" the following words: "or of the Board of any secondary school or technical school." The reason seems obvious.

Clause 45.—Strike out the words "the members of the Board," and insert after the words "for such urban school district" the following words: "the members of the Board who were elected for the said urban school district. The Commissioner so appointed," and delete the word "who" next following.

Clause 47 (4).—To omit the words "in accordance with" in line 37, and substitute the word "under"; to omit the words "and with such by-laws of the Board as are in accordance therewith," and substitute the words "in accordance with by-laws of the Board"; to omit the word "likewise," and substitute the words "in like manner."

Clause 50.—To omit subclause (1) and substitute the following:—

"(1.) The Committee shall keep such accounts as may be prescribed, and shall cause the same to be balanced to the last day of January in every year, and a statement and account to be prepared, in the prescribed form, of the receipts and expenditure of the Committee during the twelve months preceding that date."

"(2.) All such accounts shall be audited in such manner as may be prescribed."

Subclause (3): To omit the words "as provided by law" and substitute the words "in the prescribed manner."

Subclauses (2) and (3) to stand as subclauses (1) and (2) of 50A.

Clause 51.—It is suggested by the Wanganui Board that the words "five miles" in subclause (3) should be "three miles." It appears to me that the proposal to establish any school within five miles of an existing school is a matter that should be seriously considered by all the authorities concerned, as this subclause provides.

Subclause (4): Before the word "Council" where it first occurs insert for the sake of clearness the word "general."

The Taranaki Education Board objects to subclauses (4) and (5) of this clause as being too arbitrary and placing too much power in the hands of the Minister. [Note.—The Minister can act only on the advice of the Council, and it seems absolutely necessary to place some limit on the undue multiplication of small schools.]

The Taranaki Board proposes also, in subclause (6), paragraph (a), to strike out the words after the words "Grade 0." The Board says that it does not seem reasonable to require struggling settlers to provide part of the teacher's salary. I would point out that the Board may not require this.

Surely the Board might have power to require reasonable payments from well-to-do settlers who would otherwise secure private governesses at a ridiculously low rate. The same Board proposes that in the Sixth Schedule the grant for Grade 0 schools shall be £12 per head instead of £6 per head. I do not know any country in which so liberal an amount is paid as in New Zealand, and to increase it would in my opinion lead to the unnecessary multiplication of schools in Grade 0. Besides, paragraph (b) provides an alternative solution of the difficulty.

Clause 53 (6).—Strike out the words “an Inspector or of any,” and substitute therefor the words “the Director or Assistant Director, or of any Inspector or of any other.”

Clause 66.—Subclause (5): To omit the words “sections fifty-six to sixty-five hereof,” and substitute the words “this Act”; and to add at the end of the subclause the words “until such time as the Board, with the consent of the Minister, establishes them as public schools.”

Subclause (6): To omit the word “Minister” and substitute the word “Governor.”

Clause 67.—Subclause 3 (b): It was suggested by Mr. Mulgan and several other witnesses that when a school increased in size it might sometimes be more desirable to appoint an outsider to one of the new positions created than to promote thereto an assistant already in the school, and in such a case that there ought to be power to transfer the assistant not promoted. It was suggested that the insertion after the word “conduct” of the words “or organization” would meet the case, but in my opinion this is already implied in the word “conduct,” which the addition of the words would seem to limit.

Subclause (4): Objection was taken by three Education Boards to the necessity for advertising imposed by the subclause. The subclause refers only to appointments other than transfers, and I do not see in what other way than by advertising the post could be thrown open to all qualified teachers in the Dominion. The only case in which advertisements might seem to be unnecessary would be in that of training-college students.

Clause 68 (1).—The New Zealand Educational Institute proposes the deletion of this subclause. There may often be cases in which a Committee may recommend to the Board the promotion of a teacher already in the school, and so save the time involved in making a new appointment.

Clause 73.—To add the following new subclause:—

“(2.) The number of teachers in a Native school shall not be less than the number provided for in a public school of the same size.”

Clause 75.—Subclause (2): To omit the words “under the former Act” in lines 32 and 33.

Subclause (10): To omit the word “any” in line 3 and substitute the words “the head” to omit the words “special school or” in lines 3 and 4 and substitute the words “or to any teacher in.”

Clause 78.—The Wellington Board suggested that the notice to be given by a teacher of his intention to relinquish his engagement should be two months instead of one month, the reason given being that one month does not give enough time to the Board to fill the vacancy. The amendment, however, only partly does away with the difficulty, because most vacancies for which applications might have to be called, and obviously even with two months’ notice the time allowed for filling the second and third vacancies might still be less than one month.

Clause 79.—It is suggested by Wanganui that after the word “use” the words “by the Board” should be inserted. There is no harm in inserting these words, but I think they are already implied.

Clause 84 (1), (2).—It is suggested that action might be taken without Boards being consulted. To avoid any danger of this occurring, the words “after consultation with the Board” might be inserted in subclause (1) after the words “education district,” and in subclause (2) after the words “urban school districts.” In subclause (1) omit the words “Part I of.”

Clauses 85, 86.—These have reference to the Ninth Schedule. In drawing up that schedule it was overlooked that as regards control the schools in Part I are of three classes. The schedule is therefore divided into three parts—Part I, Christchurch Boys’ High School and Christchurch Girls’ High School, which are controlled by the Canterbury College Board of Governors; Part III, Wanganui Girls’ College and Marlborough High School, which are controlled by a Board consisting of the same persons as the members of the Education Board. Part II of the schedule as printed in the Bill is unnecessary, as will appear later.

Clause 85 (1).—This requires amendment as follows: After the words “named in” delete the words “Part I,” and insert in lieu thereof “Parts I and II”; and after the words “provided that” insert the words “in the case of the secondary classes named in Part II of the said schedule.”

There has been some objection made to the second proviso of the subclause, and there would indeed be some difficulty in carrying it out. It has, however, been suggested that parents of pupils should in all cases be represented on the governing bodies of the secondary schools, and I therefore suggest that for the second proviso of 85 (1) there should be substituted the following: “Provided further that in the case of any school named in Part II of the same schedule, where any such Act does not provide for the election of members of the governing body by the parents of the pupils, it is hereby enacted that the parents shall elect two members in the manner prescribed by the scheme referred to in section eighty-eight hereof.”

Clause 86 (1).—Consequential amendments should be made as follows: By deleting the words “name in Part II of” and substituting therefor the words “other than those schools named in Parts I and II.”

Subclause (4) may be deleted as unnecessary (see clause 108 (3)).

Clause 94.—Insert after the word “account,” in paragraph (a), the words in “the prescribed form”; and add at the end of the paragraph the words “and of its assets and liabilities, audited in such manner as may be prescribed.”

Clause 104.—It has been objected by the Wanganui Board that the effect of the Bill might be to take away from the Boards the control of the small technical schools which are now most economically and efficiently managed by them. This is not the intention, but the matter may be made quite clear by inserting in the definition of "technical school," after the word "Minister," the following words: "on the application of the controlling authority or on the advice of the Council."

Clause 105.—As in clause 84, insert after the words "School Committee" the words "after consultation with the Board."

Clause 108.—This clause refers to the Eleventh Schedule. The case of Canterbury College and the technical schools established by it render it necessary to add to the schedule the following: "Part III—Canterbury College School of Art," and to make the following amendments to clause 85: In subclause (1) to insert after the words "technical schools" the words "other than classes or schools established by a University college"; to add a new subclause (2) (a) as follows: "In the case of the technical schools named in Part III of the Eleventh Schedule hereto the controlling authority shall be the Managers thereof."

Clause 108.—Subclause 3 (d): After the words "possessed by" there should be inserted the words "controlling authority and." These words were in the corresponding clause before, and apparently were omitted by inadvertence.

Subclause 3 (a): It was suggested by two witnesses that the word "one-half" should be amended to read "one-third," on the ground that the clause as it stands would give Education Boards too much power over technical schools; but it may be pointed out that the only case in which the Education Board would have a majority of the total number of Managers would be the case in which it provided more than half of the cost of maintenance, and therefore it appears to me should in justice have the chief control quite apart from its status as an education authority.

Clause 110.—This clause might introduce some complication, and several witnesses asked that it be excised. There may be something in this, and its excision would have no drawback.

Clause 111 (1).—Two witnesses asked that the word "eightpence" should be deleted and "ninepence" inserted, as in the present Act. As a matter of experience ninepence has proved to be far too liberal for the needs of any of the clauses concerned. In the third proviso (line 9) insert after the words "fourteen years" the words "unless he is a holder of a certificate of proficiency." In the fourth proviso (line 13) insert after the word "moneys" the words "less the reasonable expenses of administration." This is asked for by the Wanganui and one or two other Education Boards. The amendment is reasonable.

Clause 113.—Before the word "year" insert the word "calendar" to remove any doubt.

Clause 116.—Amend so as to read "the Minister may direct any Inspector to visit, inspect, and examine technical schools and classes under this part of the Act."

Clause 122.—To omit all the words after the word "accounts" at the beginning of line 12 and substitute the following words: "in the prescribed form, and shall cause such accounts to be balanced to the end of each calendar year, and a statement and account to be prepared, in the prescribed form, of their receipts and expenditure during the preceding year and of their assets and liabilities."

"(2.) All such accounts shall be audited by the Audit Office, which for that purpose shall have and may exercise all such powers as it has under the Public Revenues Act, 1910, in respect of public moneys."

Clause 127 (3).—Delete the word "this" in line 20 and substitute therefor the word "that." (Note.—Inspectors of the Education Department are appointed under the Public Service Act, not under the Education Act.)

Add at the end of the subclause the following words: "No such Inspector shall receive a salary less than the salary he was receiving at the commencement of this Act, including the average annual amount of the fees received by him as examiner or supervisor for the Education Department for the three years immediately preceding."

Further, add the following new subclause (4):—

"In the case of every such Inspector education service as defined by the Public Service Classification and Superannuation Act, 1908, shall be deemed to have been public service."

Clause 128 (3).—Insert before the word "registered," in line 29, the word "other."

Clause 129 (3).—Omit the words "and its name shall appear in the next list of registered schools published in the *Gazette*" in lines 47 and 48.

Add the following new subclause:—

"(6.) The Director shall publish in the *Gazette*, at intervals not exceeding one year, a list of all schools for the time being registered under this section."

Clause 132.—Subclause (1): Delete the words "a Chief" and insert the word "an."

Subclause (2): Delete the words "Chief Inspector" and substitute the words "Director of Physical Education"; and, further, delete the words "the Chief Inspector" and substitute therefor the word "him."

Subclause (3): Delete the word "Director" and substitute therefor the word "latter."

Clause 143.—Line 17: Insert after the word "transfer" the following words: "or in the case of a teacher in a secondary school or in a technical school, against a reduction in salary."

A consequential amendment will be necessary also in clause 149, in regard to which I propose to consult the Crown Law Draftsman.

Clause 156 (1).—Paragraph (h): Omit, and substitute the following paragraph:—

"(h.) For prescribing the accounts to be kept by Boards and Committees, and by Managers of Technical Schools, and the times and manner of auditing such accounts."

Paragraph (i) : Delete the words “ the staffs, salaries, and allowances of teachers and.” These matters involve matters that are determined by the Public Service Commissioner, whose powers, however, will be limited by clauses 73 (2) and 75 (10) in the Bill as amended.

New Clause.—Teachers in Native schools and in various institutions managed by the Department should be treated as regards salaries and allowances on the same lines as teachers of public schools and other teachers in schools under the Education Act, but being public servants they come under the provisions of the Public Service Act, 1912, but it is found their salaries cannot be fitted into the grades provided for in the Professional Division in the Second Schedule of that Act. The Public Service Commissioner has therefore had to place them in the General Division of the Public Service. There is much inconvenience in this procedure, and indeed the officers concerned make objections to being placed in a division which is certainly not professional in character. After consultation with the Public Service Commissioner I therefore suggest the following clause :—

“ Notwithstanding anything in the Public Service Act, 1912, the Public Service Commissioner may for the purpose of that Act classify officers of the Public Service who are engaged in the Education service, as defined by the Public Service Classification and Superannuation Act, 1908, in a division to be known as the Educational Division.”

SCHEDULES.

Second Schedule.—The witnesses are almost unanimous in recommending that the smaller education districts should be incorporated with other districts so as to reduce the total number of districts. I do not propose to discuss the precise boundaries of this or that district proposed in the Bill, as they do not affect the essential character of the Bill.

Fourth Schedule.—Part I, paragraphs 9 and 10 : As has been pointed out, there seems to be no strong reason for allowing the householders in any school district a second chance of electing a School Committee. I therefore suggest that all the words after the word “ Board ” where it first occurs in paragraph 9 should be deleted down to and including the word “ Board ” in paragraph 10.

Sixth Schedule.—Grade of School—VIIb : To add at the end of column 5 the figure 1, and to omit the figure 1 from the end of column 6.

Paragraph (b) : To omit the word and figure “ Subgrade 1,” and substitute “ Grade 1.”

Paragraph (c) : To delete the word “ teachers ” wherever it occurs, and substitute the word “ assistant,” as in the present Act.

Part II : Delete paragraph (d) and substitute therefor the following :—

“ No separate boys’ school or separate girls’ school shall be established or maintained with less than 161 children in average attendance, and no separate infants’ school shall be established or maintained with less than 121 children in average attendance.”

A consequential amendment should be made in the table attached to that part of the schedule as follows :—

Table (i), Separate Boys’ Schools : To add at the end of the table the following :—

Column 1.	Column 2.	Column 3.	Column 4.	Column 5.	Column 6.	Column 7.
501-550	VIIA	VII	12	6, 5, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2	2, 2, 1, 1, 1	5

and so on, one assistant of Grade I being added for each such grade above Subgrade VIIA.

Table (ii), Separate Girls’ Schools, and (iii), Separate Infants’ Schools : To insert a new line at the beginning of the table :

Column 1.	Column 2.	Column 3.	Column 4.	Column 5.	Column 6.	Column 7.
121-160	IVA	III	3	3, 2	1	1

Sixth Schedule.—In column 3 to delete the number III where it last occurs, and to insert in lieu thereof the number IV ; and in the same column in the last two lines to delete the number IV and insert in lieu thereof the number V, and to add—

Column 1.	Column 2.	Column 3.	Column 4.	Column 5.	Column 6.	Column 7.
501-550	VIIA	VI	12	5, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1	1, 1, 1, 1, 1	5

and so on, one assistant of Grade I being added for each such grade above Subgrade VIIA.

Part IV, paragraph (a) : To delete the words “ and being open for not less than eight hours a week on the average ” ; also in paragraph (c) to insert after the words “ to teach ” the words “ or travel,” and to insert after the word “ salary ” the words “ and allowances.”

Part V, paragraph (a) : To add the words “ provided that his total salary shall not be increased thereby to more than £450 a year.”

To add a new subparagraph (ee) :—

“ Grants given under Part VIII of this Act for vocational courses in district high schools may, after due provision has been made for the apparatus and material required for such courses, be paid with the approval of the Minister either to the assistants in the secondary department or to other teachers employed to carry out the vocational courses.” This is really the law at present, but experience shows that it is not always understood. It would entirely do away with the objection made to the scale of salaries of the secondary departments of district high schools.

Ninth Schedule.—Amendment is required to this schedule as already indicated.

Tenth Schedule.—The provisoes in this schedule are to secure more reasonable salaries and efficient staffing for secondary schools. As the Government provides a large part of the money for free pupils it is obvious that it should secure also proficiency in the schools. Some of the schools without any income from endowments would have a difficulty in complying with the provisoes as printed in the Bill. I find on examination of various schools that the hardship is reduced entirely by proviso (vi), and can be removed by its deletion from the Bill.

Twelfth Schedule.—This provides for the grades and salaries of Inspectors of Schools. It has been pointed out that such officers would be in the Professional Division of the Public Service, and the salaries should agree with the clauses and subdivisions of the salaries of the officers of the Professional Division as shown in the Second Schedule of the Public Service Act, 1912. Such a schedule as the following would serve the purpose :—

Grade.	Salary.	
	Minimum.	Maximum.
	£	£
Chief Inspector	600	650
Senior Inspector	550	575
Inspector	500	525
Assistant Inspector	420	480

Part II, paragraph (c).—It seems to be unnecessary, and in any case it traverses the Public Service Act, 1912, and I therefore suggest its omission.

I should be happy to answer questions on any other points in the Bill to which I have not referred.

ADDENDUM.—Two ladies who gave evidence—Miss Birss and Miss Simpson—asked that, in column 5 of the table in Part I of the Sixth Schedule, in the last two lines of the table the grade of the fifth assistant should be 4 instead of 3. This would agree with the grades of the first three positions in the lines suggested to be added to Tables (ii) and (iii) of Part II, as the position in mixed schools assigned to women could not be lower than the second, fifth, and sixth—that is, Grades 5, 4, and 3.