

expenditure, and the comparison between the New Zealand schools and the London schools; among other things, the average cost per child and the capitation grants.]

153. *Mr. Weston.*] Would it be just and safe to compare the cost of London schools with that of New Zealand schools?—You would have to compare with the London schools New Zealand schools with from 250 to 1,050, and to exclude the cost of the small schools. Even then it would not be absolutely fair. The average size of a London school is 914.

154. So that, taking all schools, the cost per head would be greater than the cost in London?—I have not made up the cost of our schools for the year ending 31st March. We have been working actually for some years on a capitation grant of £3 15s.; but it costs the London School Board more than that.

155. *Mr. Hill.*] You say one of the purposes the Government should have in view in developing this scale is the strengthening of the staff?—Yes.

156. Can you tell us how many teachers in each education district would be reduced in salary under the scale proposed, and how many advanced in salary?—The number reduced would be comparatively small. I am safe in saying that, though I cannot give the figures.

157. Have you made the comparison?—Yes, but not in tabulated form.

158. How many assistants would be reduced in each education district?—I have not made any comparative table, but I am sure the number would be very small. There would be available positions in the country at larger salaries than they are getting now, and I consider those teachers should fill positions of that sort more than they are doing at present. I consider that we have a large number of our teachers who are only assistants in town schools when they should have the responsibility of being in charge of country schools.

159. Under the head of "staff" you propose to increase the number of adult teachers by 406: is that so?—Comparing the figures, 2,541 with 2,199, the number would be 458.

160. You propose to diminish the number of pupil-teachers by 244?—Yes. About two hundred pupil-teachers a year come into the profession, and that number will keep up the supply.

161. Have you estimated how these additional assistants would be distributed over the several educational districts—that is, would they be added to the larger or the smaller districts?—The larger proportion would be distributed where there are smaller schools—that is, in Auckland and the small districts. Of course, all districts in New Zealand would benefit, but the districts that would benefit most are the ones that have the small schools, and Auckland particularly would benefit.

162. The amount of the proposed capitation increase is 5s., is it not?—Yes; based on the total population for the colony.

163. You propose to increase the grants to Education Boards out of this additional 5s.?—Yes.

164. You say the increase will be from £59,973 to £65,303, or a difference of £5,330, nearly 9 per cent?—Yes.

165. You are increasing the capitation grant $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent?—Yes.

166. If you take from the £4 capitation allowance 11s. 3d. for the School Committees your scale is constructed upon a capitation of £3 8s. 9d. for the colony: is that correct?—I think you have deducted the inspection subsidy in one case and not in the other.

167. But, if you take the allowance for School Committees—11s. 3d.—from the £4 capitation, does it not leave only £3 8s. 9d. for the Commission to work upon in the construction of a scale?—Very nearly; but it is not exactly right.

168. In what way is it incorrect?—There is a sum of £250 for each Board, and you have omitted the inspection allowance.

169. What education district in New Zealand gives £70 for a sole or head teacher with an average attendance of 20?—There are several, I think, among them being Wellington. Otago gives £70 up to an average of 19.

170. The suggested scheme gives £5 capitation for each school under 15 in average attendance?—Yes.

171. On every pupil of such school there is an absolute loss of £1 11s. 3d., then?—No; it is not so much as that; very nearly so.

172. But dealing with the £3 8s. 9d. on the scale, and taking into consideration the amount of £5, does it not show at present that there is a loss on every pupil in New Zealand—that is, below the average attendance?—Yes, there is a loss.

173. Can you say how many schools there are in each education district with an average attendance below 15?—In Auckland, forty-one under 15.

174. Is that for New Zealand?—For the Auckland District.

175. You say that in the Auckland District there are forty-one schools with an average attendance below 15?—Yes.

176. *Mr. Davidson.*] The total number of pupils in such schools throughout the colony is 2,449?—Yes.

177. *Mr. Hill.*] Under any scale that may be adopted, it will be competent for any Education Board to open a new school in the district?—Yes.

178. Do you propose to limit the opening of such schools in any way?—I think that is a question for the Boards.

179. Would it not be better to separate such schools altogether from consideration, and suggest to the Government a special grant of £5 to such schools, seeing that such a disturbing factor will make any proposed scheme unworkable?—I do not think so. They are not always below 15. I think you must take all the schools that are recognised by Boards, and work them under one scheme. You lose on all schools—some say below 80, and some say below 100; but my own opinion is that it is somewhere below 62 of an average attendance. There is no reason to draw the line at 15.