

be affected, and the saving on these schools would amount to something like £7,000 or £8,000. In my opinion, it would be wise to expend that money in increasing the salaries allotted to head-teachers in that group and some other groups of schools. I have a strong opinion that headmasters are underpaid. In the group 36 to 75, I would make the alteration read 41 to 80. At present the pupil-teacher is introduced at 91 in North Canterbury; for six years we tried this increment at 81, and I think most people interested in the profession prefer 81. The financial necessities of our position forced us to advance to 91.

222. In the schools 75 to 100, there are eighty-five schools in the colony in that group. These schools in Otago and in Wellington carry salaries considerably higher than that allotted in this suggested scale: do you think the teachers in that group of schools in Otago, the headmasters, are too highly paid?—I think I may say they are, according to my recollection. They are much higher than this scale, which is a fairly liberal one at the stage you mention.

223. Do you think, seeing there are only eighty-five schools in the whole of the colony between 76 and 100, the salaries attached to the positions of headmasters should be such as to induce good men to go into the country, and remain there?—I do not think that the proposed salary is insufficient for a master in a school up to 200 children. But I hold that the masters in the large schools are underpaid.

224. It has been said that it is desirable in any system of education to have a certain number of prizes: how many schools in New Zealand have an average attendance of over 500?—Very few. The prizes, according to the scale before us, seem to me to go to the masters in the lower-grade schools. Considering the staff allowed, and the work and responsibilities of the master in schools of 36 and 110, I do consider salaries of £150 and £200, with a house, something of a prize.

225. In your opinion, should not the medium-sized school also be allotted such a salary as to be looked upon as a fair prize?—I have already said so.

226. If the work asked for were a little more and the salary correspondingly increased, would it not be an advantage?—It would be an advantage; but you have to consider your means. Where are you going to get the salary? If you say you can do it with that £7,000 which you get between 35 and 41, there is no reason why they should not have a share in the increase; but everything is relative.

227. Instead of 81, suppose you adhere to the 91 at present obtaining?—I would not approve of it; I am opposed to 91; we have given both these schemes a good trial in North Canterbury, and we are unanimous in preferring 81. For many years in Otago the average attendance required before a pupil-teacher was admitted was 110. That was altogether too high. I call their system barbarous. I am glad to hear that the requirement there is now reduced to 100. That is going a little way in the right direction.

228. Coming now to the salary of the mistresses: The first female assistant in a school of 35 to 75, or, as you suggest, 41 to 81, the suggested salary is £80?—I consider that large enough to begin with, but too small at the later stages; her salary should rise by unitary increments, just as the master's does.

229. Taking the next group, 75 to 100: The work of an infant mistress in that school is the preparatory classes, up to Standards I. and II. That is the usual arrangement. Do you think £85 a year is sufficient salary?—No; we increase the salary there; our salary at the present moment is higher.

230. Then the next group, 100 to 150: The suggested salary to women there would be a considerable reduction now on the Otago scale?—I would suggest that they be considerably raised.

231. You spoke very much of a group of schools of 421 upwards. You said you had a number of them in North Canterbury. You consider they form an exceptionally important group?—Seven of them between 420 and 480, very important schools, that have maintained practically the same position for years.

232. The salary paid to the infant mistress is £140; the suggested salary to the first male assistant £170: in your opinion, does the first male assistant in these large schools occupy an important position?—He occupies a very important position.

233. Do you look upon him as practically the deputy headmaster?—Yes.

234. In this suggested scale the salary for the first male assistant is £190: would you suggest a higher salary?—No; that is a considerable increase on what we have been prepared to give them here. It is a substantial salary. I would sooner have the headmaster's salary £420 than put a penny on to the first assistant at £190. Everything is relative.

235. Then, that group of schools, 421 to 480: What, in your opinion, would be an ideal staff, as far as the distribution of the sexes and the staff of assistants is concerned—a mixed school?—Say, headmaster at £320, infant mistress at £135, first assistant master at £190. He is teaching a large standard, and requires to be a man of great capabilities. The next teacher on the scale must be a female. She comes in at £110. The next a male at £100, and the next two females at £80, and five pupil-teachers. That is a beautiful staff for the purposes of the reform referred to in my introductory remarks.

236. Do you think that three male assistants in that group of 480, and three females, six assistants, counting the mistress as an assistant, would work well?—They work nicely, without an extra pupil-teacher.

237. Leaving out of consideration just now the headmaster, we have a staff of six assistants in that class of school: in your opinion, would it not be wiser to have three males and three females there?—Does not this scale provide that there may be three males and three females if you wish, as long as the males do not outnumber the females?

238. From your own experience, knowing that the Fourth Standard in that group of schools is exceptionally heavy, and the Fifth Standard as a rule is also a heavy, difficult class, and the Sixth